Moving up the Quality ladder? EU-China Trade Dynamics in Clothing

Hylke Vandenbussche, Francesco Di Comite, Laura Rovegno and Christian Viegelahn

Moving up the Quality ladder? EU-China Trade Dynamics in Clothing[1]

By

Hylke Vandenbussche,
Université catholique de Louvain, CORE-IRES & CEPR & LICOS

Francesco Di Comite[2],
Université catholique de Louvain, IRES & European Commission

Laura Rovegno,
Université catholique de Louvain, IRES

Christian Viegelahn[2]
Université catholique de Louvain, IRES & International Labour Organization

Abstract

We apply a simple method to study the relative quality of Chinese versus European products exported in the clothing sector after the end of the Multi-Fiber Arrangement. Based on the model of Foster et al (2008), we interpret the relative change of export prices and quantities sold in narrowly defined product categories as an indicator of quality shifts. Using UN Comtrade data we find that European varieties exported to the US typically sell for a higher price than identical Chinese varieties exported to the US, but this price gap is narrowing. Despite rising prices, Chinese varieties are gaining market share. This opposite movement of relative prices and quantities sold in the same destination market are a strong indication of China moving up the quality ladder in its clothing exports relative to the EU. While European "core" products in clothing are stable over time, Chinese exports show strong product dynamics with exit and entry of new "core" products every year and "core" products changing rapidly. Both China and the EU export in every product category, resulting in an almost perfect product overlap with almost no products being exported by only one of the two.

---

1.   Introduction

The general notion that many people have is that Europe exports high quality goods, while China exports low quality goods. This is related to the Linder's hypothesis (1961) that richer countries export higher quality goods.[3] If this is the case, Europe should not worry too much about adverse effects of competition. Vertical differentiation through quality differences softens price competition and allows firms at either end to survive and retain their market shares. One of the purposes of this paper is to see if the evidence in the trade data is consistent with this perception. If European exports are indeed characterized by higher quality, we would expect prices of European products to be higher than Chinese ones. This is indeed what we find when comparing EU and Chinese exports in clothing to the rest of the world (RoW). However, this could also be explained by differences in product mix or destinations between European and Chinese exports. Thus, we also explore these possible determinants in our analysis. Another issue to keep in mind when comparing EU and Chinese export prices is whether a high price of European products can truly be associated with higher quality, or is a reflection of higher production and other costs. While cost and quality push prices in the same direction, their implications for sales are very different (Foster et al., 2008). To distinguish between cost and quality is not trivial. Here we take a simple and descriptive approach used in other empirical studies, which consists in comparing relative prices and quantities. The intuition behind this is the following. When the price of a relatively low priced good goes up, while at the same time consumers buy more of it, the relative quality of that variety has increased such that despite its higher price, consumers buy more. (Foster et al., 2008; Baldwin and Harrigan, 2011; Di Comite, Thisse & Vandenbussche, 2011). In the opposite case when the price of an intially high priced good comes down, but sales are not rising, its relative quality is decreasing.

In this paper we study one particular sector in detail which is clothing. This sector is particularly interesting for various reasons. Firstly, it experienced a particularly sharp increase in exports from China following China's entry into WTO in 2001. It is also interesting because of its particular sensitivity for many developed nations, as testified by its special treatment in the international trading system. When China entered the WTO, the clothing sector was still protected by the Multi-Fiber Arrangement (MFA from now on) which allowed developed countries like the EU and US to restrict their imports of clothing products.

---

[3] Fajgelbaum et al. (2011); Hummels and Klenow (2005); Latzer and Mayneris (2011).

However, in 2005, the MFA came to an end, which marked the beginning of an increase in competition in the clothing sector. The purpose of this paper is to see at a detailed product-level whether and how that increased competition has affected EU exports to the RoW and to a particular destination market relative to Chinese exports in the same HS6 digit product categories.

Our results suggest, somewhat surprisingly, that the EU and China export the same types of clothing products to the RoW. This seems to be in line with what Schott (2008) finds. He reported that China and OECD countries have substantial overlap in the type of products they export to the US. For EU and Chinese clothing exports to the RoW, as we show in this paper, this seems also true. Even after the MFA, which ended the protection previously enjoyed by developed countries in imports of clothing products, EU and China keep on exporting the same type of clothing products with an almost perfect product overlap.

The large overlap in product range that we observe in EU and Chinese exports suggests that price differences between these countries do not result from a different product mix, but rather from different prices within the same product (HS6) categories. When comparing EU and Chinese prices on a product-by-product basis, we find that for the large majority of products EU prices are higher than Chinese prices between 2000 and 2009. This is true when we compare prices of both countries to the RoW, or when we fix a particular destination market, the US, and within that market compare EU and Chinese prices for the same products. Our findings show that, while EU prices are consistently higher in narrowly defined product categories within clothing, sales are consistently lower than sales of similar products sold by the Chinese. With two countries producing the same good, the country which sees its quantities relatively increase while its prices relatively increase, is likely to have experienced improvements in the quality of the goods it produces. This is what we observe to be the case when comparing China to the EU. In recent years, Chinese export prices have been increasing relative to the European ones, while the sales of these Chinese products in narrowly defined categories within clothing have been going up relative to the European ones. Hence European products do not appear to be characterized by a particularly sustained level of higher quality compared to the Chinese products.

A reduction in the vertical differentiation for Europe implies that competition from Chinese products is likely to intensify. The evidence presented below indeed suggests that this is what

may be going on. Ever since the end of the MFA in 2005, EU prices and Chinese prices in clothing products have been converging, suggesting that price competition is tougher, making it more difficult for EU products to continue to price high in international markets. Moreover, we find a continuous alteration of "core" products on the Chinese side, not so much on the EU side. Whereas the EU's core products in terms of export value to RoW remained pretty stable over our period of analysis, this is not the case for China. China's core export products in 2000 were very different than its core products in terms of export value in 2009, indicating a high degree of product dynamics on the Chinese side.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the data we use and includes some notes on the methodology that is applied. Section 3 compares EU and Chinese exports in clothing to the RoW and analyses export volumes, values, prices, overlap, product mix similarity and core products. Section 4 briefly introduces a model that is well-suited to interpret our findings and analyses in a comparative manner the evolution of EU and Chinese quantities and prices over time. In Section 5 and 6 we then repeat our analysis of EU and Chinese exports, but restrict the analysis to one specific destination market, the US. Section 7 concludes with a concise summary of our main findings.

2.   Data and Methodology

We use export data from UN Comtrade data which reports product-level trade at the HS6 digit level. Our period of analysis runs from 2000 to 2009.

Prices are calculated from values and volumes, resulting in unit values. In order to make prices comparable across different products, we calculate unit values as a relative measure to the "world unit value". For example, if this measure takes on a value of 2, it means that prices are twice as large as the average price at which the product is sold in the world. If it is 1, then prices are as high as in the average of the world.

Depending on the revision of the Harmonized System (HS), there are between 270 and 294 different HS6 products belonging to the clothing sector (HS codes starting with 61, 62 and 63). During the period of analysis, HS was revised twice. To account for this, we drop product lines where the correspondence across versions was ambiguous and therefore impeded comparison across years. We also dropped observations where export quantities

were not reported and hence unit values could not be calculated. The result is a sample of about 240 product lines representing around 96 and 92% of exports in the sector for the EU and China respectively.

Another difficulty we face is that the definition of the EU changed during the period of our analysis. To counter this we turn to a pragmatic approach and simply include all EU-15 into our EU definition, i.e. countries that were always part of the EU in the period of our analysis. So what we refer to as EU exports in this paper, are always exports of EU-15, where we exclude exports to the new EU member states.

In our analysis we do not consider ownership effects, so we cannot differentiate between "true" Chinese products and those products that are assembled by say European firms in China and exported from China. Both types of products will occur in our data and may well explain some of the patterns we observe.

We focus on the clothing rather than on the textiles sector. The clothing sector is a sector that is typically constituted of final products while textile products are often considered as inputs into clothing. For example, textiles include product such as silk, wool and cotton (HS codes starting with 50, 51 and 52 respectively), while clothing includes articles such as men's overcoats made of wool (610110), of cotton (610120) or of manmade fibers (610130). Given that the textile sector is predominantly an intermediate product sector with less opportunity for differentiation and price difference, we decided to focus on clothing products.

3. Comparing EU and China's Exports in Clothing to the Rest of the World

3.1. Export Volumes, Values and Prices

In this section we compare total exports in clothing products by the EU-15 and by China to the rest of the world (RoW) over the period 2000-2009. The comparison involves export volumes, values and unit values.

It is clear from Figure 1a that before China's entry in WTO in 2001 its exports of clothing products were already higher than that of the EU, suggesting some comparative advantage of China in this sector even before they gained improved market access to the rest of the world. Ever since the entry of China into the WTO in 2001, which gave them improved access to

world markets, Chinese exports of clothing have steeply increased, while EU exports have largely remained at its original level. The outbreak of the financial crisis in 2008, seems to have affected Chinese export volumes relatively more than the EU's, although in export values both countries saw a decrease in their exports of clothing to the RoW which can be observed from Figure 1b.

In terms of export prices within narrowly defined product categories at the HS6 digit level, it can be noted that EU export prices consistently lie above Chinese export prices, throughout the sample period. This can be seen from Table 1, where for each year between 2000 and 2009 we show for how many HS6 products the EU export unit value was higher than the Chinese one (column 2) and vice versa (column 3). It can be noted that in the large majority of products the EU price is higher than the Chinese price and this holds in all years.

In terms of price evolution, the pattern that emerges since 2005, the year which marked the end of the MFA, is that European prices in clothing are falling over time, whereas Chinese prices are on the rise as shown in Figure 2.

A formal test of price convergence for the period 2005-2009 as a whole, as well as for each year, reported in Table 2, confirms that this price convergence is statistically significant.[4]

3.2. Product Overlap and Product mix similarity

Similar to Schott (2008) for the US, we verify to what extent the EU and China specialize in different product categories within the clothing industry. Surprisingly, when comparing exports of both countries in HS6 categories to the RoW, we find that the product overlap is a 100% in the clothing industry. Indeed, in Table 3 we report the number of products that are exported by both the EU and China versus the number of products that are exported by the EU-only or by China-only. We see that all products are exported by both countries in all years. Put differently, both the EU and China export in every HS6 digit product category within the clothing sector, which is consistent with Schott (2008)'s results when comparing Chinese and OECD exports to the US.

---

[4] The convergence test consists in calculating the difference in EU and China export unit values for each 6-digit HS product for each year and then testing whether these differences were equal in year t with respect to year t-1 or t-5 using a one-sided t-test.

Thus far we have only counted the number of products exported by both or by either of the countries. But a complementary question would be to what extent the EU and China differ in terms of the values of products that they ship. For this purpose we use the Finger-Kreinin (1979) index which gives an idea of the overlap of export shares.[5] The index lies between 0 and 1, the closer it is to 1, the more similar is the export product-mix between China and EU, when taking into account the value of the products they export. We find the value of the Finger-Kreinin index for clothing to lie around 0.58 for the entire sample period, suggesting that while both countries are present in each product category, the extent to which they export certain clothing products differs with little indication to suggest that this is changing over time.

Additionally, we analyze the dispersion of EU and Chinese export values across 6-digit HS products. To this end Table 4 reports the standard deviation and inter-quartile range of exports shares as well as the Gini index for export values. Results do not show remarkable differences in the dispersion of export shares between EU and China. The Gini index for Chinese export values is somewhat smaller than that of EU exports, suggesting that the latter are more concentrated. Also, there seems to be an upward trend in this index for both EU and Chinese exporters. However, the differences are very small which leads us to conclude that the overall level of concentration of export values of China and EU are very similar.

3.3. Core products

Here we aim to identify the exports which are "core" for the EU and for China to the extent that they represent the top 10% centile of export shares. The questions we are interested in are 1) did "core" products change over time?; 2) are "core" products overlapping?; 3) are "core" products for the EU becoming more similar than those for China?

Some of our findings are illustrated in Figure 3 and can be summarized as follows. The EU's core products in textiles did not change much over time. By that we mean that the HS6 digit products representing the top 10% centile of export value in the starting year of our analysis i.e. the year 2000, still represent a high share of export value in the final year of our analysis,

---

[5] The Finger-Kreinin-index is calculated as $\sum_{i \in J} \min(sh_{iCHNt}, sh_{iEUt})$, where sh_{iCHNt} and sh_{iEUt} are respectively Chinese and EU exports of product i in year t. This index measures to which extent the export portfolios of two countries in a specific industry overlap.

2009. In contrast, China's core products changed a lot more during that same period. The products belonging to the top 10% of export value in the year 2000, no longer represented a large share of export value in 2009. Interestingly, the share of EU-2000 core products in Chinese exports increased over time, suggesting that, at least for core products, China's export mix became relatively closer to the EU's. However, while EU core products (which did not change much over time) gained in importance in China's export portfolio, the overlap in clothing products between China and EU in the final year 2009 remains small. In sum, product dynamics in clothing appears much stronger for China than for the EU.

When looking at unit values of core products documented in Figure 4, we notice a clear distinction between the EU and China. For the EU we find that EU exports of EU core products have *lower* unit values than EU exports of Chinese core products. This is consistent with a story of comparative advantage where the EU sells most of the products that it is relatively efficient in producing and for which it can charge a low export price.

However, it can be noted from Figure 4 that Chinese exports of Chinese core products appear to have *higher* unit values than Chinese exports of EU core products. This seems to correspond with the phenomenon described in international trade as "shipping the good apples out", where typically less developed countries export products of high quality, explaining the relatively high unit value.

Taken together, these two observations suggest that firms in developed and developing countries face opposite problems when deciding to export their products to the rest of the world. Whereas the challenge of producers in developed economies seems to involve making their goods as cheap as possible, in order to be affordable for consumers in the rest of the world, developing countries' entrepreneurs appear to be pushed in the opposite direction, having to produce goods of sufficiently high quality in order to gain access to foreign markets, where standards can be more stringent or consumers more sophisticated.

4.   Price versus Quantity Analysis

From economic theory, we know that prices can reflect costs or quality (Foster et al., 2008; Di Comite et al., 2011), therefore to conclude that the EU sells a higher quality than China would not be correct without at least trying to distinguish between the two possible sources that can account for high prices.

One way to distinguish cost from quality aspects involved in prices is to consider quantity sold, since costs and quality have a very different effect on quantities sold which provides a way to distinguish the two.[6] Profit maximizing behavior by firms implies that when a high price is the reflection of high marginal cost of production, the quantity sold will be low. However, when high prices are the result of high quality embedded in the product, this high quality will shift demand out and result in high sales and prices. To sum up, the combination of prices and corresponding quantities sold, can tell us something about whether quality or cost is driving the price pattern that we observe.

4.1.   A Simple Model to study Relative Quality

A model that clearly makes this point is the one by Foster et al (2008), who develop a simple model of monopolistic competition with non-constant markups and vertical differentiation, or "quality", based on Melitz and Ottaviano (2008). Quality is captured by a variety-specific parameter denoting the willingness to pay for the first unit of the good or, more generally, by a demand shifter. Given the nature of our data, a variety here is considered a HS6-exporting market combination (i.e. a given EU and a Chinese HS6 represent the same product but different varieties). A convenient way of expressing preferences is the following:

$$U = \int_S \alpha_s\, q_s ds - \frac{\beta}{2} \int_S q_s^2 ds - \frac{\gamma}{2}\left[\int_S q_s\, ds\right]^2 + q_0$$

Where the first term captures the intrinsic quality of a variety, the second term reflects product differentiation, the third term gives the substitutability between varieties in the product market S that is considered (see Di Comite et al. for an extensive analysis of the

---

[6] Note that here we do not assume any correlation between quality and marginal cost in order to consider their effects separately. This is equivalent to assuming that quality is generated through fixed outlays such as R&D expenses, which do not affect equilibrium prices.

function and its parameters), and the last one, q_0, is simply a numéraire representing all the rest of the economy.

As usual in monopolistic competition models, firms are not supposed to interact strategically and consider the behavior of other firms in the market as given. The competitive environment experienced by each variety is then affected by the optimal pricing strategies of the competitors which are, in turn, determined by the distribution of structural parameters. Standard aggregate indicators can be used to capture the interactions between each firm and the market at large.

Once consumers and firms optimize their behavior, the former subject to a standard budget constraints and the latter considering a simple profit function, $\pi_s = (p_s - c_s)q_s - f_s$, optimal prices and quantities can be expressed as:

$$p_s^* = \frac{\alpha_s + c_s}{2} - \left(\frac{\gamma N}{2\beta + \gamma N} \right) \frac{\bar{\alpha} - \bar{c}}{2}$$

and

$$q_s^* = \left[\frac{\alpha_s - c_s}{2} - \left(\frac{\gamma N}{2\beta + \gamma N} \right) \frac{\bar{\alpha} - \bar{c}}{2} \right] \frac{1}{\beta}.$$

Where α, β and γ are the same parameters representing, quality, product differentiation and substitutability of a variety s respectively. N, is the number of competing varieties in product market S in a particular destination market and $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\bar{c}$ are average quality and average marginal cost of other firms operating in the same product and destination market. When fixing a particular destination market like the US, we control for all the price and quantity determinants that EU and Chinese varieties have in common when selling to the same destination market and that feature in the second terms on the right hand side in the above expressions.

In contrast, the first term on the right-hand side from the above expressions, contain variety specific determinants of price and quantity. It can already be noted that a variety's quality (α_s) has a positive effect on both price and quantity, while marginal cost, (c), raises price but lowers quantity. Hence, a comparison of relative price and quantity dynamics of Chinese versus European varieties in the same destination market, is informative about the relative

importance of quality versus cost evolutions at the variety level which is what we exploit below.

4.2. Observables and Predictions

The equilibrium prices and quantities of the Foster et al (2008) model turn out to be useful to shed some light on the quality upgrading dynamics of Chinese and EU exporters to a third destination market, say the US, noting that

$$\frac{\delta p_s^*}{\delta \alpha_s} > 0; \quad \frac{\delta p_s^*}{\delta c_s} > 0; \quad \left|\frac{\delta p_s^*}{\delta \alpha_s}\right| = \left|\frac{\delta p_s^*}{\delta c_s}\right|$$

But

$$\frac{\delta q_s^*}{\delta \alpha_s} > 0; \quad \frac{\delta q_s^*}{\delta c_s} < 0; \quad \left|\frac{\delta q_s^*}{\delta \alpha_s}\right| = \left|\frac{\delta q_s^*}{\delta c_s}\right|$$

Hence, a variety's quality (α_s) has a positive effect on both price and quantity, while marginal cost, (c), raises price but lowers quantity. Thus, while price movements alone are not sufficient to identify whether cost or quality is the source of the rise, but in combination with quantity movements yield sufficient information to identify whether the main underlying determinant of the price rise is cost or quality. For example, rising prices can either be a reflection of lower efficiency (higher costs) or higher quality or both. But in combination with quantity movements we can identify the source of the price rise. If say, rising prices coincide with lower sales, this is a reflection of higher costs. But if rising prices coincide with higher quantity sold, the Foster et al (2008) model would suggest that the quality determinant is a more important explanation of the price rise.

EU vis-à-vis China : Comparison over time

Evaluating the relative export performance of the EU and China towards a specific market and tracing the evolution of their unit prices and quantities shipped, we get an idea on the evolution of quality and costs in the period considered. More precisely, we can determine which one of the two price components (quality or costs) had a bigger impact on the

11

comparative evolution of unit values and volumes shipped from EU and China to third countries over time to determine in which direction quality and costs wrt to the competitor have evolved :

$$p_{eu}^* - p_{china}^* = \frac{((\alpha_{eu} + c_{eu}) - (\alpha_{china} + c_{china}))}{2}$$

$$\Delta(p_{eu}^* - p_{china}^*) = \frac{\Delta(\alpha_{eu} - \alpha_{china}) + \Delta(c_{eu} - c_{china}))}{2}$$

And

$$q_{eu}^* - q_{china}^* = \frac{((\alpha_{eu} + c_{eu}) - (\alpha_{china} + c_{china}))}{2\beta}$$

$$\Delta(q_{eu}^* - q_{china}^*) = \frac{\Delta(\alpha_{eu} - \alpha_{china}) + \Delta(c_{eu} - c_{china}))}{2\beta}$$

.

Looking at relative (EU vis-à-vis China) variations over time in prices and quantities, the following theoretical implications on the dominating effects can be drawn ($\Delta x_i = x_{i,t} - x_{i,t-1}$ where $x = p, q$ and $i = EU$ or China)

- If $\Delta q_{eu} > \Delta q_{china}$ and $\Delta p_{eu} > \Delta p_{china}$ $\Rightarrow$ European exporters are improving their quality($\uparrow \alpha$)with respect to Chinese exporters;

- If$\Delta q_{eu} < \Delta q_{china}$ and $\Delta p_{eu} < \Delta p_{china}$ $\Rightarrow$ European exporters are reducing their quality advantage ($\downarrow \alpha$) with respect to Chinese exporters;

- If$\Delta q_{eu} > \Delta q_{china}$ and $\Delta p_{eu} < \Delta p_{china}$ $\Rightarrow$ European exporters are improving their efficiency ($\downarrow c$)with respect to Chinese exporters;

- If $\Delta q_{eu} < \Delta q_{china}$ and $\Delta p_{eu} > \Delta p_{china}$ $\Rightarrow$ European exporters are losing cost competitiveness ($\uparrow c$)with respect to Chinese exporters;

To see which of the above scenarios applies, we plot prices and quantities for all HS6 digit clothing products exported by EU and China to RoW in Figure 5 in 2000, 2005 and 2009,

corresponding to the first, middle and final year of our data. Each dot represents the relative position of EU price and quantity versus China for a particular HS6 product.

The horizontal line in the figures represents the relative quantity calculated as follows:

$$\frac{Q^{EU}}{Q^{CH}} - 1 \ if \ Q^{EU} > Q^{CH}$$

$$-\left(\frac{Q^{CH}}{Q^{EU}} - 1\right) \ if \ Q^{EU} < Q^{CH}$$

where Q^{EU} and Q^{CH} are the quantities exported by EU and China respectively. Therefore, the dots in the left-hand panel of the figures represent products for which the quantity exported by China is larger, while those to the right are products for which EU exports are larger in quantity. The position of each dot with respect to the central axis shows how large this difference is in percentage. A similar measure is used for relative unit values:

$$\frac{UV^{EU}}{UV^{CH}} - 1 \ if \ UV^{EU} > UV^{CH}$$

$$-\left(\frac{UV^{CH}}{UV^{EU}} - 1\right) \ if \ UV^{EU} < UV^{CH}$$

where UV^{EU} and UV^{CH} are the export unit values for EU and China respectively. So now, products where the unit value of EU export is higher are represented in the upper panel, while the lower panel presents those for which the Chinese export unit value is higher.

It becomes clear that in 2009, quantity observations are situated more in the left hand side quadrant, suggesting that the relative sales of EU products vis-à-vis the Chinese sales in terms of quantities have fallen. The fact that relative EU prices are situated above the horizontal line suggests that EU prices are relatively higher than Chinese prices. So EU products are keeping higher prices and selling less over time. This is strongly rejecting the hypothesis that European exporters are improving the quality of their products to differentiate themselves vertically from Chinese exporters and, if anything, may suggest from 2005 to 2009 lower quality differences between EU and Chinese exports (depressing both prices and quantities of EU against Chinese exports). In addition, between 2000 and 2005, Figure 5 may even suggest higher cost differences, with prices diverging and quantity differences increasing even more, be it for Chinese merits or European demerits.

5. Fixing the destination market: Exports to the US

In our comparison of unit values, we have controlled for the product-level, meaning that the higher unit values we find for the EU, are not driven by the product composition since both the EU and China are present in all product categories. Moreover, instead of comparing average unit values across HS6 digit products, we have instead compared unit values within the same HS6 digit products. However, the higher unit values we find for EU exports of similar HS6 digit products could still be the result of a different country-mix as already hinted at in the previous paragraph before. Given that we have thus far analyzed EU and China's exports to the RoW, we cannot exclude that this price difference is driven by the fact that the EU may be selling to a different set of countries than China. Suppose that the EU is typically exporting products to developed countries, whereas China mainly exports to developing countries, then it would not be a surprise that EU unit values are higher than China's which would simply reflect the fact of different incomes and market characteristics in destination countries. To accommodate for the country-mix, and to make the price comparison more meaningful, we should compare EU and China's exports in the same destination market. A comparison of prices and quantities in the same destination market, therefore, seems more warranted. This is what we pursue in this section.

We repeat now our analysis of prices and quantities presented in Figure 5 but now limiting our attention to EU and China exports in clothing to the US market. This is presented in Figure 6. Interestingly, the results obtained earlier to RoW are also present when comparing EU and Chinese exports to the same destination market i.e. the US. Again we see that in 2009, observations lie in the top left quadrant of Figure 6, suggesting that while EU prices are higher than Chinese prices, EU quantities lose ground and that our earlier results were not driven by a country mix effect. Again, it can be noted that in 2000 EU exports to the US were more expensive than Chinese, but volumes were very similar, and even higher for many European HS6 products. In 2005, as the US market became more and more open to Chinese exports, the price difference between European and Chinese products increased and quantities decreased (the dots are shifted upwards and leftwards). This is again indicative of a widening cost difference, causing relatively inefficient European products to lose market share with respect to Chinese competitors. Finally in 2009 the movement is more leftward and downward, indicating a reduction in price differences but a further loss of EU market shares

vis-à-vis Chinese exporters. This suggests that quality differences are decreasing but cost differences may be still increasing.[7]

It is reassuring to notice that the same qualitative trends are present when considering either the RoW or a single destination market such as the US, for EU and Chinese exports.

6. Product dynamics and unit values on the US market

It can be noted from Table 5 that product dynamics of EU and Chinese exports at the HS6 product level in clothing to the US market are low. Most HS 6-digit products that were exported as early as 2000, are still present ten years later i.e. in 2009. Very few, if any products are added or dropped.

However, when focusing our attention on "core products" only, we see that the HS6 digits in the top 10% centile of export shares show a very different evolution over time for EU exports versus Chinese exports to US (Figure 7). European top 10% core products in 2000 represented 58% of EU exports to the US and these same products still accounted for almost 50% of the EU export value to the US ten years later. The Chinese product mix in contrast, changed much more over time. Whereas the top 10% of products in 2000 accounted for 65% of Chinese export value to the US in 2000, these same products represent only 35% of exports to the US in 2009, suggesting that other products became much more important in China's exports to the US.

In terms of unit values, we see that average unit values for EU products always lie above Chinese unit values on the US market, which is also true for the median unit value. This is illustrated in Figure 8. To make the comparison a correct one, we only include those products in the comparison that are exported by both EU and China to the US, to avoid that the average unit value difference is driven by a product composition effect. Also, by comparing prices on the same destination market, we now know for sure that the unit value difference, also found for exports of EU and China to RoW, is not driven by a country composition effect. Just like with RoW, the average unit value in Figure 8 reflects a higher price of EU products on a product-by-product basis for the majority of HS6 digit products included in the comparison.

---

[7] These trends are similar even when considering destination markets with different income levels and different income distributions such as Brazil and Mexico in which we compare the relative performance of European and Chinese HS6 digit products.

Moreover, Table 6 reports the number of products for which EU and Chinese export unit values are higher, and confirms what was found for export to the RoW. For the vast majority of products exported to the US, the unit value of EU exports is higher than that of Chinese exports.

It can also be noted from Figure 8 that ever since 2005, prices seem to be converging whereby the Chinese price of similar products is rising, while the EU export price to the US if anything is falling. Together with the evidence we supplied on the quantities sold, we believe that this reflects a reduction in vertical differentiation, where the quality of Chinese products is increasing, but where the EU products, while still selling for higher prices, are not following the same quality upgrading pattern which leads us to conclude that this evidence suggests an increase in the intensity of competition and an absence of sufficient quality upgrading on the EU's behalf, to face the intensified competition from China which results in a loss of EU clothing products market share on international markets.

7.   Conclusion

When China entered the WTO in 2001, this was the start of a steep rise in its exports in general and in clothing in particular. As a result, traditional clothing producers and exporters such as the EU experienced a sharp increase in competition, not just in its own market, but also in third markets. The purpose of this paper was to see if that rise in competition, especially after the Multi-Fiber Arrangement came to an end in 2005, has altered European product level exports in clothing in terms of prices and quantities sold. A first question raised was whether the product export mix of Europe as a whole changed in the face of rising Chinese exports. For the clothing sector we find very little movement in Europe's product export mix. The EU is present in all HS6 digit product categories and the export share of its core products accounting for most of its exports has remained remarkably stable over time. A second question we addressed was whether there is any evidence of quality differences between European and Chinese products using a combination of prices and quantities sold as proxies. We started by comparing unit values for China and EU in narrowly defined product categories. The results showed that in the large majority of HS6 digit product categories, EU prices are consistently higher than Chinese prices. If we trust prices to remotely reflect

quality, this would lead us to conclude that European products are indeed of higher quality. However, a true test for quality lies in the combination of prices and quantities.

But when simply comparing unit values of EU and China exports to the Rest of the world (RoW) at the HS6 digit level, the higher EU and Chinese export prices could reflect a different country-mix, which is not what we want. To address that, we singled out one particular destination market by looking at EU and Chinese exports to the US. EU prices on the US market are consistently higher than Chinese ones for most HS6 categories in clothing and this holds for any year between 2000 and 2009. However, when we engage in a more dynamic analysis we get interesting additional insights. Based on the theoretical model of Foster et al (2008) we look at prices and quantities of both EU and Chinese clothing products in the US market. Ever since the end of the Multi Fiber Arrangement, we find Chinese prices rising and EU prices falling. However, the market shares go in directions opposite to what would be expected, with Chinese market shares growing and EU market shares falling. A correlation of rising prices and rising market shares for the Chinese products in combination with lower relative prices for the EU and falling market shares, is highly suggestive of a relative increase of the quality embedded in Chinese products. Therefore we conclude that exports are less and less vertically differentiated in the clothing sector, at least as far as the country of origin of the export is concerned, since we had no information of the ownership of the Chinese exporters.

References

Baldwin, R. and Harrigan, J. (2011). "Zeros, quality, and space: Trade theory and trade evidence." *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 3, 60–88.

Di Comite, F., Thisse, J.-F. and Vandenbussche, H. (2011). "Verti-zontal differentiation in monopolistic competition", National Bank of Belgium working paper.

Evans, Carolyn and James Harrigan. (2005). "Tight Clothing. How the Mfa Affects Asian Apparel Exports," Ito, T. and A. K. Rose, *International Trade in East Asia, Nber-East Asia Seminar on Economics*. University of Chicago Press, 367-90.

Fajgelbaum, Pablo, Gene M. Grossman and Elhanan Helpman (2011)," Income Distribution, Product Quality and International Trade" *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 119, August.

Finger, J. M. and M. E. Kreinin.(1979). "A Measure of `Export Similarity' and Its Possible Uses." *The Economic Journal*, 89(356), 905-12.

Francois, Joseph and Julia Woerz. 2009. "Non-Linear Panel Estimation of Import Quotas: The Evolution of Quota Premiums under the Atc." *Journal of International Economics*, 78(2), 181-91.

Foster, Lucia; John Haltiwanger and Chad Syverson.(2008). "Reallocation, Firm Turnover, and Efficiency: Selection on Productivity or Profitability?" *The American Economic Review*, 98(1), 394-425.

Hummels, David and Peter Klenow, (2005), "The Variety and Quality of a Nation's Exports,"

American Economic Review, 2005, 95 (3), 704–723

Latzer, Hélène and Florian Mayneris (2011),"Trade in quality and income distribution", working paper, Université Catholique de Louvain.

Melitz, M. J. and Ottaviano, G. I. P. (2008). Market size, trade, and productivity. *Review of Economic Studies,* 75: 295–316.

G. Mion, H. Vandenbussche and L. Zhu (2010), "Trade with China and Skill-upgrading. Evidence from Belgian firm-level data", *National Bank of Belgium working paper*, 2010-194.

Nordås, Hildegunn Kyvik (2004). "The Global Textile and Clothing Industry Post the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing " *World Trade Organization Discussion Paper* No. 5.

Schott, Peter K. 2008. "The Relative Sophistication of Chinese Exports." *Economic Policy*, 23(53), 5-49.

Tables

Table 1: Unit Value Comparison EU-China in Clothing Products (HS6), exports to the rest of the world

Year	Total number of HS6 products* (1)	Number of HS6 for which EU unit value> Chinese unit value (2)	Number of HS6 for which Chinese unit value > EU unit value (3)
2000	241	199	42
2001	233	192	41
2002	231	196	35
2003	231	198	33
2004	241	221	20
2005	241	221	20
2006	241	225	16
2007	209	191	18
2008	215	182	33
2009	220	170	50

* Number of HS6 products for which we have no missing values for quantities.

Table 2: T-tests on convergence vs. divergence of EU and Chinese clothing unit values

Period	Average difference in unit values, year 1[#]	Average difference in unit values, year 2[##]	P-value (convergence)[§]	Trend
2005-2009	0.850705	0.340920	0.00	Convergence***
2005-2006	0.850705	0.804580	0.28	convergence
2006-2007	0.804580	0.637243	0.01	Convergence***
2007-2008	0.637243	0.486857	0.03	Convergence**
2008-2009	0.486857	0.340920	0.03	Convergence**

Notes:[#]Average difference between EU and Chinese export unit values in the first year indicated in the first column (difference 1) [##]Same for the second year indicated (difference 2). [§]Correspond to the t-test H_0) difference 1 = difference 2.

Table 3: Total clothing exports to the rest of the world

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Exported by both	292	292	294	294	294	294	294	271	271	271
EU-only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
China-only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Notes: The table reports the number of 6-digit HS codes for which both EU and China reports non-zero export values.

Source: UN COMTRADE data

Table 4: Descriptive statistics on the dispersion of export shares

	EU				China			
Year	Mean	Standard Deviation	Inter-quartile range	Gini Index	Mean	Standard Deviation	Inter-quartile range	Gini Index
2000	0.0041	0.0073	0.0036	67.4%	0.0041	0.0071	0.0039	66.0%
2001	0.0041	0.0074	0.0036	67.6%	0.0043	0.0069	0.0042	64.0%
2002	0.0041	0.0072	0.0038	67.9%	0.0043	0.0072	0.0043	64.6%
2003	0.0041	0.0072	0.0039	68.0%	0.0043	0.0072	0.0043	64.9%
2004	0.0041	0.0073	0.0036	69.1%	0.0041	0.0068	0.0038	65.0%
2005	0.0041	0.0073	0.0038	69.5%	0.0041	0.0076	0.0041	67.0%
2006	0.0041	0.0072	0.0037	69.2%	0.0041	0.0078	0.0041	67.8%
2007	0.0041	0.0071	0.0038	68.5%	0.0048	0.0089	0.0047	67.1%
2008	0.0041	0.0072	0.0036	69.1%	0.0047	0.0080	0.0048	66.2%
2009	0.0041	0.0072	0.0041	68.8%	0.0045	0.0082	0.0047	67.2%

Notes: The mean, standard deviation and inter-quartile range are calculated using the share of each 6-digit HS codes on total export value in clothing. The Gini index is calculated using the export value of each 6-digit HS code using UN Comtrade data

Table 5: Number of newly exported, continuously exported and dropped clothing products (exports to the US)

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
New EU*	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cont. EU**	246	246	246	246	245	245	245	246	246	245
Dropped EU***	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
New China*	5	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
Cont. China**	240	244	243	243	243	245	246	246	246	246
Dropped China***	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Always Both****	235	235	235	235	235	235	235	235	235	235

Notes: * Number of 6-digit HS codes exported the current year and not exported the year before, ** number of 6-digit HS codes exported both the current and previous years, *** number of products exported the previous year but not the current year, **** number of products exported both by EU and China every year using UN Comtrade data.

Table 6: Unit Value Comparison EU-China in Clothing Products (HS6), exports to the US

Year	Number of HS6 products*	Number of HS6 EU unit price > Chinese unit price	Number of HS6 Chinese unit price > EU unit price
2000	240	221	19
2001	231	212	19
2002	230	213	17
2003	229	215	14
2004	239	231	8
2005	240	235	5
2006	241	235	6
2007	209	202	7
2008	215	196	19
2009	219	204	15

Note: *Number of HS6 products for which we have no missing values for quantities using UN Comtrade data.

Figures

Figure 1a: Export quantity (Mio. kilos) of clothing exports to the rest of the world (UN Comtrade)

Figure 1b: Export value (Mio. USD) of clothing exports to the rest of the world (UN Comtrade)

Figure 2: Relative unit values (median) of clothing exports to the rest of the world (UN Comtrade)

Figure 3: Share of clothing core products in clothing export value, exports to the rest of the world

Figure 4: Core product unit values of clothing exports to the rest of the world (based on UN Comtrade)

Figure 5: Relative quantities and unit values (EU vs. China) in 2000, 2005 and 2009 for clothing, exports to the Rest of the world (RoW), at the HS6 digit level

Notes : A positive (negative) value on the horizontal axis means that European quantities in a particular HS6 is higher (is lower) then the Chinese quantity of the same HS6 to the RoW. And similarly for prices on the vertical axis ie a positive (negative) value on the vertical axis means that the European price is higher (is lower) than the Chinese price for the same HS6.

Figure 6: Relative quantities and unit values (EU vs. China) in 2000, 2005 and 2009 for clothing, exports to the US, at the HS6 digit level.

Notes : A positive (negative) value on the horizontal axis means that European quantities in a particular HS6 is higher (is lower) then the Chinese quantity of the same HS6 to the US market. And similarly for prices on the vertical axis ie a positive (negative) value on the vertical axis means that the European price is higher (is lower) than the Chinese price for the same HS6.

Figure 7: Share of clothing core products in clothing export value, exports to the US (UN Comtrade)

Figure 8: Relative unit values (median) of clothing products exported from both China and EU throughout 2000-2009 to the US (UN Comtrade)