

**IS CHINA CLIMBING UP THE QUALITY
LADDER? 2012**

Gabor Pula and Daniel Santabárbara

**Documentos de Trabajo
N.º 1209**

BANCO DE ESPAÑA
Eurosistema



IS CHINA CLIMBING UP THE QUALITY LADDER?

IS CHINA CLIMBING UP THE QUALITY LADDER? (*)

Gabor Pula (**)

EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

Daniel Santabárbara (**)

BANCO DE ESPAÑA

(*) The opinions expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Banco de España or the European Central Bank. We would like to acknowledge Tuomas Peltonen for his worthy help in setting up the database. We also thank Michael Ehrmann, Amit Khandelwal, Elena Martínez, Livio Stracca, Daria Taglioni and an anonymous referee for their valuable comments. All remaining errors are obviously ours.

(**) Emails: gabor.pula@ecb.europa.eu and daniel.santabarbara@bde.es.

The Working Paper Series seeks to disseminate original research in economics and finance. All papers have been anonymously refereed. By publishing these papers, the Banco de España aims to contribute to economic analysis and, in particular, to knowledge of the Spanish economy and its international environment.

The opinions and analyses in the Working Paper Series are the responsibility of the authors and, therefore, do not necessarily coincide with those of the Banco de España or the Eurosystem.

The Banco de España disseminates its main reports and most of its publications via the INTERNET at the following website: <http://www.bde.es>.

Reproduction for educational and non-commercial purposes is permitted provided that the source is acknowledged.

© BANCO DE ESPAÑA, Madrid, 2012

ISSN: 1579-8666 (on line)

Abstract

There is an ongoing debate in the literature about the quality content of Chinese exports and to what extent China poses a threat to the market positions of advanced economies. While China's export structure is very similar to that of the advanced world, its export unit values are well below the level of developed economies. Building on the assumption that unit values reflect quality, the prevailing view of the literature is that China exports low quality varieties of the same products as its advanced competitors. This paper challenges this view by relaxing the assumption that unit values reflect quality. We derive the quality of Chinese exports to the European Union by estimating disaggregated demand functions from a discrete choice model. The paper has three major findings. First, China's share of the European Union market is larger than would be justified only by its low average prices, implying that the quality of Chinese exports is high compared to many competitors. Second, China has gained quality relative to other competitors since 1995, indicating that China is climbing up the quality ladder. Finally, our analysis of the supply side determinants reveals that the relatively high quality of Chinese exports is related to processing trade and the increasing role of global production networks in China.

Keywords: Chinese exports, vertical product differentiation, quality ladder, global production networks, discrete choice model, COMEXT database.

JEL Classification: F1, F12, F14, F15, F23.

Resumen

La calidad de las exportaciones chinas y hasta qué punto pueden ser una amenaza a las posiciones de mercado de las economías avanzadas es un debate abierto en la literatura. Si bien la estructura de las exportaciones de China es similar a la de los países avanzados, sus valores unitarios son muy inferiores. Basándose en el supuesto de que los valores unitarios reflejan la calidad de las exportaciones, la corriente predominante en la literatura es que China exporta las variedades de baja calidad de los mismos productos que exportan las economías avanzadas. Este trabajo cuestiona esta hipótesis al relajar el supuesto de que los valores unitarios sean una medida de la calidad. La calidad de las exportaciones chinas a la UE se obtiene a través de las funciones desagregadas de demanda derivadas de un modelo de elección discreta. Nuestro análisis obtiene tres resultados principales. En primer lugar, la cuota de mercado de China en la UE es mayor de la que sólo se justificaría por sus precios bajos, lo que implica que la calidad de las exportaciones chinas es relativamente alta respecto a muchos competidores. En segundo lugar, China ha aumentado la calidad relativa de sus exportaciones en relación con otros competidores desde 1995. Finalmente, el análisis sobre los determinantes de oferta de la calidad de las exportaciones chinas revela su relación con el comercio de procesamiento y ensamblaje y, por tanto, con el papel creciente de las redes mundiales de producción.

Palabras claves: Exportaciones chinas, diferenciación vertical de producto, escala de calidad, redes mundiales de producción, modelo de elección discreta, base de datos COMEXT.

Códigos JEL: F1, F12, F14, F15, F23.

1 Introduction

Analyzing the quality of Chinese exports is of interest for three reasons. First the quality upgrading of Chinese exports could threaten the export market positions of both emerging and advanced economies. In order to implement an adequate policy response, it is necessary to have a deeper understanding of the nature of China's quality upgrading. The quality of Chinese exports has also implications for the exchange rate pass-through, i.e. how much the appreciation of the renminbi may reduce China's trade surplus. *Ceteris paribus*, the higher the quality of Chinese products the lower the price elasticity of demand for them, implying that, in case of an appreciation of the renminbi, export volumes fall less and the trade surplus is more sustained. Finally, historical experience suggests that there are limits to gains in global market shares. This means that China, if it intends to sustain its export-led growth strategy will have to move away from extensive export growth towards exports with higher quality and value-added content. Thus, the pace of quality upgrading also has implications for China's long term growth.

Existing empirical evidence on the quality of Chinese export products is scarce and ambiguous. This is related to the fact that product quality is unobservable and difficult to measure. One simple way of assessing the quality content of exports is looking at the *sectoral composition of exports by technological intensity*. Table 1 shows the composition of various country groups' exports to the EU markets by technological intensity, where sector classification is given by the OECD's methodology. According to the table, China's export structure has changed dramatically since the mid-nineties and the share of high-tech sectors in China's exports has increased from 7% in 1995 to 33% in 2007. This indicates a significant technological / quality upgrading of Chinese export products. By 2007 one-third of China's export was high tech, higher than that of Japan or the EU15. The finding that China's export structure is more sophisticated than suggested by its level of economic development is well documented by the literature (Rodrik, 2006 and Schott, 2008). The most likely explanation for the "over-sophistication" of Chinese exports is the increasing role of production networks, which are dominantly present in high-tech industries of IT, electronics and car manufacturing.

An alternative way of assessing product quality is using the *prices (unit values) of products as proxies for quality*. Chart 1 shows the relative unit values of imports of the EU from main country groups, in 1995 and 2007.¹ Chart 1 has two important findings. First, it shows that unit values of products from China are 30% lower than the average unit value of all importers. Actually, Chinese products are imported at the lowest prices across the country groups presented on the Chart. Second, there is no sign of catching up in the relative import prices of Chinese goods in the 1995-2007 period, i.e. the negative unit value gap of China is persistent. Assuming that unit values are good proxies for quality, looking at Chart 1 one may conclude that (1) of all the trading countries, China exports the lowest quality goods to the EU market and (2) there was no quality upgrading (relative to other competitors) in the recent

¹ In line with the literature relative unit values or unit value gaps are calculated at the product and country level based on the following formula:

$$UVgap_t^c = \sum_g (UV_{gt}^c / UV_{gt}^{EU}) * w_{gt}^c$$

The unit value gap of an import product from a given country equals the unit value of the product imported from the country divided by the average unit value of the same product on the EU15 market (i.e. the average unit value of the same product across all import origins). To get a country unit value we aggregate the product unit value gaps across all products.

decades. All in all, evidence on sectoral composition by technological intensity and on prices as proxies for quality provide different conclusions on the question whether China is climbing up the technology ladder.

Academics bridged this contradictory evidence by using the most recent findings of the trade literature, which suggest that *countries specialize within products rather than across products*. As set out by Schott (2004), contrary to the predictions of traditional trade theory, both advanced and developed countries export the same set of products, but more developed countries tend to export more expensive varieties of the same product. Assuming that price reflects quality it means that there is a *within product specialization* in world trade, i.e. more developed countries export the higher quality varieties of the same product and less developed countries export lower quality varieties. The fact that China exports low quality varieties of the same products as advanced economies would help to understand why it has an “over-sophisticated” export structure on the one hand and has low unit values on the other (Schott, 2008, Fontagné et al., 2008 and Xu, 2010). This finding may also lead to the conclusion that Chinese exports pose only limited competition on advanced economies.

Our analysis challenges this view. The literature summarized above builds on the assumption that prices and unit values reflect quality. There are several reasons why this may not be the case. First, the unit value is not the market price, but rather a proxy for the import price. Tariffs, taxes and distribution mark-ups, which are not represented in the unit value, all have an impact on the final price of the product, but not on its quality. Chinese companies have to export cheaper even high-quality products, if tariffs on their products are higher than their competitors. Second, production costs and exchange rates may also drive a wedge between price and quality. Chinese shirts may be sold at lower prices if their production cost is below that of the competitors, or the renminbi is depreciating against the competitors’ currencies, even if there is no difference in the quality of the products. Finally, under product differentiation, high cost producers can survive on the market not only due to actual or perceived higher quality (vertical attribute), but also due to horizontal attributes, such as design.

The novelty of this paper compared to the summarized literature is that it relaxes the assumption that import prices reflect quality. We estimate quality following the methodology introduced by Berry (1994) and Berry et al. (1995), who use *not only prices, but also information on market shares to derive a quality measure*. Quality is obtained from a nested logit demand function derived from a discrete choice model. A recent application of this methodology to trade data is given by Khandelwal (2010). Our paper is the first to apply this methodology to a European database. We use the Eurostat’s COMEXT database, which provides information on EU imports from 240 partner economies at the CN-8 digit product level (approximately 8500 product headings).²

Two attempts to identify export quality using information on US import prices and market share, by Hallak and Schott (2010) and Khandelwal (2010), find contradictory results. Hallak and Schott, who develop a technique for estimating quality using information in countries’ export unit values, quantities and trade balances find that China’s quality is low compared to developed economies. Khandelwal, however, finds

² Trade balance has been used as additional variable to determine product quality by Aiginger (1997) and Hallak and Schott (2010) on a US database. Recently Benkovskis and Rimgailaitė (2010) estimated quality and variety of exports of new EU member states. They followed a methodology introduced by Feenstra (1994), which account for quality based on unit values, market shares and firms’ market power.

that Chinese quality is relatively low in some products (e.g., transmission receivers) but high in others (e.g., footwear).

This paper has three major findings. First, it finds that despite its lower unit value, the average quality of China's exports to EU markets is high relative to other developing economies. Second, we find that China has gained quality competitiveness relative to other competitors since 1995. With other words, China is climbing up the quality ladder. The cross-product pattern of our quality estimates suggests a link between the quality and the domestic value-added content of a product.³ To test this relationship, we also analyze some supply side factors related to export quality. Our results indicate that processing trade, i.e. exports with high import and low domestic value added content, are indeed associated with higher export quality. That implies that quality upgrading in China so far is not embedded in the country's indigenous technological upgrading and it largely benefits multinational rather than Chinese companies.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 summarizes the theoretical discrete choice model and the derivation of the demand functions. Section 3 gives an overview of the empirical implementation, the dataset and the estimation methodology. It also provides a description of our methodology to assess the role of processing trade in determining export quality. Section 4 summarizes the results and their robustness and Section 5 concludes.

³ Recently, several papers have documented a positive relationship between the presence of foreign firms / processing activity in a certain sector and the sophistication of its exports (Xu and Lu, 2009, Amiti and Freund, 2010, Wang and Wei, 2010, and Van Assche and Gagnes, 2010).

2 Theoretical Model

Following Berry (1994) and Berry et al. (1995), our demand curve specification is derived from a discrete choice model. In the following, unlike in the standard literature, the unit of consumer choice is called *variety* rather than *product* in order to take into account the specifics of our database, which has both a product and country dimension. Variety is defined as a specific product imported from a given country.

We assume the following random utility function for the consumer i (j indexes variety and t is time):

$$U_{i,j,t} = x_{j,t} \beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \xi_{j,t} + \varepsilon_{i,j}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\xi_{j,t} = \xi_j + \xi_t + \Delta \xi_{j,t}. \quad (2)$$

The random utility consists of four terms. The first term $x_{j,t} = (x_{j,t,1}, \dots, x_{j,t,K})$ is a $K \times 1$ vector of attributes for variety j , which may evolve over time. The second term, $p_{j,t}$ denote the price of variety j at time t . The terms $\xi_{j,t}$ and $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ stands for unobserved characteristics of the variety.

$\xi_{j,t}$ is commonly interpreted as the vertical attribute, i.e., the unobserved *quality* of the variety. All else equal, all consumers are more willing to pay for varieties for which $\xi_{j,t}$ is high (that is why the term is not subscripted by i). The unobserved quality term is decomposed into three components: ξ_j is the time-invariant valuation that the consumer attaches to variety j ; ξ_t captures common (demand) shocks across all varieties; and $\Delta \xi_{j,t}$ is a variety-time variation from the quality fixed effect, which is observed by the consumer but not by the researcher.

The horizontal attribute of a variety is measured by $\varepsilon_{i,j}$. Unlike quality, the horizontal variety attribute is valued by some consumers but not by others. The horizontal variety attribute helps to explain why some consumers buy low quality but expensive varieties.

Assuming that the error term $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is distributed *i.i.d.* type I extreme value across i , the choice probabilities (the probability that consumer i chooses variety j) take a multinomial logit form. Using a further assumption that the number of consumers are infinite ($i = 1, \dots, I = \infty$) the market share for variety j at time t can be written as follows:

$$S_{j,t} = \frac{\exp(V_{j,t})}{\sum_{j'=1}^J \exp(V_{j',t})} = \frac{\exp(x'_{j,t} \beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \xi_{j,t})}{\sum_{j'=1}^J \exp(x'_{j',t} \beta - \alpha p_{j',t} + \xi_{j',t})}. \quad (3)$$

Based on Berry (1994) the following transformation can be made:

$$\log(S_{j,t}) = e_t + x'_{j,t} \beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \xi_{j,t} \quad (4)$$

substituting this into (3) gives

$$e_t = -\log\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \exp(x'_{j,t}\beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \xi_{j,t})\right). \quad (5)$$

An outside variety is needed to complete the demand system. The purpose of the outside variety is to allow consumers the possibility to not purchase any of the inside varieties. For example, consumers may choose to purchase a domestic variety or simply not purchasing anything. If we normalize the utility of the outside variety ($j = 0$) to zero, the market share of the outside variety can be expressed as follows:

$$S_{0,t} = \frac{\exp(0)}{\sum_{j=1}^J \exp(x'_{j,t}\beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \xi_{j,t})} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\log(S_{0,t}) = 0 - e_t. \quad (6)$$

Substituting (6) to (4) and rearranging gives the following demand curve:

$$\log(S_{j,t}) - \log(S_{0,t}) = x'_{j,t}\beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \xi_{j,t} \quad (7)$$

The above model can be estimated by an instrumental variable derived estimator, where the independent variable is $\log(S_{j,t}) - \log(S_{0,t})$, the independent variables are $x'_{j,t}$, $p_{j,t}$ and $\bar{s}_{j/g,t}$, and the error term is $\xi_{j,t}$.

Nonetheless, a major limitation of the simple multinomial logit demand curve in (7) is that it assumes the same substitution pattern across all products' varieties.⁴ To remedy this shortcoming we have to extend (7) and use a nested logit model. In contrast to the simple logit model the nested logit model preserves the assumption that consumer tastes have an extreme value distribution, but allows consumer tastes to be correlated across varieties.

We follow Berry (1994) and Cardell (1997) in the exposition of the nested logit model. Let's group the varieties into $G+1$ exhaustive and mutually exclusive sets, $g = 0, 1, \dots, G$. The utility of consumer i for variety j in group g can be written as follows:

$$U_{i,j,t} = x_{j,t}\beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \xi_{j,t} + \mu_{i,g,t} + (1 - \sigma)\varepsilon_{i,j} \quad (8)$$

where similarly to (1) $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is distributed *i.i.d.* type I extreme value across i . $0 \leq \sigma < 1$ is the substitution parameter. As σ approaches one the within group correlation of utility levels goes to one and the across group correlation goes to zero. The nest term $\mu_{i,g,t}$ is common to all varieties in group g for consumer i and it has a distribution that depends on σ . Cardell (1997) shows that the distribution of $\mu_{i,g,t}$ is the unique distribution with the property that, if $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is an extreme value random variable, then $\mu_{i,g,t} + (1 - \sigma)\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is also an extreme value random variable.

⁴ This is the so called independence of irrelevant alternatives property, which ensures that the ratio of the probability of two choices does not change depending on the set of choices that are available.

Based on the distributional assumption on the random component and following the transformations under (1) to (7) one can derive the following demand-function (see Berry, 1994):

$$\ln(S_{j,t}) - \ln(S_{0,t}) = x'_{j,t} \beta - \alpha p_{j,t} + \sigma \ln(\bar{s}_{j/g,t}) + \xi_{j,t} \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{s}_{j/g,t}$ is the nest share, measured as the market share of variety j as a fraction of the total group market share. In equation (9) $\xi_{j,t}$ is expected to be correlated with both $p_{j,t}$ and $\bar{s}_{j/g,t}$. This implies that the OLS estimates of (9) are biased and we need to use valid instruments to estimate our model. The procedure will be discussed in the next section.

3 Data and Empirical Implementation

We estimate the demand function (9) using data from the Eurostat's COMEXT database. The COMEXT database collects EU customs data and it contains information on trade flows as reported by EU countries. It is a disaggregated data source, which provides trade data at the CN8-digit product level.⁵ This database contains the values and quantities of imports of 15 selected EU countries.⁶ Given that the analysis of the heterogeneity of various EU markets is out of the scope of this paper, we consider one single EU15 market and use the aggregated imports of all the 15 selected countries. Accordingly, our database is three dimensional: it contains EU15 import data under 8500 product labels (g) from 240 trade partners (c) for the 1995-2007 period (t). Under the same product label different goods can be imported from the various trade partners. In the following, we call the good imported under product label g from country c as a *variety* ($j=g,c$) of product g . Since consumers are choosing between varieties, a *variety can be seen as the basic unit of consumer choice in our analysis*.

As indicated by (9) our nested logit model allows correlation patterns to depend on groupings of varieties, which however have to be determined prior to the estimation. We group the varieties based on CN-8 digit product labels, i.e. products, which serve as nests. This means that we assume that consumer preferences are more strongly correlated among varieties within the same product than among varieties across product. For example, a Chinese shirt made of cotton is more substitutable with a Vietnamese shirt made of the same material than with a Chinese shirt made of nylon.⁷

The estimation of demand functions requires some sort of substitutability across products. Using a nested logit model helps us to take into account the correlation of consumer preferences. Furthermore, we have to guarantee a certain level of homogeneity of products in our demand function estimation. We achieve this by estimating a separate demand function for each NACE 4-digit industries in our database.⁸

Taking all the specifics of our database into consideration we can rewrite (9) in the following form⁹:

$$\ln(S_{j,t}) - \ln(S_{0,t}) = \xi_j + \xi_t - \alpha p_{j,t} + \sigma \ln(ns_{j,t}) + \xi_{j,t} \quad (10)$$

This is the equation that we ultimately estimate separately for each industry. As regards quantification, $S_{j,t}$ is measured as the import share of variety j in the total consumption of the respective industry, where the latter is proxied by the sum of the

⁵ For example we are able to distinguish within the men's knitted shirt category (CN 4 digit code 6105) by the material of the shirt, i.e. whether the shirt is made of cotton (61051000), synthetic fibre (61052010), artificial fibre (61052090), wool (61059010), or other material (61059090).

⁶ The EU15 includes Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Denmark, Greece, Germany, Italy, Ireland, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

⁷ In this example the cotton shirt and the nylon shirt are two distinctive nests.

⁸ The sectoral level is chosen at NACE 4-digits, while this is the most disaggregate level, where data is available for calculating market shares.

⁹ The first term, which describes observed product attributes, is dropped from (9) because our database does not contain information on product attributes.

industry's production and its imports.¹⁰ The market share is calculated in quantities. Since the outside variety is seen as the domestic substitute for imports the market share of the outside option $S_{0,t}$ is calculated as one minus the industry's overall import penetration.

In equation (10) we estimate quality as a sum of three components: the time invariant component of quality (ξ_j) is measured by a variety fixed effect; the common shock (ξ_t) is calculated as year fixed effects; while the third term ($\xi_{j,t}$) is unobserved and plays the role of the estimation error. Intuitively, equation (10) assumes that *the quality of a variety is higher when its market share is higher, after controlling for the variety's relative price*.

The next term $ns_{j,t}$ has the important role of controlling for the substitutability of varieties in equation (10) in order to get unbiased estimates on quality. In case of an increase in its relative price, a variety which is easier to substitute will have a stronger decline in its market share, despite no changes in its relative quality. Without using the nest term to control for the different level of substitutability, the lower market share would imply a lower quality estimate. That is the reason why the nested term must be included in equation (10). The nest term $ns_{j,t}$ is calculated as the import share of variety j in the total imports of product g (the nest).¹¹

Table 2 gives an overview of the database by 2-digit sectors. Overall, the database contains 189 NACE 4-digit industries, thus we have 189 separate estimates of equation (10). On average per equation, we have 30 products (nests), above 2000 varieties and close 14000 observations. The coverage of the database varies significantly across the 2-digit industries. For example, wearing apparel has on average more than 70 products per equation, while the computer industry has only 16. This suggests that the demand curves are estimated on a more heterogeneous product sample in the wearing apparel than in the computer industries.

As mentioned in the previous section, $p_{j,t}$ and $ns_{j,t}$ are endogenous, i.e. they are correlated with $\xi_{j,t}$. In order to obtain consistent and unbiased estimates of the coefficient of $p_{j,t}$ we use two sets of instruments. First, given that the COMEXT database contains neither variety-level transportation costs nor rival variety characteristics (which are widely used instruments in the literature since Hausman, 1997), we have to rely on *non-variety specific*

¹⁰ Theoretically consumption = industrial production + imports – exports, but given that calculation with Eurostat data provided negative consumption figures for many sectors, we decided to leave exports aside and proxy consumption with the sum of industrial production and imports. Data on industrial production is taken from the Eurostat's PRODCOM database. The PRODCOM data are only available in NACE Rev. 2 and thus needs to be transformed to NACE Rev 1.1 in order to be able to match with the COMEXT database.

¹¹ Theoretically, $ns_{j,t}$ should be calculated as a market share. However, given that we have no information on the size of the domestic market at the product level, we calculate it as an import share, i.e. the share of variety j import in the total imports of product g . This is equivalent to the assumption that each product market has the same import penetration ratio.

The substitution parameter σ can be interpreted the following way. As σ approaches one there will be perfect substitution among varieties within the nest (e.g. between Chinese and Vietnamese shirts made of cotton), but no substitution across the nests (e.g. no substitution between Chinese cotton and nylon shirts). As a result, if the price of a given variety increases, consumers will substitute it with varieties from the nest but not outside of the nest. This implies that the varieties' relative market share will change within the nest, but not outside of the nest, and thus changes in the overall market share ($S_{j,t}$) will be exclusively determined by the market share within the nest ($ns_{j,t}$). As an example, if the price of the Chinese cotton shirt goes up, consumers will substitute it with Vietnamese shirts made of cotton and not by Chinese shirts made of nylon. The overall market share of both cotton and nylon shirts will remain unchanged while the market share of Chinese cotton shirt within the outwear sector will fall together with its market share within the cotton shirt nest.

instruments, i.e. country level data, namely the bilateral exchange rate and a proxy for transportation costs calculated as the interaction of bilateral country distances and the oil price¹². This set of instruments has the advantage of being available for the whole sample. The second set of instruments is taken from the US Customs database. While these data are available at the variety level, i.e, they are *variety specific*, they cover only 40% of our sample.¹³ We use two instruments from the US database. One is the variety specific transportation cost, which we re-scale in order to express distances from the EU15. The other is the varieties' unit values on the US market. The idea behind using these so called Hausman instruments is that changes in unit values in third markets (US) can be assumed to reflect cost shocks and thus be used as instruments for prices on the reference (EU15) market.¹⁴ On the other hand, to obtain unbiased and consistent estimates of the substitution parameter, σ , we instrument the nest term with the number of varieties within the nest and the number of varieties exported by a country.

To give an overview of the “quality” of the regressions and the validity of the various sets of instruments, Table 3 provides an overview of the test statistics of the estimates. Given the large number of separate equations the table shows the distribution of the test statistics across estimations. We compared three estimation methods, the OLS, the IV using the subset of *non-variety specific* instruments and an IV using the full set of variety and non-variety specific instruments. When estimated by OLS, 72% of the regressions have a negative and significant price coefficient. This share falls to around 40% and 30% in the case of IV estimation using the non-variety specific and the full set of instruments, respectively. The average IV price coefficient is lower than the OLS price coefficient, indicating that the OLS estimator is biasing the price coefficient upwards as expected. The price coefficients are more negative when using the subset of non-variety specific instruments only. The nested term coefficient is positive and significant, which indicates that the use of the nested logit structure is appropriate. According to the Hausman test we cannot reject the hypothesis that the estimator based on variety-specific instruments is efficient. However, we disfavour the full instrument set due to the lower sample coverage and the worse performance on the over-identifying restriction test. As a result, we use the non-variety specific instruments in our benchmark estimate.

In a second stage, we assess to what extent export quality is related to global production networks. The literature (Xu and Lu, 2009, Wang and Wei, 2010, and Van Assche and Gagnés, 2010) suggests that export quality is higher in sectors with higher role of multinationals and lower domestic value added content. To formally test the relationship between our quality estimates and processing trade (and cross-check the plausibility of our quality measures) we estimate the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 quality_{j,h,t} = & \delta + \delta_h + \delta_t + \gamma_1 proc_{j,h,t} + \gamma_2 foreign_{j,h,t} + \gamma_3 private_{j,h,t} + \\
 & + \gamma_4 \ln(GDPpc_{h,t}) + \gamma_5 educ_{h,t} + v_{j,h,t}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{11}$$

¹² Bilateral exchange rates are taken from IFS database, distances are from the CEPII database (<http://www.cepii.fr/anglaisgraph/bdd/distances.htm>)

¹³ The database was obtained from the Center for International Data at UC Davis (<http://cid.econ.ucdavis.edu>). The partial coverage of the US Customs' import data are mainly due the differences in country-product coverage and losses due to the different classifications of the two databases.

¹⁴ However, if these instruments pick up demand shocks they are invalid.

where $quality_{j,h,t}$ indicates our relative quality estimates normalized within each nest, $proc_{j,h,t}$ is the share of processing exports¹⁵ in total exports of city h , $foreign_{j,h,t}$ and $private_{j,h,t}$ are the shares of exports by foreign invested enterprises and private firms in total exports of city h , respectively, $GDPpc_{h,t}$ is the real GDP per capita of city h , and $educ_{h,t}$ is the share of high education graduates in non-agricultural population, which we use as a proxy for human capital.

Data on processing and firm ownership are available from the China Customs Administration electronic database at prefecture city and HS6 product level. However, we only got the data for the years 1995, 2005 and 2007. The source of GDP per capita and education data is from the official national statistics. Given that educational data is only available at the provincial level we intra-polated these data at the more disaggregated prefecture city level. Equation 11 is estimated with the OLS estimator.

The quality estimates and their relationship with global production networks are presented in the next section.

¹⁵ According to the “broad” Chinese definition, processing exports include all exports that contain imported input elements.

4 Results

Our quality estimates are presented in Chart 2. The Chart shows the distribution of the quality estimates across varieties by major country groups for the years 1995 and 2007.¹⁶ Chart 2 has two important findings. First, *the quality of Chinese exports to the EU has been relatively high compared to the country's level of development.*¹⁷ In 1995 the mean of China's quality distribution was already higher than that of other emerging economies, such as Latin America, the New Member States and the ASEAN countries and it came as fourth in the group ranking after Japan, the US, EU15 and the New Industrialized Economies (NIEs). Second, *since 1995 Chinese exports have further improved their quality competitiveness relative to other regions of the world.* Between 1995 and 2007 the quality of advanced economies' exports has increased slightly, while a more pronounced upgrading occurred in the quality of developing economies. The quality upgrading was the largest in China, the NMS, and the ASEAN. By 2007, China has taken over the NIEs in terms of export quality and has been placed 4th in our country group ranking after Japan, the US and the EU15.

More specifically, the bottom panel of Chart 2 shows the relative quality estimates of China in comparison with several EU countries. While *China still lags behind compared to all European countries with the exception of Greece, its relative quality has improved more.* As regards the EU, the data indicate a "quality convergence" between 1995 and 2007, with the Scandinavian economies, Ireland, Portugal and Greece improving their export quality relative to the leading economies of Germany, France and Italy. Nonetheless, due to the strong improvement in the quality of Chinese exports, Ireland, Portugal and Greece appear to trade in the same quality segment as China, and thus, to be the most exposed to China's competition.

The data reveal a significant sectoral heterogeneity of quality estimates. To give an example, on Chart 3 we show the quality rankings of each country group in the two most important 4-digit Chinese export industries, namely manufacturing of office equipment, i.e. computers (13% share in total Chinese exports to EU) and manufacturing of other wearing apparel (with a 5% share)¹⁸. In the office equipment industry China was ranked 5th in the mid-nineties and improved its relative position gradually to become the second highest quality exporter by 2007, after the US. In the wearing apparel industry, on the other hand, China has been exporting goods with low quality and the estimates indicate no quality upgrading during the years.

Why is export quality of office equipment so different from that of the apparel industry? And how can China export higher quality products than many advanced economies? A possible explanation is the role of global production networks in China. As an illustration, Chart 4 plots the share of domestic value added in the total value added of 4-digit industries versus the quality ranking of China in these industries.¹⁹ The relationship is far from

¹⁶ To control for the possible bias in the distribution of quality estimates due to the different product structure of exports from various countries, we normalized the quality estimates from (10) within each product group (nest).

¹⁷ Recalling that quality is determined against the market share and price of a given variety, the results imply that China's market share is higher than justified by its price.

¹⁸ China is also the main source of imports in these industries. Imports from China account for 58% and 63% of total extra-euro area imports in the office equipment and other wearing apparel industries, respectively.

¹⁹ The share of domestic value added is taken from Koopman et al. (2010). Unfortunately, the two databases could be matched only with a significant loss in information.

clear, nonetheless the position of the two most important industries are clearly distinguishable. As regards wearing apparel, it has a domestic value added share above 60% with a large part of input material produced domestically. In office equipment, on the other hand, the share of domestic value added is below 5% indicating that the industry is almost exclusively involved in the assembling of high quality parts that are imported from more advanced economies. This may explain how China is able to export products, which have as high quality as products of technologically more advanced economies.

Empirical evidence of other studies also supports this hypothesis. Using a detailed database on industrial firms in China, Xu and Lu (2009) also came to the conclusion that export sophistication of industries is positively related to the share of wholly foreign owned enterprises and the share of processing exports in a given industry. Amiti and Freund (2010) and Wang and Wei (2010) has similar findings. Van Assche and Gagnés (2010) argue that high sophistication of Chinese electronics exports may simply be due to the high sophistication of imported inputs in the processing trade.

Our results also support the hypothesis that *the increasing role of global production networks is associated with the quality upgrading of Chinese exports*. According to the estimate of equation (11), the share of processing in total exports has indeed a positive significant impact on the quality of exported goods (Table 4). This result is robust across all the alternative specification (no location specific fixed effects, prefecture city level versus provincial fixed effects).²⁰ Foreign ownership seem to have no significant positive impact on export quality, which is not surprising given that processing trade is largely associated with foreign firms (85% of processing trade was made by foreign firms in 2010) and, hence, highly correlated with processing exports. The relation between quality and private ownership is positive and significant in two of our specifications. Real GDP per capita and human capital seems to have a negative correlation with export quality, suggesting that processing activity is strong in less developed regions. Nonetheless, when prefecture city fixed effects are used both coefficients turn insignificant.

To assess the *robustness of our quality measures*, we experimented with alternative ways of estimating quality. Given that our quality measures are derived partly from the residuals of the estimated demand functions, they may contain non-quality related components, i.e. the effect of tariffs, the exchange rate and measurement errors. For this reason, we checked what impact tariffs and any measurement error in prices would have on our results. In addition, we tested the implications of using an alternative set of instruments. The alternative instruments, namely the instrument list including variety specific instruments, has already been discussed in the previous section.

As regards measurement errors, given that quality includes the residual term from equation (10) any measurement error to prices will result in a bias of the quality estimate. As discussed in the introductory section, import unit values do not contain tariffs and mark-ups, which both may affect the final selling price of a variety. Omitting these factors, which tend to set the actual price above the import unit value, would result in an underestimation of quality.²¹ For this reason, we also estimate (10) with including a term for tariffs and a

²⁰ The low R squared can be explained by the fact that endogeneous variable (relative quality of each variety) has significantly more variation than our explanatory variables (prefecture city level data). However, given that our aim is to analyze the relationship between export quality and processing trade rather than capturing the variation of export quality in full, the low explanatory power of the equation is irrelevant regarding our conclusion.

²¹ Due to the fact that a product to realize the same market share at a higher price has to have higher quality.

trend (in order to proxy non-tariff barriers). Tariffs are calculated from the COMEXT database.²² Unfortunately tariff data are only available after 2000, thus data have to be imputed for the years before (Chart 2).

As a final step, we also tried to use an alternative way of calculating the quality term. According to our definition, quality consists of three elements: a variety fixed effect, a time dummy and the residual term. To control for all the unexplained factors included in the residual term, we decided to calculate the quality estimate excluding this component.

The results provided by the above three alternative scenarios have a strong correlation with the results from our benchmark model (Table 5). At the product level, the correlation of quality estimates is as high as 0.93 and 0.74 when tariffs are included and quality is calculated excluding the residual term. The correlation falls to 0.54 when we use the variety specific instruments. The low correlation is partly explained by the difference in the sample size, as discussed in the previous section the coverage of the sample is only 40% when we use the variety-specific instruments from the US Customs database.

²² COMEXT contains information on varieties falling under certain tariff regimes. COMEXT distinguishes four regimes: (i) imports under most favoured nation (MFN) regime but duty free, (ii) imports under any preferential regime that grants duty free, (iii) imports under a preferential tariff, and (iv) imports under the MFN tariff. We calculate our time-variety specific tariff measure by combining the last two regimes. Given that data are only available after 2000, we impute the data for the years before (with the extrapolation of the after 2000 shares of the various regimes).

5 Conclusion

This paper challenges the view that China exports low quality products to European markets. The paper lifts the assumption that prices reflect quality and estimates measures of quality derived from a discrete choice model following the nested logit approach introduced by Berry (1994) and Berry et al. (1995).

According to our findings China not only exports the same kind of products as developed economies, but also the quality of these products is similar to the technologically most advanced competitors. In addition, China has increased the quality of its export products and thus poses a potential threat to the market position of the US, Japan or the EU economies.

Our explanation to these findings lays down in China's active role in Asian production networks as an assembler. Quality of Chinese products seems to be higher in industries where processing trade is dominant and the domestic share in total value added is relatively low. Our analysis of the relationship between product quality and various supply side determinants indicate a positive relationship between processing trade and export quality.

This finding suggests that China's export quality and technological upgrading is related to the high-technology content of imported inputs and thus not embedded in the country's indigenous technological development. Given that processing trade is largely benefiting multinational companies our findings also suggest that China's export quality upgrading is a side-effect of the global trend of production delocalization.

References

- AW B. Y. and M. J. ROBERTS (1986), Measuring Quality Change in Quota-Constrained Import Markets, *Journal of International Economics* 21, pp 45-60.
- AIGINGER K. (1997), The Use of Unit Values to Discriminate Between Price and Quality Competition, *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 21, pp 571-592.
- AMITI M. and C. FREUND (2010), An Anatomy of China's Export Growth. In R. Feenstra and S-J. Wei (Eds) *China's Growing Role in World Trade*: University of Chicago Press.
- BENKOVSKIS K. and R. RIMGAILAITE (2010), The Quality and Variety of Exports from New EU Member States: Evidence from Very Disaggregated Data, *Latvijas Banka Working Paper 2/2010*.
- BERRY S. (1994), Estimating Discrete-Choice Models of Product Differentiation, *The RAND Journal of Economics* 25, pp 242-262.
- BERRY S., J. LEVINSOHN, and A. PAKES (1995), Automobile Prices in Market Equilibrium, *Econometrica* 63, pp 841-890.
- BOORSTEIN R. and R. C. FEENSTRA (1987), Quality Upgrading and Its Welfare Costs in US Steel Imports, 1969-74, NBER Working Paper No. 2452.
- CARDELL N. S. (1997), Variance Components Structures for the Extreme-Value and Logistic Distributions with Application to Models of Heterogeneity, *Econometric Theory* 13 pp 185-213.
- EICHENGREEN, B. J., RHEE, Y. and H. TONG (2004), The Impact of China on the Exports of Other Asian Countries, NBER Working Paper No. W10768.
- FEENSTRA, R. (1994), New Product Varieties and the Measurement of International Prices. *American Economic Review* 84, pp 157-177.
- FONTAGNE L., GAULIER, G. and S. ZIGNANO (2008), North-South Competition in Quality, *Economic Policy* 23 pp 51-91.
- HALLAK, J. C. and P. K. SCHOTT (2011), Estimating Cross-Country Differences in Product Quality, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126 (1), pp 417-474.
- HAUSMAN, J. (1997), Valuation of New Goods under Perfect and Imperfect Competition, in *The Economics of New Goods*, NBER, edited by Tim Bresnahan and Robert Gordon.
- KHANDELWAL, A. (2010), The Long and Short (of) Quality Ladders, *Review of Economic Studies* 77, pp 1450-1476.
- KOOPMAN, R., W. POWERS, Z. WANG and S. J. WEI (2010), Give Credit where Credit is Due: Tracing Value Added in Global Production Chains. NBER Working Papers 16426.
- RODRIG, D. (2006), What's So Special About China's Exports?, CEPR Discussion Paper No. 5484.
- SCHOTT, P. K. (2004), Across-Product vs. Within-Product Specialization in International Trade. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119.
- SCHOTT, P. K. (2008), The Relative Sophistication of Chinese Exports, *Economic Policy* 23, pp 5-49.
- VAN ASSCHE, A. and B. GAGNES (2010), Electronics Production Upgrading: is China Exceptional? *Applied Economics Letters* 17.
- WANG, Z. and S-J. WEI (2010), What Accounts for the Rising Sophistication of China's Exports?, in R. Feenstra and S-J. Wei (Eds) *China's Growing Role in World Trade*: University of Chicago Press.
- XU B. (2010), The sophistication of exports: Is China special?, *China Economic Review* 21.
- XU B. and J. LU (2009), Foreign Direct Investment, Processing Trade, and the Sophistication of China's Exports, *China Economic Review* 20.

Tables and Charts

Table 1. The composition of exports by technology intensity, 1995 vs 2005

(in % of total exports)

	1995			2007		
	high-tech	medium	low-tech	high-tech	medium	low-tech
China	7%	24%	69%	33%	33%	34%
Japan	16%	82%	2%	20%	78%	1%
US	45%	44%	11%	51%	44%	4%
EU 15	8%	67%	25%	11%	71%	17%
NMS 12	4%	52%	44%	8%	68%	24%
Latin America	6%	28%	66%	11%	41%	48%
NIE	15%	63%	22%	28%	68%	4%
ASEAN	10%	18%	72%	23%	32%	45%
RoW	13%	39%	48%	9%	57%	34%


SOURCE: Own calculations based on COMEXT.

NMS 12 = New Member States: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia; Latin-America: Mexico, Brazil and Argentina; NIE: Korea, Singapore and Taiwan; ASEAN: Indonesia, Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam.

Calculation based on the OECD's classification of industries by technology intensity. High-tech: pharmaceuticals, office and computer, electrical appliances (radio, TV), medical and optical appliances. Medium-tech: basic chemicals, machinery, electrical machinery, transport machinery, rubber and plastic, non-metals, basic and processed metals. Low-tech: food, textile, clothes, footwear paper and furniture and other manufacturing.

Chart 1. Unit value gaps 1995 and 2007, by country groups

The ratio of the exporters' unit value to the unit value of all EU imports



UV gaps are calculated at the product level g , for each country c , at time t according to the following formula:

$$UVgap_t^c = \sum_g (UV_{gt}^c / UV_{gt}^{EU}) * w_{gt}^c$$

The unit value gap of product g , country c , equals the unit value of product g exported by country c divided by the average unit value of the same product on the EU15 market (i.e. the average of the unit values of all imported product is on the EU market). To get a country unit value we aggregate the product UV gaps across all products.

Table 2. Structure of the database (by NACE 2 digit industries)

	Sector	No. of 4 digit sectors	No. of products (g)	No. of varieties (j=product, country)	No. of obs (j,t)	No. of products per equation	No. of varieties per equation	No. of obs per equation
14	Mining	7	51	3,606	22,539	7	515	3,220
15	Food	21	744	34,192	196,886	35	1,628	9,376
16	Tobacco	1	9	546	2,948	9	546	2,948
17	Textile	9	661	44,457	282,938	73	4,940	31,438
18	Wearing apparel	6	337	32,235	237,452	56	5,373	39,575
19	Leather and shoes	3	162	14,064	89,836	54	4,688	29,945
20	Wood	4	44	4,027	27,352	11	1,007	6,838
21	Paper	6	64	4,659	30,511	11	777	5,085
22	Publishing	7	38	3,982	28,429	5	569	4,061
24	Chemicals	12	463	26,336	155,315	39	2,195	12,943
25	Rubber and plastic	6	175	13,156	88,058	29	2,193	14,676
26	Non-metallic mineral	24	187	13,973	91,548	8	582	3,815
27	Basic metals	10	501	27,561	173,563	50	2,756	17,356
28	Fabricated metals	13	343	27,388	186,276	26	2,107	14,329
29	Machinery	22	848	66,976	398,241	39	3,044	18,102
30	Computers	2	32	2,936	14,880	16	1,468	7,440
31	Electrical machinery	7	251	21,552	130,621	36	3,079	18,660
32	Radio and television	3	88	6,113	36,966	29	2,038	12,322
33	Medical, precision, optical	4	290	22,154	130,168	73	5,539	32,542
34	Motor vehicles	3	98	7,326	43,851	33	2,442	14,617
35	Other transport	8	138	9,880	55,480	17	1,235	6,935
36	Furniture and other	11	211	17,966	122,491	19	1,633	11,136
	Total	189	5,735	405,085	2,546,349	30	2,143	13,473

Table 3. An overview of estimation test statistics*


	Mean	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile
OLS				
Price coeff	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	0.000
Price coeff, p-value	0.140	0.000	0.000	0.127
Nest coeff	0.888	0.925	0.962	0.981
Nest coeff, p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Observations per equation	13112	2429	7261	15884
R2	0.92	0.90	0.95	0.97
Share of eqs with significant and negative price coefficient			72%	
No. of equations			166	
Non-variety specific instruments				
Price coeff	-0.079	-0.136	-0.015	0.003
Price coeff, p-value	0.226	0.007	0.092	0.351
Nest coeff	0.861	0.643	0.987	1.035
Nest coeff, p-value	0.088	0.000	0.000	0.016
Overidentifying restrictions, p-value	0.306	0.000	0.141	0.635
Observations per equation	11410	2780	6431	13528
R2	0.575	0.326	0.652	0.820
Share of eqs with significant and negative price coefficient			41%	
No. of equations			155	
Full set of instrument (non-variety + variety specific instruments)				
Price coeff	-0.007	-0.009	-0.001	0.001
Price coeff, p-value	0.299	0.012	0.176	0.538
Nest coeff	0.950	0.948	1.000	1.028
Nest coeff, p-value	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000
Overidentifying restrictions, p-value	0.185	0.000	0.002	0.210
Observations per equation	4795	919	2620	5470
R2	0.73	0.64	0.76	0.87
Share of eqs with significant and negative price coefficient			31%	
No. of equations			145	
Hausman Test , p-value	0.726	0.459	0.997	1.000

* Reported as the distribution of test statistics across estimations.

Non-variety specific instruments: nominal bilateral exchange rate, bilateral distance*oil price, number of varieties within the nest, number of varieties exported by a country.


Full set of instruments: nominal bilateral exchange rate, distance*oil, number of varieties within the nest, number of varieties exported by a country + variety specific transportation cost and unit values in the US market.

Chart 2. Distribution of standardized quality estimates




SOURCE: Own calculations.

Chart 3. Quality rankings in China's two most important export sectors (NACE 4-digit)



SOURCE: Own calculations. Japan and rest of the world not reported.

Chart 4. Quality ranking vs the share of domestic value added by NACE 4-digit sectors




SOURCE: Own calculations.

Table 4. Export quality and firm characteristics

Dependent variable	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Standardized product quality (hs6 and city level data)</i>	Time fixed effects	City and time fixed effects	Province and time fixed effects
Share processing trade	0.119*** (0)	0.0984*** (0)	0.114*** (0)
Share foreign ownership	0.00268 (0.782)	-0.0161 (0.116)	0.00867 (0.382)
Share private ownership	0.0150* (0.0743)	-0.000833 (0.926)	0.0168* (0.0509)
Real GDP per capita	-0.00423*** (0)	0.00135 (0.386)	-0.00360*** (0)
Graduates/non-agricultural population	-11.79*** (0)	-1.524 (0.718)	-4.195 (0.302)
Constant	0.0169 (0.439)	-0.0724 (0.126)	0.0130 (0.723)
Observations	119,035	119,035	119,035
R-squared	0.015	0.026	0.018

OLS estimates. Time and location fixed effects not reported. Sample: 1995, 2005, 2007. City level data. P-value in parentheses, ***p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Chart 5. Imputed tariffs by main country groups



SOURCE: COMEXT database and own calculations.

Table 5. Correlation of results from alternative specifications at the product level

	1	2	3	4
Sample	EU extra+intra	EU extra+intra	EU extra+intra	EU extra+intra
Instrument	EU	US	EU	EU
Tariff	no	no	yes	no
Resid	yes	yes	yes	no
	1	2	3	4
1	1.000			
2	0.540	1.000		
3	0.930	0.436	1.000	
4	0.735	0.435	0.647	1.000

SOURCE: Own calculations.

BANCO DE ESPAÑA PUBLICATIONS

WORKING PAPERS¹

- 1032 GABE J. DE BONDT, TUOMAS A. PELTONEN AND DANIEL SANTABÁRBARA: Booms and busts in China's stock market: Estimates based on fundamentals.
- 1033 CARMEN MARTÍNEZ-CARRASCAL AND JULIAN VON LANDESBERGER: Explaining the demand for money by non-financial corporations in the euro area: A macro and a micro view.
- 1034 CARMEN MARTÍNEZ-CARRASCAL: Cash holdings, firm size and access to external finance. Evidence for the euro area.
- 1035 CÉSAR ALONSO-BORREGO: Firm behavior, market deregulation and productivity in Spain.
- 1036 OLYMPIA BOVER: Housing purchases and the dynamics of housing wealth.
- 1037 DAVID DE ANTONIO LIEDO AND ELENA FERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ: Nowcasting Spanish GDP growth in real time: "One and a half months earlier".
- 1038 FRANCESCA VIANI: International financial flows, real exchange rates and cross-border insurance.
- 1039 FERNANDO BRONER, TATIANA DIDIER, AITOR ERCE AND SERGIO L. SCHMUKLER: Gross capital flows: dynamics and crises.
- 1101 GIACOMO MASIER AND ERNESTO VILLANUEVA: Consumption and initial mortgage conditions: evidence from survey data.
- 1102 PABLO HERNÁNDEZ DE COS AND ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO: Endogenous fiscal consolidations.
- 1103 CÉSAR CALDERÓN, ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO AND LUIS SERVÉN: Is infrastructure capital productive? A dynamic heterogeneous approach.
- 1104 MICHAEL DANQUAH, ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO AND BAZOUMANA OUATTARA: TFP growth and its determinants: nonparametrics and model averaging.
- 1105 JUAN CARLOS BERGANZA AND CARMEN BROTO: Flexible inflation targets, forex interventions and exchange rate volatility in emerging countries.
- 1106 FRANCISCO DE CASTRO, JAVIER J. PÉREZ AND MARTA RODRÍGUEZ VIVES: Fiscal data revisions in Europe.
- 1107 ANGEL GAVILÁN, PABLO HERNÁNDEZ DE COS, JUAN F. JIMENO AND JUAN A. ROJAS: Fiscal policy, structural reforms and external imbalances: a quantitative evaluation for Spain.
- 1108 EVA ORTEGA, MARGARITA RUBIO AND CARLOS THOMAS: House purchase versus rental in Spain.
- 1109 ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO: Dynamic panels with predetermined regressors: likelihood-based estimation and Bayesian averaging with an application to cross-country growth.
- 1110 NIKOLAI STÄHLER AND CARLOS THOMAS: FIMod – a DSGE model for fiscal policy simulations.
- 1111 ÁLVARO CARTEA AND JOSÉ PENALVA: Where is the value in high frequency trading?
- 1112 FILIPA SÁ AND FRANCESCA VIANI: Shifts in portfolio preferences of international investors: an application to sovereign wealth funds.
- 1113 REBECA ANGUREN MARTÍN: Credit cycles: Evidence based on a non-linear model for developed countries.
- 1114 LAURA HOSPIDO: Estimating non-linear models with multiple fixed effects: A computational note.
- 1115 ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO AND CRISTIAN BARTOLUCCI: Income and democracy: Revisiting the evidence.
- 1116 AGUSTÍN MARAVALL HERRERO AND DOMINGO PÉREZ CAÑETE: Applying and interpreting model-based seasonal adjustment. The euro-area industrial production series.
- 1117 JULIO CÁCERES-DELPIANO: Is there a cost associated with an increase in family size beyond child investment? Evidence from developing countries.
- 1118 DANIEL PÉREZ, VICENTE SALAS-FUMÁS AND JESÚS SAURINA: Do dynamic provisions reduce income smoothing using loan loss provisions?
- 1119 GALO NUÑO, PEDRO TEDDE AND ALESSIO MORO: Money dynamics with multiple banks of issue: evidence from Spain 1856-1874.
- 1120 RAQUEL CARRASCO, JUAN F. JIMENO AND A. CAROLINA ORTEGA: Accounting for changes in the Spanish wage distribution: the role of employment composition effects.

1. Previously published Working Papers are listed in the Banco de España publications catalogue.

- 1121 FRANCISCO DE CASTRO AND LAURA FERNÁNDEZ-CABALLERO: The effects of fiscal shocks on the exchange rate in Spain.
- 1122 JAMES COSTAIN AND ANTON NAKOV: Precautionary price stickiness.
- 1123 ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO: Model averaging in economics.
- 1124 GABRIEL JIMÉNEZ, ATIF MIAN, JOSÉ-LUIS PEYDRÓ AND JESÚS SAURINA: Local versus aggregate lending channels: the effects of securitization on corporate credit supply.
- 1125 ANTON NAKOV AND GALO NUÑO: A general equilibrium model of the oil market.
- 1126 DANIEL C. HARDY AND MARÍA J. NIETO: Cross-border coordination of prudential supervision and deposit guarantees.
- 1127 LAURA FERNÁNDEZ-CABALLERO, DIEGO J. PEDREGAL AND JAVIER J. PÉREZ: Monitoring sub-central government spending in Spain.
- 1128 CARLOS PÉREZ MONTES: Optimal capital structure and regulatory control.
- 1129 JAVIER ANDRÉS, JOSÉ E. BOSCA AND JAVIER FERRI: Household debt and labour market fluctuations.
- 1130 ANTON NAKOV AND CARLOS THOMAS: Optimal monetary policy with state-dependent pricing.
- 1131 JUAN F. JIMENO AND CARLOS THOMAS: Collective bargaining, firm heterogeneity and unemployment.
- 1132 ANTON NAKOV AND GALO NUÑO: Learning from experience in the stock market.
- 1133 ALESSIO MORO AND GALO NUÑO: Does TFP drive housing prices? A growth accounting exercise for four countries.
- 1201 CARLOS PÉREZ MONTES: Regulatory bias in the price structure of local telephone services.
- 1202 MAXIMO CAMACHO, GABRIEL PEREZ-QUIROS AND PILAR PONCELA: Extracting non-linear signals from several economic indicators.
- 1203 MARCOS DAL BIANCO, MAXIMO CAMACHO AND GABRIEL PEREZ-QUIROS: Short-run forecasting of the euro-dollar exchange rate with economic fundamentals.
- 1204 ROCIO ALVAREZ, MAXIMO CAMACHO AND GABRIEL PEREZ-QUIROS: Finite sample performance of small versus large scale dynamic factor models.
- 1205 MAXIMO CAMACHO, GABRIEL PEREZ-QUIROS AND PILAR PONCELA: Markov-switching dynamic factor models in real time.
- 1206 IGNACIO HERNANDO AND ERNESTO VILLANUEVA: The recent slowdown of bank lending in Spain: are supply-side factors relevant?
- 1207 JAMES COSTAIN AND BEATRIZ DE BLAS: Smoothing shocks and balancing budgets in a currency union.
- 1208 AITOR LACUESTA, SERGIO PUENTE AND ERNESTO VILLANUEVA: The schooling response to a sustained increase in low-skill wages: evidence from Spain 1989-2009.
- 1209 GABOR PULA AND DANIEL SANTABÁRBARA: Is China climbing up the quality ladder?

BANCO DE ESPAÑA
Eurosistema

Unidad de Publicaciones
Alcalá 522, 28027 Madrid
Telephone +34 91 338 6363. Fax +34 91 338 6488
E-mail: publicaciones@bde.es
www.bde.es