


The Mutable Geography of Firms' International Trade

Lu Han
International Economic Analysis
Department
Bank of Canada
halu@bankofcanada.ca

Bank of Canada staff working papers provide a forum for staff to publish work-in-progress research independently from the Bank's Governing Council. This work may support or challenge prevailing policy orthodoxy. Therefore, the views expressed in this note are solely those of the authors and may differ from official Bank of Canada views. No responsibility for them should be attributed to the Bank.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34989/swp-2025-11> | ISSN 1701-9397

© 2025 Bank of Canada



Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Giancarlo Corsetti and Meredith Crowley for their invaluable guidance and constant support. I thank George Alessandria, Vasco Carvalho, Tiago Cavalcanti, Arpita Chatterjee, Charles Engel, Julian di Giovanni, Doireann Fitzgerald, Scott French, Yuko Imura, Pete Klenow, Jozef Konings, Oleksiy Kryvtsov, Joel Rodrigue, Kim Ruhl, Tim Schmidt-Eisenlohr, Lucas Macedoni, Gaelan MacKenzie, Balázs Muraközy, Rui Zhang and Weilong Zhang, and participants at various seminars and conferences for their feedback. I thank the Cambridge Endowment for Research in Finance (CERF) for its financial support for the acquisition of the Chinese customs data used in my empirical analysis

Abstract

Exporters frequently change their set of destination markets. This paper proposes a new approach to identifying the underlying drivers of changes in exporters' market decisions over time. The approach exploits information on the price and quantity of the changes in firms' continuing markets, to uncover the microshocks that drive firms' market changes. Applying the method to customs data from China (2000-2006) and the UK (2010-2016), I find consistent results showing that most firm- and firm-product-level market changes are driven by demand-related shocks, with a nontrivial proportion of these changes being correlated across markets.

Topics: International topics; Economic models; Firm dynamics; Trade integration

JEL codes: F14, F12, L11

Résumé

Les exportateurs changent fréquemment leurs marchés de destination. Cette étude propose une nouvelle approche pour faire ressortir les facteurs sous-jacents qui motivent les décisions relatives aux marchés des exportateurs au fil du temps. L'approche se fonde sur des données sur les prix et les quantités dans les marchés que les entreprises continuent d'exploiter afin de révéler les microchocs qui entraînent les changements. En appliquant la méthode aux données douanières de la Chine (2000-2006) et du Royaume-Uni (2010-2016), j'obtiens des résultats montrant de façon cohérente que la plupart des changements de marché au niveau de l'entreprise et du produit sont entraînés par des chocs liés à la demande, et qu'une proportion non négligeable des changements est corrélée entre les marchés.

Sujets : Questions internationales ; Modèles économiques ; Dynamique des entreprises ; Intégration des échanges

Codes JEL : F14, F12, L11

1 Introduction

Firms engaged in the global economy face a complex and ever-changing landscape. Contrary to the conventional wisdom that once a firm enters a foreign market it tends to stay in that market, recent studies have documented a high exit rate of firms, following their entry into foreign markets.¹ These works highlight the importance of demand changes in driving firms' export market decisions, as opposed to classical models that rely on productivity or cost changes (Melitz 2003; Bernard, Eaton, Jensen and Kortum 2003; Chaney 2008). While the demand explanations are appealing and can successfully explain recently documented empirical facts, it is hard to rule out the fact that some firms may exit markets due to supply-side changes. How can we assess the relative contributions of supply versus demand factors in driving firms' market changes in international trade?

A key challenge in quantifying the underlying drivers of firms' market changes is that we do not observe firms' prices and quantities in the markets they have either not yet entered or have already exited. Consequently, it becomes impossible to provide direct estimations on the price and quantity changes in those markets to infer the underlying shocks. This paper proposes a novel approach to overcome this challenge by looking at firms' price and quantity adjustments in their continuing markets. It first provides new empirical measures to link firms' intensive margin adjustments in their continuing markets to their extensive margin adjustments in their market participation. It then builds a tractable analytical framework to map the new empirical measures into the relative contributions of firm- and firm-market-specific demand and supply shocks in driving firms' market changes.

Empirically, using detailed information on firms' country-specific product sales from the universe of customs transactions for China for the period 2000-2006 and the UK for 2010-2016,² I document two new facts on within-firm (and product) market changes.³ First, the geography of firms' international trade is highly mutable – an exporter frequently adjusts the set of markets it serves. This pattern is observed not only among growing firms but also among established ones. In fact, this mutability is especially pronounced among “the happy few,” consisting of large, multi-product, and multi-destination exporters.⁴ At the

¹See Besedeš and Prusa (2011), Albornoz, Calvo Pardo, Corcos and Ornelas (2012, 2023), Ruhl and Willis (2017), Geishecker, Schröder and Sørensen (2019) and Fanelli, Hallak and Yin (2024). See Alessandria, Arkolakis and Ruhl (2021) for a recent literature review on exporter dynamics.

²The two time periods were selected based on data availability and for the purpose of studying firms' entry dynamics both before and after the Great Trade Collapse (2008-2009).

³The empirical analysis is conducted separately at the firm, firm-sector (2-digit HS), and firm-product (8-digit HS) level. While the exact quantitative estimates may differ, the main qualitative findings of this paper hold at different disaggregation levels.

⁴International trade is dominated by a relatively small number of large multi-product, multi-destination

firm-product level, a typical established exporter changes *two-thirds* of its markets on a year-to-year basis, with about *one-third* of these market changes involving simultaneously adding and dropping markets.

Second, for the same product, firms that drop more markets also see significant declines in the quantities they sell in the markets to which they continue to export, with prices remaining largely unchanged. For a one-percentage-point change in the drop-to-change ratio, defined as the proportion of markets being dropped relative to the total number of markets remaining changed in the same period, the average quantity sold in the continuing markets drops by 0.66%, while the average price only increases by 0.01%. These estimates suggest that these market changes could be largely driven by demand-related shocks that not only contain destination-market-specific changes but also correlated changes across markets.

Theoretically, I build a tractable analytical framework to quantify the extent to which the firms' market changes are driven by various underlying shocks, including firm-destination-specific demand shocks and firm-specific demand and supply shocks.⁵ I show that the relationship between the drop-to-change ratio and the price and quantity adjustments, in the continuing markets, provides important insights on the underlying shocks that drive the within-firm market changes. For example, firms dropping markets due to supply shocks should also see price rises in their continuing markets, resulting in a positive relationship between the price changes in the continuing markets and the drop-to-change ratio. Similarly, firms dropping markets due to global demand shocks should see large quantity drops in their continuing markets but limited price changes. In contrast, if the market changes are purely driven by firm-destination-specific shocks, then the drop-to-change ratio would be uncorrelated with the price and quantity adjustments in the continuing markets. Applying the framework to the data suggests that within-firm market changes are largely driven by demand rather than supply shocks, with a nontrivial fraction (13–45%) of these demand shocks being correlated across markets.

In addition to the within-firm market changes, I show that the uncovered microshocks are also important for explaining the price and quantity dynamics as a firm grows and adds more markets. Specifically, I document that as firms grow and add more destination markets over time, they tend to sell more products in their core destination markets, while their prices in these markets are barely changed. I show that this empirical pattern is driven by correlated demand shocks across destination markets within a firm. Supply shocks or firm-destination-

firms; see [Mayer and Ottaviano \(2008\)](#).

⁵I use the word “shock” to refer to the demand or supply variations at a particular panel dimension. Some of these variations could arise from more-fundamental shocks in alternative models or settings.

specific shocks alone cannot explain the exporters' observed price and quantity dynamics over time.

This paper contributes to the literature on understanding exporter dynamics.⁶ Existing works often focus on a particular mechanism to explain the extensive and intensive margins of international trade, which include productivity and costs (e.g., Melitz, 2003; Chaney, 2008), informational frictions (Chaney, 2014), contract enforcement (Araujo, Mion and Ornelas, 2016), demand learning (e.g., Alborno, Calvo Pardo, Corcos and Ornelas, 2012; Timoshenko, 2015; Fanelli, Hallak and Yin, 2024), and complementarities across markets (e.g., Morales, Sheu and Zahler, 2019; Alfaro-Urena, Castro-Vincenzi, Fanelli and Morales, 2023). This paper complements the existing literature by providing a systematic approach to uncovering the underlying shocks that drive market changes. I create new measures that link firms' extensive margin adjustments to their intensive margin adjustments and show that the prices and quantities in the continuing markets can provide useful information on the underlying shocks that drive market changes.

This paper is also related to the broader literature on understanding firm heterogeneity, encompassing both domestic firms and exporters and spanning dimensions such as growth, size, and performance. Motivated by the important macroeconomic implications of firm heterogeneity,⁷ this literature explores various demand- and supply-side factors to explain the causes of firm heterogeneity.⁸ While the heterogeneity in firm dynamics is traditionally attributed to supply-side factors, such as firm productivity shocks and cost efficiency, recent literature emphasizes the importance of demand factors in explaining firm heterogeneity.

The findings in this paper contribute to this literature in two ways. First, relative to papers that show the importance of demand in explaining firm heterogeneity (e.g., Foster, Haltiwanger and Syverson, 2008; Baldwin and Harrigan, 2011; Manova and Zhang, 2012; Hottman, Redding and Weinstein, 2016), my finding that *within-firm* market changes are mostly driven by demand shocks brings additional evidence to this literature by showing the

⁶For the aggregate implications of exporter dynamics, see Ghironi and Melitz (2005), Alessandria and Choi (2007), Das, Roberts and Tybout (2007), Ruhl (2008), Kehoe and Ruhl (2013), Alessandria and Choi (2014), Alessandria, Choi, Kaboski and Midrigan (2015), Fitzgerald and Haller (2018), and Alessandria, Choi and Ruhl (2021).

⁷There is a large literature on how micro-level firm heterogeneity influences aggregate outcomes, including aggregate productivity (Pavcnik, 2002), aggregate fluctuations (Gabaix, 2011; Di Giovanni, Levchenko and Mejean, 2014; Carvalho and Grassi, 2019), and international trade (Chaney, 2008; Melitz and Redding, 2015; Gaubert and Itskhoki, 2021).

⁸See e.g., Foster, Haltiwanger and Syverson (2008); Baldwin and Harrigan (2011); Eaton, Kortum and Kramarz (2011); Johnson (2012); Manova and Zhang (2012); Hottman, Redding and Weinstein (2016); Alfaro-Urena, Castro-Vincenzi, Fanelli and Morales (2023); Fitzgerald, Haller and Yedid-Levi (2023); Eslava, Haltiwanger and Urdaneta (2024).

importance of demand in explaining another dimension of firm heterogeneity, that is, firms’ market choices. Second, the finding that demand shocks play a significant role in explaining a firm’s price and quantity dynamics in its core markets as it grows and expands underscores the importance of understanding demand-related channels in driving the dynamics of firm growth (e.g., Fitzgerald, Haller and Yedid-Levi, 2023; Argente, Fitzgerald, Moreira and Priolo, 2024).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the new empirical measures and discusses the key empirical findings. Section 3 introduces a tractable analytical framework to identify the underlying drivers of the observed market changes. Section 4 discusses the implications of identified shocks for exporter dynamics. Section 5 concludes.

2 Within-firm Market Changes: Measurement and Evidence

Firms engaged in international trade have a “frothy” extensive margin characterized by simultaneous entry and exit. I introduce a new set of empirical measures, for this froth, which can be used to quantify firms’ market changes and the underlying drivers of their market-change decisions.

In Section 2.1, I introduce the customs datasets my empirical analysis is based on. In Section 2.2, I introduce the new measures of within-firm market changes, and I show the key stylized facts in Section 2.3. In Section 2.4, I show the new empirical measures that link the intensive and extensive margin adjustments within a firm. Finally, in Section 2.5, I exploit the heterogeneity in the empirical measures by product and firm type.

2.1 Data

I carry out my empirical analysis with the use of two customs databases: (1) Chinese customs data, that is, the universe of import and export records for China for the period 2000 to 2006, and (2) administrative data for Her Majesty’s Customs and Revenue (HMRC) in the UK for the period 2010 to 2016.

Chinese customs data reports detailed trade flows (by quantity and value) at the firm-product-destination-month level. In addition to standard variables, such as the firm ID, an 8-digit HS code, and the destination country and month, the database contains the word for the Chinese measure in which the quantities are reported, an indicator of the form

of commerce for tax and tariff purposes, and a categorization based on the exporting firm’s registration type. The database is available at monthly frequencies for the period 2000–2006. In this study, I aggregate trade flows into annual levels. Similar to other firm-level studies that use customs databases, I use unit values as a proxy for prices. A product is defined as an 8-digit harmonized system (HS) code. A sector is defined as a 2-digit HS code.

The HMRC administrative datasets include transaction-level trade flows for non-EU exports and monthly records for EU exports.⁹ The HMRC reports the transaction values in sterling and two quantity measures: net mass and quantity. I aggregate trade flows at the firm-product-destination-year level by summing over the quantities and values of the transactions. The unit values are calculated in total sterling value divided by the quantities, with the reported quantities by net mass in kilos, units, pairs, and so on, and as the total sterling values divided by the net mass in kilos for products for which there are no specific quantity units reported. Firms are identified by a firm-specific anonymized identifier. Products are defined by an 8-digit combined nomenclature (CN) code.¹⁰ To create the same time span of Chinese firms, I focus on the time period 2010–2016, where 2016 is the latest year of data available.

Since the empirical patterns I document in the following sections are robust to the customs datasets used, in the paper I focus on discussing the results of Chinese exporters, and I report the statistics and estimates of UK exporters in [Online Appendix: UK Results](#).

2.2 Measuring Changes in Trade Patterns

How can we measure changes in trade patterns? I develop two simple measures to capture the changes in the set of export markets served by a firm with a particular product, over time. To illustrate the properties of the customs datasets and how the trade pattern measures are defined and calculated, it is useful to go through the following example. The example, constructed to reflect the actual structure of the trading patterns of many firm- and firm-product-level transactions, conveys the highly unbalanced nature of the data.

Consider a firm that sells a product to four countries, A, B, C, and D, over four time

⁹EU records only contain UK firms with exports to the EU exceeding £250,000 in a given calendar year. The requirement to report exports at the detailed product level applies to firms with total export values exceeding the reporting threshold. A comparison with official statistics indicates that these companies account for around 96–98% of the total value of UK exports to the EU.

¹⁰In 2012, there was a major revision in the product classification and there were many small revisions in other years in my sampling period, 2010–2016. I wrote an algorithm to convert all product classifications into the base year (2012), while keeping the maximum number of consistent product definitions, based on the [official concordance tables](#).

periods. The left-hand panel of Figure 1 shows the trading records of this firm-product pair. An empty cell means no trade. The right-hand panel shows the construction of the relevant statistics.

				Trade Pattern	Activity	M. Changes/ Markets	Drops/ Changes
$t = 1$	A	B		A-B	–	–	–
$t = 2$	A		C	A-C	Churn	2/2	1/2
$t = 3$	A		C	D	A-C-D	Add	1/2.5
$t = 4$	A		C		A-C	Drop	1/2.5

Figure 1: An Example of Market-switching Measures

A trade pattern is defined as the set of destination markets that a firm-product pair exports to in a given period. The first column in the right-hand panel shows the identified trade patterns. In this example, three trade patterns are identified: A-B, A-C, and A-C-D. The second column in the right-hand panel classifies the market-change activity into three different categories. Market churn happens if the firm-product pair simultaneously adds and drops markets within a given period. In this example, market churn only occurs in period 2. The last two columns of Figure 1 show that changes to the extensive margin can be decomposed into two components: (a) the proportion of the markets that changed among all active markets and (b) the proportion of the markets being dropped/added among the changed markets.

Specifically, I construct two measures to capture the magnitude and direction of the changes in a firm’s (or firm-product’s) the trade patterns.

Market Changes / Number of Markets (MCM) captures the magnitude of the market changes, defined as follows:

$$\text{MCM}_{ft} \equiv \frac{N_{ft,t-s}^{\text{changed}}}{\frac{1}{2}(N_{ft} + N_{ft-s})}, \quad (1)$$

where f represents a firm or firm-product pair; $N_{ft,t-s}^{\text{changed}}$ is the number of markets that f changed from period $t - s$ to period t ; N_{ft} is the total number of markets f exported to at

t ; and s is the lag between the two observed periods.¹¹ The advantage of having both N_{ft} and N_{ft-s} in the denominator is that the measured MCM_{ft} will be bounded from 0 to 2.

The ratio *Market Drop / Market Changes (DC Ratio)* captures the proportion of markets being dropped among the total number of markets changed:

$$\text{Drop-to-change ratio}_{ft} \equiv \frac{N_{ft,t-s}^{\text{dropped}}}{N_{ft,t-s}^{\text{changed}}}, \quad (2)$$

where $N_{ft,t-s}^{\text{dropped}}$ is the number of markets that have been dropped between $t-s$ and t . Note that the drop-to-change ratio is a directional measure. If a firm only adds markets, then the drop-to-change ratio will be zero; if a firm only drops markets, then the drop-to-change ratio will be 1; if a firm simultaneously adds and drops markets, then the drop-to-change ratio will be in between 0 and 1. The DC ratio also provides a simple way to calculate the *probability of churn*: the market churn activity, by number, over the total number of trading periods, that is, the probability that the DC ratio is neither one nor zero. I also create the corresponding value measures of (1) and (2) by calculating the total trade value involved in the firm's markets.

2.3 Stylized Facts on Within-firm Market Changes

Table 1 presents the distribution of market-change measures for Chinese exporters during the period 2000–2006. The top panel shows the market changes based on trade patterns defined at the firm-product level. We see from the first row of panel (a) that a median Chinese exporter changes around *two-thirds* of their markets at an annual frequency. The second row shows the corresponding measures of the values of these market changes. The trade values involved in these market changes are nontrivial—about a quarter of each firm's total trade value.

In view of the large scale of market changes found in the data, a natural question is whether these changes mainly consist of dropping existing markets or adding new markets. The next two rows of each panel show the count and value measures of the drop-to-change ratios. These statistics are calculated based on those time periods involving market changes. The median value of the market drops over the market changes (the drop-to-change ratio) is around 0.5. This suggests that firms simultaneously add and drop markets—a pattern that is difficult to rationalize using trade models that focus exclusively on supply-side (produc-

¹¹At the annual frequency, $s = 1$ in most cases.

Table 1: Measures of Within-firm Market Changes

	Median	Mean	Distribution (Percentile)				Observations
			5th	25th	75th	95th	
<i>(a) Firm-product level</i>							
MCM (count measure)	0.67	0.86	0.00	0.00	1.50	2.00	3,894,362
MCM (value measure)	0.24	0.72	0.00	0.00	1.73	2.00	3,894,362
DC (count measure)	0.50	0.47	0.00	0.22	0.67	1.00	2,652,112
DC (value measure)	0.42	0.46	0.00	0.03	0.90	1.00	2,652,112
Prob. of churn	0.27	0.27	0.00	0.05	0.43	0.60	6,444,617
Number of markets	1.00	2.90	1.00	1.00	3.00	10.00	6,444,617
<i>(b) Firm-sector level</i>							
MCM (count measure)	0.67	0.77	0.00	0.00	1.20	2.00	1,317,304
MCM (value measure)	0.14	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.85	2.00	1,317,304
DC (count measure)	0.50	0.45	0.00	0.17	0.68	1.00	958,212
DC (value measure)	0.37	0.44	0.00	0.02	0.88	1.00	958,211
Prob. of churn	0.25	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.83	2,033,556
Number of markets	2.00	4.95	1.00	1.00	5.00	19.00	2,033,556
<i>(c) Firm level</i>							
MCM (count measure)	0.67	0.69	0.00	0.29	1.00	2.00	454,901
MCM (value measure)	0.10	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.48	2.00	454,901
DC (count measure)	0.40	0.43	0.00	0.11	0.67	1.00	360,007
DC (value measure)	0.30	0.41	0.00	0.01	0.82	1.00	360,007
Prob. of churn	0.33	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.86	649,633
Number of markets	3.00	8.25	1.00	1.00	10.00	32.00	649,633

Source: Chinese customs database, 2000–2006.

Note: This table shows the summary statistics of different measures of within-firm market changes at the firm-product level in panel (a), the firm-sector level in panel (b), and the firm level in panel (c). The count measures for the market-change-to-markets (MCM) ratio and the drop-to-change (DC) ratio are defined as in (1) and (2). The value measures for the two ratios are calculated using the total trade value of the markets instead of the number of markets. The probability of churn is the market churn activity, by number, over the total number of trading periods.

tivity or cost-efficiency) determinants of trade. Among these market changes, market churn accounts for around *one-third* of a firm’s trading periods.

Panels (b) and (c) of Table 1 show the results based on trade patterns calculated at a more-aggregated firm-sector (2-digit HS) level and at the firm level, respectively. In general, we observe very similar patterns, compared to the results for the firm-product level. At the more-aggregated firm sector or firm level, firms export to more markets and the trade patterns are slightly more stable.¹²

2.4 Price and Quantity Adjustments in Continuing Markets

What drives these market changes? Do these market changes reflect the large and frequent demand shocks firms face? Or are these changes driven by supply-side factors? For example, a firm receiving a common adverse cost shock will need to increase its prices and, thus, may no longer have enough demand for its products to cover the fixed costs of exporting to some destinations.

A known problem in addressing these questions is the measurement. We do not observe the price that would have been set or the quantity that would have been sold before the firm enters (or after the firm exited) the market. A key innovation of this paper is to exploit the price and quantity adjustments in the firm’s continuing markets (i.e., those markets where the firm continues to sell during the period $t - 1$ to t) to gauge the potential shocks firms face when they add or drop markets.

			Δ Outcome	Drops/Changes	
			in Continuing Markets		
$t = 1$	A	B	–	–	
$t = 2$	A	C	$y_{A,2} - y_{A,1}$	1/2	
$t = 3$	A	C	D	$y_{AC,3} - y_{AC,2}$	0/1
$t = 4$	A	C	$y_{AC,4} - y_{AC,3}$	1/1	

Figure 2: Illustration of the Estimation Strategy

Note: The first subscript in y denotes the set of markets in which the variable is calculated. The outcome variable is the unit value or mean quantity calculated based on the set of markets indicated by the first subscript of y .

¹²All statistics are calculated based on year-to-year changes. In Appendix A.1, I report statistics with trade patterns calculated at different time frequencies. The magnitude of the market changes increases slightly with the time span in which the trade pattern is calculated.

Table 2: Quantity and Price Elasticities to the Drop-to-change Ratio

	Quantity Elasticity to DC	Price Elasticity to DC	Observations
<u>Count measure</u>			
Firm-product level	-0.66***	0.01***	1,326,377
Firm-sector level	-0.70***	0.04***	667,478
Firm level	-0.74***	0.05***	294,438
<u>Value measure</u>			
Firm-product level	-0.61***	-0.00	1,326,377
Firm-sector level	-0.62***	0.01***	667,477
Firm level	-0.62***	0.03***	294,438

Note: This table presents a summary of the estimates from regressing the changes in the logged unit value or logged mean quantity in firms' continuing markets on the drop-to-change (DC) ratio. The top and bottom panels present the results using the count and value measures, respectively, of the DC ratio. The rows within each panel indicate the level of disaggregation at which the market-change measures are constructed. Each cell reports an estimate from a separate regression. Firm (-product/sector) and year fixed effects are added in each specification. The statistical significance is calculated based on robust standard errors with ***, **, * representing statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, 10% level, respectively. Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

Figure 2 illustrates the estimation strategy, where I regress the changes in the mean unit value or the quantity sold in the firms' continuing markets on the drop-to-change ratio, which measures the direction of the market changes, that is, the proportion of markets being dropped.¹³ The estimates from this specification capture whether firms dropping more markets also charge higher prices and sell lower quantities in those continuing markets.

Table 2 presents a summary of the estimation results for the continuing markets. The estimates suggest that the quantities in the continuing markets are significantly lower if more markets are dropped conditional on a market change. However, the changes in the prices firms charge in these markets are small and are only weakly related to the proportion of the markets being dropped.¹⁴ For example, at a firm-product level, for a one-percentage-point increase in the drop-to-change ratio, the quantity in the continuing markets drops by 0.66% while the price only increases by 0.01%.

While the market-specific demand changes can be important in driving the market changes, the estimates highlight that global or common demand changes are also impor-

¹³Note that the drop-to-change ratio is already a change measure and, therefore, no further time differences need to be taken.

¹⁴The magnitudes of the unit-value changes are small and the statistical significance of the unit value coefficients is sensitive to the estimation sample.

tant in driving the market changes. More specifically, the large quantity changes in the continuing markets suggest that a nontrivial proportion of these market changes are driven by correlated changes across markets. If the market changes were purely driven by idiosyncratic market-specific changes, then we would not have observed any big change in firms' continuing markets.

2.5 Heterogeneity by Product and Firm Type

Relying on the rich information contained in the Chinese customs database, I uncover substantial heterogeneity in the magnitude of within-firm market changes, based on the degree of product differentiation, the end-use of the product, the capital structure of the firm, and the nature of the business. However, the estimated quantity and price elasticities with respect to the drop-to-change ratio are highly similar and consistent across product and firm type.¹⁵

Heterogeneity by product type. Panel (a) of Table 3 breaks down trade transactions by product differentiation according to Rauch (1999) classification. Firms selling less-differentiated products (such as commodities traded at an organized exchange) tend to have stable trade patterns and are less likely to change their destination markets. In contrast, firms selling more-differentiated products, such as machinery and mechanical appliances and optical and photographic products, demonstrate a significantly larger degree of market changes. Panel (b) shows a breakdown by the end use categories of the goods. The magnitudes of the market changes are similar across consumption and intermediate goods, while the magnitudes are higher for capital goods.¹⁶

Heterogeneity by firm type. Panel (c) of Table 3 shows the breakdown by firm registration type.¹⁷ I find that market changes are considerable for both private- and state-owned

¹⁵Note that the regressions are conducted conditional on a market change. As a result, the substantial heterogeneity in the magnitude of the market changes does not contradict the observed similarity in the price and quantity elasticities once the analysis is restricted to the sample of market changes within each firm and product category. Table 3 presents regression estimates based on the count measure of the drop-to-change ratio. Similar regression results using trade values are provided in Appendix A.3.

¹⁶A breakdown by detailed 2-digit industries is presented in Table A6 in the appendix.

¹⁷The registration type variable contains information on firms' capital formations across eight categories: state-owned enterprises, Sino-foreign contractual joint ventures, Sino-foreign equity joint ventures, wholly foreign-owned enterprises, collective enterprises, private enterprises, individual businesses, and other enterprises. I group three types of foreign-invested firms—namely, wholly foreign-owned enterprises, Sino-foreign contractual joint ventures, and Sino-foreign equity joint ventures—into one category, referred to as “foreign-invested enterprises.”

Table 3: Within-firm Market Changes and Elasticities of Prices and Quantities to the Drop-to-Change Ratio: Breakdown by Firm and Product Type

	MCM (count)	MCM (value)	Quantity	Price	Observations
All	0.67	0.24	-0.66***	0.01***	3,894,362
(a) Rauch classification					
Differentiated products	0.67	0.28	-0.67***	0.01***	2,941,998
Reference priced	0.67	0.10	-0.54***	0.00	380,726
Organized exchange	0.40	0.03	-0.59***	-0.01	43,147
(b) BEC classification					
Capital	0.77	0.34	-0.66***	0.02***	219,311
Consumption	0.67	0.24	-0.64***	0.01***	1,524,589
Intermediate	0.67	0.23	-0.64***	0.01***	1,189,037
(c) Company type					
State-owned enterprises	0.86	0.44	-0.59***	0.01***	1,810,690
Private enterprises	0.86	0.40	-0.73***	0.02***	859,079
Foreign-invested enterprises	0.40	0.01	-0.70***	-0.01**	959,474
(d) Form of commerce					
General trade	0.81	0.38	-0.65***	0.01***	3,171,831
Processing trade	0.40	0.01	-0.74***	-0.02***	573,360

Note: The first two columns of the table present the *median* values for the market-change-to-markets ratio (MCM) calculated using the count measure or the trade value measure. The next two columns show estimates from regressing the changes in the quantities or the prices (indicated by the column header) in the continuing markets on the count measure of the drop-to-change ratio. Each cell in these two columns presents an estimate from a separate regression. Firm-product and year fixed effects are added to all specifications. The statistical significance is calculated based on robust standard errors, with ***, **, * representing statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, 10% level, respectively. Statistics and elasticities are based on trade patterns calculated at the firm-product (8-digit HS) level. Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

enterprises. In contrast, trade patterns appear more stable for foreign-invested enterprises. Panel (d) utilizes information about the form of commerce to group transactions into two categories based on the purpose of trade: (i) firm-product pairs conducting general trade (i.e., manufacturers selling their own products in the foreign market), and (ii) firm-product pairs engaged in contracts to process other foreign firms' products or materials. A notable difference emerges between these two types of firms: large market changes are observed only in relation to general trade, while firms with contracts to process other firms' products show more-stable trade patterns.¹⁸

Heterogeneity by exporter size. Lastly, I explore whether the market changes and the elasticities of the prices and quantities to the drop-to-change ratio vary with exporter size. I divide the firm-product pairs into five equal-sized bins, based on their export value across all destinations and years. Table 4 reports the median values of the key empirical statistics and the estimated quantity and price elasticities to the drop-to-change ratio.¹⁹ There are three key observations. First, the median value of the MCM's count measure does not vary over the size of the firm-product—even large and established exporters frequently change the set of their destination markets. Second, the MCM's value measure decreases with firm size, suggesting that the markets being added or dropped account for an increasingly smaller share of the firm's total trade value as the firm becomes large. Nonetheless, even for the largest exporters (bin 5), the trade value of those changed markets accounts for more than 10% of these firms' annual total exports. Third, the price elasticities are consistently small and close to zero for all firm size bins, while the quantity elasticities increase in firm size.

¹⁸See Yu (2014) for further discussion on the key features of processing trade in Chinese firms.

¹⁹The empirical patterns are robust to alternative measures and different aggregation levels. In Appendix A.2, I report additional statistics and estimates calculated at the firm-product level as well as those based on the size bins calculated at the firm-sector level.

Table 4: Within-firm Market Changes and Elasticities of the Prices and Quantities to the Drop-to-Change Ratio: Breakdown by Exporter Size

Size Bin	No. of Dest.	MCM (count)	MCM (value)	Quantity	Price	Observations
1 (smallest)	1.00	0.67	0.66	-0.23***	0.00	1,290,050
2	1.00	0.67	0.51	-0.38***	0.01	1,289,982
3	1.00	0.67	0.39	-0.49***	0.02***	1,289,983
4	2.00	0.67	0.29	-0.64***	0.01***	1,289,999
5 (largest)	3.00	0.67	0.12	-0.84***	0.00	1,289,999

Note: This table presents the statistics by exporter size bins, where the bins are defined based on the total export value of a firm-product across all destinations and years. The first three columns of the table reports the median number of destination markets and the market-change-to-markets (MCM) ratios calculated using both the count measure and the trade value measure. The next two columns display the regression estimates for the quantity and price elasticities with respect to the count measure of the drop-to-change ratio. Firm-product and year fixed effects are added to all of the specifications. Statistical significance is calculated using robust standard errors, with ***, **, and * denoting significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The statistics and elasticities are based on trade patterns at the firm-product level. Source: Chinese customs database, 2000–2006.

3 Conceptual Framework

In this section, I develop a tractable analytical framework to highlight the key implications of the empirical facts documented in the previous section. Section 3.1 introduces the model setup. Section 3.2 derives a closed-form mapping between the model parameters and the proposed empirical measures, using a simplified version of the model with two types of firms and two markets. Section 3.3 generalizes the results from Section 3.2 to include multiple firm types and markets. It also discusses how the contributions of the various shocks can be identified from the new empirical measures. Section 3.4 applies the analytical framework to the Chinese customs data to uncover the key drivers of the market changes documented empirically.

3.1 Model Setup

In each period t , a firm f decides whether to export to market d , based on its operating profit π_{fdt} relative to the fixed cost of exporting, ζ_{fd} . Firm f 's market participation indicator ϕ_{fdt} is

$$\phi_{f dt} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \pi_{f dt} > \zeta_{fd} \\ 0 & \text{if } \pi_{f dt} \leq \zeta_{fd} \end{cases}$$

If $\pi_{f dt}$ is greater than ζ_{fd} , firm f will export to market d in period t and the market participation indicator, $\phi_{f dt}$, equals one, while $\phi_{f dt}$ equals zero, if otherwise.

The probability of a market, d , being added from $t - 1$ to t is the joint probability that the firm did not export to market d in $t - 1$ but decides to export to market d in t :

$$Pr(\pi_{f dt} > \zeta_{fd} \cap \pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd}),$$

which equals the probability of not exporting to market d in period $t - 1$, $Pr(\pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd})$, multiplied by the conditional probability of exporting to market d in period t , $Pr(\pi_{f dt} > \zeta_{fd} | \pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd})$. Similarly, the probability of exiting market d in period t is the joint probability that the firm exported to market d in $t - 1$ and decided not to export to market d in t , $Pr(\pi_{f dt} \leq \zeta_{fd} \cap \pi_{f dt-1} > \zeta_{fd})$.

Assuming there is a unit mass of firms, the fraction of firms that exported to market d in $t - 1$ is $Pr(\pi_{f dt-1} > \zeta_{fd})$ and the fraction of firms that did not export to market d in $t - 1$ is $Pr(\pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd})$. Then the probability of a market change is the sum of the probability of those firms that exported in $t - 1$ dropping market d in t and the probability of those firms that did not export in $t - 1$ adding market d in t :

$$\underbrace{Pr(\pi_{f dt} > \zeta_{fd} \cap \pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd})}_{\text{Entrants}} + \underbrace{Pr(\pi_{f dt} \leq \zeta_{fd} \cap \pi_{f dt-1} > \zeta_{fd})}_{\text{Exiters}}, \quad (3)$$

where $Pr(\pi_{f dt} > \zeta_{fd} \cap \pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd}) = Pr(\pi_{f dt} > \zeta_{fd} | \pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd}) Pr(\pi_{f dt-1} \leq \zeta_{fd})$ is the probability of those firms that did not export to d starting to export to d in t .

As shown in (3), the key to understanding how and why these firms' market participation changed over time is to understand how their destination-specific profits, $\pi_{f dt}$, changed from one period to the next. Denote the percentage change in profits from $t - 1$ to t as $\hat{\pi}_{f dt} \equiv \pi_{f dt} / \pi_{f dt-1} - 1$ and the percentage difference between the fixed cost of entry and the period- $(t - 1)$ profit as $\xi_{f dt-1} \equiv \zeta_{fd} / \pi_{f dt-1} - 1$. Substitute $\hat{\pi}_{f dt}$ and $\xi_{f dt-1}$ into (3) to rewrite (3) as

$$\underbrace{Pr(\hat{\pi}_{f dt} > \xi_{f dt-1} \cap \xi_{f dt-1} \geq 0)}_{\text{Entrants}} + \underbrace{Pr(\hat{\pi}_{f dt} \leq \xi_{f dt-1} \cap \xi_{f dt-1} < 0)}_{\text{Exiters}}. \quad (4)$$

An observation from (4) is that firms' market changes depend on the distributions of two key

statistics: (i) $\widehat{\pi}_{fdt}$, capturing how operating profits changed from $t - 1$ to t , and (ii) ξ_{fdt-1} , capturing the percentage difference between the cost of fixed entry and the initial profits in period $t - 1$.

To show the mechanisms behind the market changes, we need to specify the firm's profit maximization problem and study $\widehat{\pi}_{fdt}$. Specifically, I assume firms compete via monopolistic competition and each firm, f , faces the following residual demand function:

$$q_{fdt} = a_{fdt} b_{ft} (p_{ft})^{-\eta}, \quad (5)$$

where η is the elasticity of substitution and a_{fdt} and b_{ft} denote the firm-destination-specific and firm-specific demand shifters, respectively. Facing the residual demand function, the firm, f , chooses its price, p_{ft} , to maximize its profit:

$$\pi_{fdt} = q_{fdt} (p_{ft} - mc_{ft}),$$

where mc_{ft} denotes the firm's marginal cost. Taking the first-order condition with respect to p_{ft} gives the firm's optimal price as a constant markup over its marginal cost (of production):

$$p_{ft} = \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1} mc_{ft}. \quad (6)$$

Substituting (6) and (5) into the profit function, it can be shown that the firm's profit at the optimal price is

$$\pi_{fdt} = \frac{1}{\eta} a_{fdt} b_{ft} \left(\frac{\eta}{\eta - 1} mc_{ft} \right)^{1-\eta}. \quad (7)$$

Let $\widehat{X}_t \equiv \frac{X_t - X_{t-1}}{X_{t-1}}$ denote the percentage change of X from $t - 1$ to t . Taking the first-order linear approximation of (7) gives the following percentage change in profits:

$$\widehat{\pi}_{fdt} = \widehat{a}_{fdt} + \widehat{b}_{ft} + (1 - \eta) \widehat{mc}_{ft}. \quad (8)$$

As can be seen, the change in profits is driven by the changes in the firm's residual demand and its marginal cost on the supply side. In addition, the change in the profits can be due to changes in the firm-destination-specific conditions or firm-specific conditions.

To quantify the relative importance between (1) the residual demand changes vs. the marginal cost (supply-side) changes and between (2) the firm-destination-specific changes vs. the firm-specific changes, I introduce two weight parameters, $\rho \in [0, 1]$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, to

capture the relative importance between the different types of changes²⁰ and rewrite (8) as

$$\widehat{\pi}_{f dt} = (1 - \rho)A_{f dt} + \rho[\gamma B_{f t} + (1 - \gamma)C_{f t}], \quad (9)$$

where $(1 - \rho)A_{f dt} \equiv \widehat{a}_{f dt}$, $\gamma\rho B_{f t} \equiv \widehat{b}_{f t}$, and $(1 - \gamma)\rho C_{f t} \equiv (1 - \eta)\widehat{m}c_{f t}$. I assume $A_{f dt}$, $B_{f t}$ and $C_{f t}$ are drawn from mean zero normal distributions with variances $\sigma_A^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{(1-\rho)^2 + \rho^2}$ and $\sigma_B^2 = \sigma_C^2 = \frac{\sigma_A^2}{(1-\gamma)^2 + \gamma^2}$, so that $\widehat{\pi}_{f dt}$ is normally distributed with $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Under this assumption, the changes in the optimal price and quantity are given by

$$\widehat{p}_{f t} = \rho \frac{1 - \gamma}{1 - \eta} C_{f t} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{q}_{f dt} = (1 - \rho)A_{f dt} + \gamma\rho B_{f t} - \eta\widehat{p}_{f t}. \quad (10)$$

Most importantly, parameter ρ reflects the relative contribution of the firm-specific shocks, compared to the firm-destination-specific shocks, in driving the profit changes, while parameter γ captures the extent to which the firm-specific shocks are driven by demand, versus supply, factors. The observed changes in the prices and the quantities in those continuing markets can inform the underlying shocks that drive those market-change decisions. For example, if $\widehat{\pi}_{f dt}$ is mainly driven by firm- rather than destination-specific changes (i.e., ρ is close to one), then the changes in the profits would be correlated across the firm's destination markets. Therefore, for firms that are dropping more markets, we should also see a drop in the quantity of the products sold or an increase in the prices charged in those markets the firms continue to sell to. In the next two sections, I show how the two contribution parameters, ρ and γ , as well as the volatility of the profit change, σ , can be uniquely pinned down by the observed market-change-to-markets ratio and the estimated quantity and price elasticities to the drop-to-change ratio.

3.2 Mapping Empirical Measures to the Model Parameters: A First Look with Two Firm Types and Two Markets

In this section, I demonstrate how the constructed empirical measures map to the model parameters, using a simplified version with two firm types and two markets. To derive closed-form solutions, I make two simplifying assumptions. First, the entry cost for firms to

²⁰An alternative way is to directly specify the shock processes for $\widehat{a}_{f dt}$, $\widehat{b}_{f t}$, and $\widehat{m}c_{f t}$, for example, $\widehat{a}_{f dt} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_a^2)$, $\widehat{b}_{f t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_b^2)$, $\widehat{m}c_{f t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{mc}^2)$. The volatility σ of the profit change and the relative contribution of the parameters, ρ and γ , can be backed out from σ_a , σ_b , and σ_{mc} . This approach is identical to my specification (9). The main advantage of specification (9) is that it allows for direct control of the contribution parameters, ρ and γ , which facilitates interpretation in later analyses.

enter market 1 is sufficiently low, ensuring that firms always export to market 1 in periods $t - 1$ and t . Consequently, market 1 represents the continuing market. Second, only two types of firms sell to market 2, where ξ_{f2t-1} is randomly drawn from $\{-\bar{\xi}, \bar{\xi}\}$ with equal probability, where $0 < \bar{\xi} < 1$. Both assumptions will be relaxed in the quantitative exercises in Section 3.3, where all of the results remain consistent.

Under these assumptions, half of the firms that draw $\xi_{f2t-1} = -\bar{\xi} < 0$ would export to market 2 in $t - 1$. Following (4), the probability of a change in participation in market 2 is

$$\underbrace{Pr(\hat{\pi}_{f2t} > \bar{\xi} \cap \xi_{f2t-1} = \bar{\xi})}_{\text{Entrants in market 2}} + \underbrace{Pr(\hat{\pi}_{f2t} \leq -\bar{\xi} \cap \xi_{f2t-1} = -\bar{\xi})}_{\text{Exiters from market 2}}, \quad (11)$$

where the first term captures the probability of those firms that did not export to market 2 in $t - 1$ deciding to enter market 2 in t due to higher operating profits relative to the entry cost. Similarly, the second term captures the probability that those firms that exported to market 2 in $t - 1$ did not do so in t due to a drop in profits.

Under the assumption that firms always export to market 1, the mean MCM across all firms can be derived using (11) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MCM} &= \frac{2}{3} Pr(\hat{\pi}_{f2t} > \bar{\xi} \cap \xi_{f2t-1} = \bar{\xi}) + \frac{2}{3} Pr(\hat{\pi}_{f2t} \leq -\bar{\xi} \cap \xi_{f2t-1} = -\bar{\xi}) \\ &= \frac{4}{3} \Phi(-\bar{\xi}/\sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the fraction $2/3$ in front of the terms comes from the definition of the denominator of the MCM (1).²¹ Given that $\hat{\pi}_{f2t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ and ξ_{f2t-1} are drawn from $\{-\bar{\xi}, \bar{\xi}\}$ with equal probability, it can be shown that the MCM ratio in this case equals $\frac{4}{3} \Phi(-\bar{\xi}/\sigma)$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative density function of a standard normal distribution. For a given $\bar{\xi}$, the measured MCM is increasing in the volatility of the firms' profits, σ .

In this simple setup with two markets, the drop-to-change ratio can only take a value of zero (when the firms add market 2 in t) or one (when the firms drop market 2 in t). Therefore, regressing the change in the quantity of products sold in the continuing market

²¹Based on (1), the denominator of the MCM ratio is the average number of markets over the two periods, $\frac{1}{2}(N_{ft} + N_{ft-1})$. For those firms that only exported to market 1 in $t - 1$ but added market 2 in t , the average number of markets is $\frac{1}{2}(2 + 1) = 3/2$. Similarly, it can be shown that the average number of markets for those firms that exported to the two markets in $t - 1$ but only exported to one market in t (i.e., that dropped market 2) is also $3/2$.

(i.e., market 1) on the drop-to-change ratio gives the following estimator:

$$\text{QDC} = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}(\widehat{q}_{f1t} | \widehat{\pi}_{f2t} \leq -\bar{\xi} \cap \xi_{f2t-1} = -\bar{\xi})}_{\text{Those dropping market 2 in } t} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}(\widehat{q}_{f1t} | \widehat{\pi}_{f2t} > \bar{\xi} \cap \xi_{f2t-1} = \bar{\xi})}_{\text{Those adding market 2 in } t}. \quad (13)$$

When the changes in the profits are purely driven by firm-destination-specific changes (i.e., $\rho = 0$), the profits and, thus, the market changes in market 2 do not provide any information on market 1, in which case the estimated elasticity in (13) will be exactly zero. To see this, I use the residual demand function (5) and the decomposition (9) to rewrite (13) as²²

$$\begin{aligned} \text{QDC} &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(1 - \rho)A_{f1t} + \rho\gamma B_{ft} + \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1}\rho(1 - \gamma)C_{ft} \mid (1 - \rho)A_{f2t} + \rho\gamma B_{ft} + \rho(1 - \gamma)C_{ft} \leq -\bar{\xi}]}_{\text{Those dropping market 2 in } t} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(1 - \rho)A_{f1t} + \rho\gamma B_{ft} + \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1}\rho(1 - \gamma)C_{ft} \mid (1 - \rho)A_{f2t} + \rho\gamma B_{ft} + \rho(1 - \gamma)C_{ft} > \bar{\xi}]}_{\text{Those adding market 2 in } t} \\ &= -2\rho^2\sigma \frac{\phi(\bar{\xi}/\sigma)}{\Phi(-\bar{\xi}/\sigma)} \frac{\gamma^2 + (1 - \gamma)^2 \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1}}{\gamma^2 + (1 - \gamma)^2} \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ denote the probability density function and the cumulative distribution function, respectively, of a standard normal distribution. Three main insights arise from (14). First, for a given profit volatility, σ , and demand contribution, γ , the magnitude of the elasticity of the change in the quantity sold in the continuing market with respect to the drop-to-change ratio increases with the contribution of firm-specific changes relative to firm-destination-specific changes, captured by ρ . Second, for a given ρ and γ , the magnitude of the elasticity rises with the profit volatility, σ . Intuitively, a larger profit volatility implies larger underlying demand or supply shocks, which result in bigger changes in the quantities firms sell in their continuing markets. Finally, for a given σ and ρ , the magnitude of the elasticity weakly decreases with the demand contribution, γ , as indicated by the term $\frac{\gamma^2 + (1 - \gamma)^2 \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1}}{\gamma^2 + (1 - \gamma)^2}$, which reflects the unequal contribution of the cost changes on the quantity of products sold and the profits.

²²A similar expression can be obtained for the elasticity of the price change in the continuing markets to the drop-to-change ratio:

$$\text{PDC} = 2\sigma \frac{\phi(\bar{\xi}/\sigma)}{\Phi(-\bar{\xi}/\sigma)} \frac{\rho^2(1 - \gamma)^2}{[(1 - \rho)^2 + \rho^2][(1 - \gamma)^2 + \gamma^2]} \frac{1}{\eta - 1} \geq 0.$$

3.3 Mapping Empirical Measures to the Model Parameters: Many Firm Types and Many Markets

In this section, I extend the simple model to allow for an arbitrary number of exporting markets and relax the two restrictive assumptions in Section 3.2. First, I remove the assumption of a stable market, with sufficiently low entry costs, that firms always export to. Second, instead of limiting the model to two types of firms with two distinct initial profit values, I adopt a more realistic distribution of the initial profits. Following Head, Mayer and Thoenig (2014), I assume the initial profit distribution is log-normal.²³ In this more general case, there are no closed-form solutions.²⁴ Therefore, numerical simulations are used in this section instead. Nevertheless, all of the previous discussion’s key insights will carry through.

Specifically, I simulate data for 10 thousand firms potentially exporting to 20 markets, according to the model setup in Section 3.1. I begin by calibrating $\sigma = 1.74$, $\rho = 0.23$, and $\gamma = 0.86$, which roughly aligns with my empirical estimates of the market-changes-to-markets ratio (MCM) and the elasticities of the quantity and price changes in the continuing markets with respect to the drop-to-change ratio (DC) calculated at the firm-product level. This calibration indicates that approximately 23% of the with-firm market changes are driven by correlated shocks across markets within a firm-product, with most of these correlated shocks ($\approx 86\%$) being demand rather than supply driven. To further explore these mechanisms, I adjust these parameter values to illustrate how the three empirical measures vary in response to changes in each parameter.


Figure 3 shows the simulation results. The blue line in Figure 3(a) shows that the MCM ratio in the model is monotonically increasing in the volatility of the operating profits measured by σ , while keeping ρ and γ at the calibrated values. Varying ρ while keeping γ and σ unchanged, or varying γ while keeping the other two parameters unchanged has no impact on the MCM, as seen from the pink and green lines, respectively. This can also be seen from (12), where the MCM ratio does not depend on ρ or γ . Intuitively, firms’ market decisions depend solely on the magnitude of the changes in their profits. The composition of a given change in profits—whether driven by demand or supply factors—is irrelevant.

Figure 3(b) shows that the model-predicted elasticity of the changes in the quantity sold in the continuing markets with respect to the drop-to-change ratio is monotonically decreasing


²³Due to the CES preference assumption, a firm’s operating profit is a fraction of its sales: $\pi_{f dt} = \frac{1}{\eta} p_{ft} q_{f dt}$. Therefore, the profit distribution is a scaled version of the sales distribution. The assumption of a log-normal profit distribution is for analytical convenience. All of the results carry through if the initial profit distribution is Pareto.

²⁴This is because there is no closed-form solution for the conditional expectation of a *multivariate truncated normal* distribution.

(a) Market Changes to Markets (MCM)



(b) Elasticity of Quantity w.r.t. DC



(c) Elasticity of Price w.r.t. DC




Figure 3: Relationship Between Empirical Measures and Model Parameters

Note: This figure plots how the three statistics (i.e., the market-change-to-markets ratio, the elasticity of the quantity changes in the continuing markets with respect to the drop-to-change (DC) ratio, and the elasticity of the price changes in the continuing markets with respect to the DC ratio) that are calculated using the model-simulated data vary with each of the key model parameters $\{\sigma, \rho, \gamma\}$. Each line shows the change in a given parameter, while keeping the other two parameters unchanged at their initial calibrated values, and the x-axis shows the value of the parameter being changed.

in ρ , which is consistent with equation (14). It is worth noting that when $\rho = 0$ and, thus, there are no correlated changes across markets, the estimated elasticity with respect to the drop-to-change ratio is always zero, regardless of the volatility of the profits, σ , as shown by the red lines. This is because when the changes to the profits are not correlated across the destination markets, the market changes are purely driven by firm-destination-specific changes and, thus, do not provide information about the changes in the quantity sold in the firms' continuing markets.²⁵

Finally, the green line in Figure 3(c) shows that as γ increases, indicating that the changes in the firms' residual demand contribute more to the changes in the profits, compared to the contribution of the marginal cost changes, and the elasticity of the price changes in the firms' continuing markets with respect to the drop-to-change ratio falls, in order to match the very low price elasticity to the drop-to-change ratio observed in the data (0.01, as shown in row 1, column (1) of Table 2), a value of γ close to one is required.

To sum up, these three statistics shown in Figure 3 provide a joint system to pin down the three key model parameters: $\{\sigma, \rho, \gamma\}$. The MCM ratio pins down the volatility of firm profits, σ . Changes in the elasticity of the price in the continuing markets with respect to the drop-to-change ratio pin down the contribution of changes in the marginal cost to changes to the profits, $(1 - \gamma)$. Given σ and γ , the elasticity of the changes in the quantity sold in the continuing markets, with respect to the drop-to-change ratio, pins down the contribution of the firm-specific changes that are correlated across a firm's destination markets.

3.4 Applying the Conceptual Framework to Chinese Customs Data

The identification strategy discussed above can be readily applied to most transaction-level databases that include information on prices and quantities.²⁶ Applying this method to the Chinese customs data, Table 5 shows the estimated parameters (σ, ρ, γ) for each of the different products and firm types. There are three main takeaways. First, the estimated σ suggests there is significant heterogeneity in the volatility of the profits across products and firm types. The profits earned from the goods traded on organized exchanges, the products sold by foreign-invested enterprises, and the firms that are processing goods for other firms

²⁵For clarity, I omitted the impacts of the varying profit volatilities, σ , on the quantity and price elasticities in Figure 3 (b) and (c). Figure B3 in the Appendix shows the results that include σ . Consistent with the analytical expression (14), the magnitude of the elasticity of the quantity with respect to the drop-to-change ratio increases with σ .

²⁶While this paper focuses on firms' export market decisions, it should be clear that the method developed here can also be applied to study the drivers of extensive margin adjustments in firm-to-firm trade in the domestic context.

tend to be more stable. This explains why these firms experience fewer market changes.

Table 5: Estimated Parameters

	σ (Shock size)	ρ (Common contrib.)	γ (Demand contrib.)
Full Sample	1.00	0.23	0.89
(a) Rauch classification			
Differentiated products	1.00	0.23	0.86
Reference priced	1.00	0.21	0.95
Organized exchange	0.42	0.37	0.96
(b) BEC classification			
Capital	1.53	0.18	0.81
Consumption	1.00	0.23	0.86
Intermediate	1.00	0.23	0.86
(c) Company type			
State-owned enterprises	2.29	0.13	0.86
Private enterprises	2.28	0.15	0.83
Foreign-invested enterprises	0.42	0.43	0.87
(d) Form of commerce			
General trade	1.87	0.16	0.87
Processing trade	0.43	0.45	0.99

Note: This table represents the estimated model parameters by separately matching the empirical statistics in Table 3 for each firm and product type. To facilitate comparison, the estimated σ for the full sample is normalized to one as the benchmark.

Second, the estimated ρ suggests that a nontrivial proportion (13–45%) of the shocks are correlated across destinations within a firm-product pair. As expected, commodities that are traded on organized exchanges are more prone to correlated shocks across destinations. These products are highly standardized and are often priced in US dollars, making them more sensitive to global demand shocks and dollar exchange rate movements. The foreign-invested enterprises in panel (c) are also more prone to the correlated shocks, with an estimated ρ similar to that of the firms in the processing trade in panel (d). For both types of firms, the

demand for their products is likely to originate from the contracted foreign multinationals, making them more exposed to global shocks.²⁷

Third, the estimated demand contribution parameter, γ , is consistently high (81–99%) across all products and firm types, suggesting that most firm-level shocks are demand rather than supply driven. This is consistent with papers that emphasize the importance of demand variations in driving firm performance (e.g., Foster, Haltiwanger and Syverson, 2008; Baldwin and Harrigan, 2011; Hottman, Redding and Weinstein, 2016). For instance, Hottman, Redding and Weinstein (2016) find that demand differences (which could arise from variations in quality or taste) can account for 80–97% of the variation in firm sales. Foster, Haltiwanger and Syverson (2008) find that variation in demand across producers is the dominant factor in determining firm survival.

4 Implications for Exporter Dynamics

In this section, I show that the uncovered microshocks are also important for explaining the observed exporter dynamics. Section 4.1 calibrates the model to match the key firm and market distributions and the estimated price and quantity elasticities of Chinese exporters. Section 4.2 shows that the model performs extremely well in matching the non-targeted evolution of the price and quantity dynamics in the data. Finally, Section 4.3 conducts two counterfactual exercises to highlight the importance of correlated demand shocks in shaping the observed exporter dynamics.

4.1 Extended Model and Calibration

I generalize the quantitative model discussed in subsection 3.2 to capture the dynamic features of the data. First, instead of simulating the model for two periods, I simulate it for seven periods, corresponding to the seven years of the Chinese customs data in my empirical analysis. With multiple periods, the distribution $\xi_{f dt-1}$ evolves over time and can no longer be drawn from an ex-ante fixed distribution. Specifically, I assume firms’ operating profits and optimal quantities and prices evolve according to equations (9) and (10), with the same

²⁷The purpose of this paper is to decompose and identify the key variations that drive firms’ market decisions. The common component ρ (the correlated “shocks”) referred to in the text may well be endogenously generated in a richer model that accounts for the special features of the goods and the firm types. However, due to the substantial heterogeneity in the firm and product types, pinpointing a single source for a common component is challenging if not impossible. Therefore, this paper does not take a definitive stance on the specific mechanism that is driving the common shock component. Instead, it provides valuable moments to guide and inform future research.

initial demand preference $a_{fd0} = b_{fd0} = 0$ and with the initial marginal cost, mc_{f0} , being drawn from a log-normal distribution, $\Omega_f \sim \mathcal{LN}(0, \sigma_\Omega^2)$. The three shock parameters (σ, ρ, γ) and the dispersion of the initial marginal cost, σ_Ω , jointly determine how the distribution of ξ_{fdt-1} evolves over time.

Second, to match the fact that most firms only export to a couple of markets, I assume the fixed cost of exporting to a market takes the following quadratic form:

$$\zeta_d = \exp[\chi_0 + \chi_1 d/D + \chi_2 (d/D)^2],$$

where $d \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ is the market index, $D = 20$ is the total number of markets, and $\chi_1 > 0$ and $\chi_2 > 0$ indicate that markets with a higher index, d , are more costly to reach.

The parameters $(\sigma, \rho, \gamma, \sigma_\Omega, \chi_0, \chi_1, \chi_2)$ jointly determine the distributions of the market and firm sizes. I use simulated methods of moments to calibrate these parameters to match the following statistics at the firm-product level: (i) the market-change-to-markets ratio, the price and quantity elasticities to the drop-to-change ratio in the full sample, (ii) the price and quantity elasticity estimates by firm size bins (see Figure 4), and (iii) the relationship between the firm size and its number of destination markets (see Appendix figure B2). Figure 4 shows that the model can successfully match the relationship between the firm size and the quantity and price elasticities estimated in the data, even without calibrating separate parameters for each firm size group (e.g., a different σ, ρ, γ for each firm size bin).²⁸

4.2 Price and Quantity Dynamics

In this section, I study a firm's price and quantity dynamics as it grows and adds more markets over time. Specifically, I estimate an empirical specification in the spirit of Fitzgerald,

²⁸The magnitude of the quantity elasticity to the drop-to-change ratio increases in the exporter size due to the correlation of the shocks across the markets (i.e., $\rho > 0$) and the selection effects. Specifically, when there are no correlated shocks across markets (i.e., $\rho = 0$), the estimated quantity elasticity would be zero as the exporters' continuing markets are not affected by the destination-specific shocks. Conditioning on $\rho > 0$, the pattern in Figure 4(a) arises from two endogenous selection effects. First, firms experiencing more of the positive shocks would be more likely to enter the larger size bin and would also increase their quantities more in their continuing markets. This explains why their quantities in their continuing markets increase by more when there are positive shocks. Second, when there are negative shocks, firms in the larger size bin are better able to survive than smaller firms. Conditional on survival, the quantities larger firms export to their continuing markets drop by more, as smaller firms are more likely to have already exited those markets. Therefore, for a given level of the drop-to-change ratio, the quantities the larger exporters sell in their continuing markets tend to vary by more.




Figure 4: Matching Moments by Exporter Size

Note: This figure compares the quantity and price elasticities to the drop-to-change ratio in the data and in the calibrated model. The data estimates are taken from Table 4. The firm size bins are categorized according to the total export value of a firm-product across all destinations and years. The model is simulated for 100 replications, with the red dots representing the median value of the 100 estimates and the top and bottom red bars around the red dots representing the 5th and 95th percentiles, respectively.

Haller and Yedid-Levi (2023) and Argente, Fitzgerald, Moreira and Priolo (2024):

$$\ln \text{Outcome}_{ft} = \sum_n \beta_n * \mathbb{1}(\text{Number of markets}_{ft} = n) + \delta_f + \delta_t + v_{ft}, \quad (15)$$

where Outcome_{ft} refers to the mean price in the firm’s core market, the mean quantity in the firm’s core market, or the total quantity in all of the firm’s markets. A market is defined as “core” (market) if it is observed in all periods where the firm is observed in the dataset.²⁹ A set of ten dummies is included, indicating the number of markets a firm, f , exports to at time t . If the number of markets exceeds ten, then it is grouped into one dummy, indicating that the number of markets is higher than or equal to ten.³⁰ β_n captures the impact of the given indicator variable on the outcome variable. δ_f and δ_t are the firm and time fixed effects, respectively, which ensures the comparison is made within a firm across time. v_{ft} is the residual term. Relative to the original specifications of Fitzgerald, Haller and Yedid-Levi (2023) and Argente, Fitzgerald, Moreira and Priolo (2024), which study a firm’s price and

²⁹By definition, the core market is the first market (or among the set of first markets) the firm exports to. However, not all first markets are core markets (as some first markets may not survive for some firms).

³⁰Note that f in the model corresponds to a firm-product or firm-sector pair in the data.

quantity dynamics as the firm grows within a market, my specification focuses on the firm’s dynamics as it grows and adds more markets.³¹

Figure 5 plots the empirical estimates β_n (from a firm-product-level estimation), together with their model-predicted counterparts. As can be seen, the calibrated model performs well in matching the firm’s quantity and price dynamics as it grows and adds more markets, despite the fact that the model is not specifically calibrated to target the empirical moments, β_n . This suggests that the new measures and elasticities proposed and their relationship with firm size provide a powerful way to discipline firms’ export dynamics.

Figures 5(a) and 5(b) show that as a firm grows and adds more markets, it also sells more quantities of its goods in its core markets, while it barely changes its prices in these markets. Figure 5(c) shows the results for the firm’s total quantity in all of its markets. The difference between panels (a) and (c) reflects the role of extensive margin adjustments. Since the firm’s prices do not change with the number of markets it sells to, we get very similar patterns if the dependent variable is the firm’s total global sales.

These results closely align with the findings of [Fitzgerald, Haller and Yedid-Levi \(2023\)](#) and [Argente, Fitzgerald, Moreira and Priolo \(2024\)](#) on the life cycle of a firm’s quantities and prices within a market. However, it is worth mentioning that the results of these two papers do not automatically imply the findings here. This is because a crucial condition to replicate the data pattern in (a) is to have shocks correlated across destination markets (i.e., $\rho > 0$). If all shocks are destination-specific demand shocks, then the pattern in (a) would be a flat line because the firm’s core markets would be unaffected by the destination-specific shocks. However, within each market, the quantity sold would increase in the number of years the firm is selling in the market, as the number of positive shocks accumulates over time, conditional on firm survival, while the firms receiving the negative shocks exit the market. Therefore, in the absence of correlated shocks across markets, the model can still replicate the within-market patterns observed in the above two papers while failing to replicate the pattern in (a). In the next section, I provide more discussion on the key factors that explain the empirical patterns in Figure 5.

³¹In Appendix B.1, I implement the original empirical specification of [Fitzgerald, Haller and Yedid-Levi \(2023\)](#) and [Argente, Fitzgerald, Moreira and Priolo \(2024\)](#) and document that Chinese exporters follow the same empirical pattern as found in these two papers. In addition, the calibrated model is able to match these empirical patterns. See Appendix B.1 for more discussions on the difference between these two specifications.




Figure 5: Quantity and Price Dynamics as a Firm Adds More Markets

Note: This figure compares the quantity and price dynamics estimated from specification (15) in the data versus the calibrated model. The estimated fixed effect when the number of markets is equal to one is normalized to one. The data moments are estimated using Chinese exporters' firm-product-level data. The standard errors of the data estimates are small and omitted for clarity. The calibrated model is simulated for 100 replications, with the red dots representing the median value of the 100 estimates, and the top and bottom red bars around the red dots representing the 5th and 95th percentiles, respectively.

4.3 Importance of Demand Shocks and the Common Component

In this section, I use two counterfactual cases to highlight the importance of demand shocks and common shocks across destination markets in shaping the empirical patterns of the exporter’s growth dynamics. Figure 6 illustrates this by comparing the exporter’s price and quantity dynamics in its core markets, in the calibrated baseline model with two counterfactual cases: (1) the common component, ρ , is set to zero while keeping the other parameters unchanged from the baseline calibration; and (2) the demand contribution to the firm-specific shocks, γ , is set to zero and the size of the shock, σ , is recalibrated to match the dynamics of the quantity elasticities in the baseline model.

In the first counterfactual case, by setting $\rho = 0$, all of the shocks are destination-specific. As a result, a firm’s potential profits and the optimal price and quantity in each market are independently determined across markets. When a firm receives positive shocks in certain destination markets, its core markets (i.e., the markets to which the firm always sells) would be unaffected by these destination-specific shocks. As can be seen in Figures 6(a) and 6(b), the firm’s price and quantity dynamics in its core markets are unchanged if the firm’s growth in its destination markets is purely driven by destination-specific shocks. When the firm receives positive shocks in these markets, it grows by adding more markets over time (see the red lines in Figure 6(c)). However, due to the lack of within-firm spillovers, from these shocks, across destinations when $\rho = 0$, the increase in the quantity sold will be much more muted than under the baseline case, as shown in Figure 6(c).

In the second counterfactual case, I set the demand contribution, γ , to zero and recalibrate the size of the shock, σ , to match the dynamics of the quantity elasticities in the baseline case. In this case, the shocks’ within-firm spillovers across destination markets are purely driven by supply-side cost changes. As a consequence, when a firm receives negative cost shocks (or positive productivity shocks) in these markets, it grows and adds more markets over time. As shown by the orange lines in Figures 6(a) and 6(c), the firm sells more in its core markets as it adds more markets over time and the quantity sold in all of its markets also increases due to both the new markets being added and the favorable shocks’ spillover effects on the firm’s core markets. The shock size, σ , is recalibrated such that the orange lines in Figures 6(a) and 6(c) can match the quantity dynamics under the baseline calibration (red lines). A crucial implication of this firm-specific supply shock can be seen in Figure 6(b). At the calibrated size of the shock that matches the quantity dynamics, the firm’s prices in its core markets should drop significantly if the growth in its number of destination markets is driven by firm-specific supply shocks. This is at odds with the empirical observation that




Figure 6: Counterfactual Price and Quantity Dynamics

Note: This figure compares the quantity and price dynamics in the baseline model (in red) with two counterfactual calibrations. The black lines represent cases where the contributions of the common shock components are set to zero $\rho = 0$. The orange lines show the results where all of the firm-level shocks are cost driven, $\gamma = 0$. The calibrated model is simulated for 100 replications, with the dots in each line representing the median values of the 100 estimates.

the price dynamics are muted.

The importance of common correlated demand components in explaining the empirical patterns of exporter dynamics aligns with recent work that highlights the complementarities in firms’ export decisions across markets (e.g., [Berman, Berthou and Héricourt, 2015](#); [Alfaro-Urena, Castro-Vincenzi, Fanelli and Morales, 2023](#)). While this paper does not take a stance on the specific mechanisms generating the common demand change, the findings of this paper provide useful statistics for future models to target firms’ export dynamics and joint market decisions.

5 Conclusions

Firms frequently change the set of destinations to which they export their products—their international trade is characterized by what I call a “mutable geography.” This dynamism in the market changes observed is not merely an artifact of the early stages of a firm’s growth in global markets. It is actually detectable among established exporters.

This paper proposes a new approach to understanding the microdrivers of these market changes and decomposes these factors into demand-versus-supply-related components. The idea is to exploit information on the price and quantity changes in the firm’s continuing markets to infer the microshocks the firm receives. Applying this approach to customs data on Chinese and UK exporters, I find consistent results, in both countries, that firms dropping more markets see big quantity drops in their continuing markets, with little change in the prices of the goods these firms export to these markets. Through the lens of the model, I conclude that most of within-firm market changes are demand rather than supply driven, with a nontrivial proportion (13–45%) of these demand changes being correlated across a firm’s markets.

Finally, I show that the uncovered shock contributions play an important role in explaining the price and quantity dynamics as a firm grows and adds more markets. Successful firms that expand globally also see big quantity increases in terms of their exports to their core destination markets, while the prices their goods receive in these markets are barely changed. These results highlight the need to understand the corresponding demand-related channels in shaping firms’ growth dynamics (e.g., [Argente, Fitzgerald, Moreira and Priolo, 2024](#)).

References

- Albornoz, Facundo, Héctor F. Calvo Pardo, Gregory Corcos, and Emanuel Ornelas.** 2012. “Sequential Exporting.” *Journal of International Economics*, 88(1): 17–31.
- Albornoz, Facundo, Héctor F. Calvo Pardo, Gregory Corcos, and Emanuel Ornelas.** 2023. “Sequentially exporting products across countries.” *Journal of International Economics*, 142: 103735.
- Alessandria, George, and Horag Choi.** 2007. “Do Sunk Costs of Exporting Matter for Net Export Dynamics?” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(1): 289–336.
- Alessandria, George, and Horag Choi.** 2014. “Establishment Heterogeneity, Exporter Dynamics, and the Effects of Trade Liberalization.” *Journal of International Economics*, 94(2): 207–223.
- Alessandria, George, Costas Arkolakis, and Kim J. Ruhl.** 2021. “Firm Dynamics and Trade.” *Annual Review of Economics*, 13(Volume 13, 2021): 253–280.
- Alessandria, George, Horag Choi, and Kim J. Ruhl.** 2021. “Trade adjustment dynamics and the welfare gains from trade.” *Journal of International Economics*, 131: 103458.
- Alessandria, George, Horag Choi, Joseph P. Kaboski, and Virgiliu Midrigan.** 2015. “Microeconomic uncertainty, international trade, and aggregate fluctuations.” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 69: 20–38.
- Alfaro-Urena, Alonso, Juanma Castro-Vincenzi, Sebastián Fanelli, and Eduardo Morales.** 2023. “Firm Export Dynamics in Interdependent Markets.” National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 31610.
- Araujo, Luis, Giordano Mion, and Emanuel Ornelas.** 2016. “Institutions and Export Dynamics.” *Journal of International Economics*, 98: 2–20.
- Argente, David, Doireann Fitzgerald, Sara Moreira, and Anthony Priolo.** 2024. “How Do Entrants Build Market Share? The Role of Demand Frictions.” *American Economic Review: Insights*. Forthcoming.
- Baldwin, Richard, and James Harrigan.** 2011. “Zeros, Quality, and Space: Trade Theory and Trade Evidence.” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 3(2): 60–88.

- Berman, Nicolas, Antoine Berthou, and Jérôme Héricourt.** 2015. “Export dynamics and sales at home.” *Journal of International Economics*, 96(2): 298–310.
- Bernard, Andrew B., Jonathan Eaton, J. Bradford Jensen, and Samuel Kortum.** 2003. “Plants and Productivity in International Trade.” *American Economic Review*, 93(4): 1268–1290.
- Besedeš, Tibor, and Thomas J. Prusa.** 2011. “The role of extensive and intensive margins and export growth.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 96(2): 371–379.
- Carvalho, Vasco M, and Basile Grassi.** 2019. “Large Firm Dynamics and the Business Cycle.” *American Economic Review*, 109(4): 1375–1425.
- Chaney, Thomas.** 2008. “Distorted Gravity: The Intensive and Extensive Margins of International Trade.” *American Economic Review*, 98(4): 1707–21.
- Chaney, Thomas.** 2014. “The Network Structure of International Trade.” *American Economic Review*, 104(11): 3600–3634.
- Das, Sanghamitra, Mark J. Roberts, and James R. Tybout.** 2007. “Market Entry Costs, Producer Heterogeneity, and Export Dynamics.” *Econometrica*, 75(3): 837–873.
- Di Giovanni, Julian, Andrei A Levchenko, and Isabelle Mejean.** 2014. “Firms, Destinations, and Aggregate Fluctuations.” *Econometrica*, 82(4): 1303–1340.
- Eaton, Jonathan, Samuel Kortum, and Francis Kramarz.** 2011. “An Anatomy of International Trade: Evidence from French Firms.” *Econometrica*, 79(5): 1453–1498.
- Eslava, Marcela, John Haltiwanger, and Nicolas Urdaneta.** 2024. “The Size and Life-cycle Growth of Plants: The Role of Productivity, Demand, and Wedges.” *Review of Economic Studies*, 91(1): 259–300.
- Fanelli, Sebastián, Juan Carlos Hallak, and Yongkun Yin.** 2024. “Exporter Survival with Uncertainty and Experimentation.” Available at: https://yongkun-yin.com/Documents/FHY_2024.pdf.
- Fitzgerald, Doireann, and Stefanie Haller.** 2018. “Exporters and Shocks.” *Journal of International Economics*, 113: 154–171.
- Fitzgerald, Doireann, Stefanie Haller, and Yaniv Yedid-Levi.** 2023. “How Exporters Grow.” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 91(4): 2276–2306.

- Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger, and Chad Syverson.** 2008. “Reallocation, Firm Turnover, and Efficiency: Selection on Productivity or Profitability?” *American Economic Review*, 98(1): 394–425.
- Gabaix, Xavier.** 2011. “The Granular Origins of Aggregate Fluctuations.” *Econometrica*, 79(3): 733–772.
- Gaubert, Cecile, and Oleg Itskhoki.** 2021. “Granular Comparative Advantage.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 129(3): 871–939.
- Geishecker, Ingo, Philipp JH Schröder, and Allan Sørensen.** 2019. “One-off Export Events.” *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 52(1): 93–131.
- Ghironi, Fabio, and Marc J. Melitz.** 2005. “International Trade and Macroeconomic Dynamics with Heterogeneous Firms.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(3): 865–915.
- Head, Keith, Thierry Mayer, and Mathias Thoenig.** 2014. “Welfare and Trade without Pareto.” *American Economic Review*, 104(5): 310–16.
- Hottman, Colin J, Stephen J Redding, and David E Weinstein.** 2016. “Quantifying the Sources of Firm Heterogeneity.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(3): 1291–1364.
- Johnson, Robert C.** 2012. “Trade and prices with heterogeneous firms.” *Journal of International Economics*, 86(1): 43–56.
- Kehoe, Timothy J., and Kim J. Ruhl.** 2013. “How Important Is the New Goods Margin in International Trade?” *Journal of Political Economy*, 121(2): 358–392.
- Manova, Kalina, and Zhiwei Zhang.** 2012. “Export Prices across Firms and Destinations.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(1): 379.
- Mayer, Thierry, and Gianmarco I. Ottaviano.** 2008. “The Happy Few: The Internationalisation of European Firms.” *Intereconomics*, 43(3): 135–148.
- Melitz, Marc J.** 2003. “The Impact of Trade on Aggregate Industry Productivity and Intra-industry Reallocations.” *Econometrica*, 71(6): 1695–1725.
- Melitz, Marc J, and Stephen J Redding.** 2015. “New Trade Models, New Welfare Implications.” *American Economic Review*, 105(3): 1105–1146.

- Morales, Eduardo, Gloria Sheu, and Andrés Zahler.** 2019. “Extended Gravity.” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(6): 2668–2712.
- Pavcnik, Nina.** 2002. “Trade Liberalization, Exit, and Productivity Improvements: Evidence from Chilean Plants.” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 69(1): 245–276.
- Rauch, James E.** 1999. “Networks Versus Markets in International Trade.” *Journal of International Economics*, 48(1): 7–35.
- Ruhl, Kim J.** 2008. “The international elasticity puzzle.” *unpublished paper, NYU*, 703–726.
- Ruhl, Kim J, and Jonathan L Willis.** 2017. “New Exporter Dynamics.” *International Economic Review*, 58(3): 703–726.
- Timoshenko, Olga A.** 2015. “Product Switching in a Model of Learning.” *Journal of International Economics*, 95(2): 233–249.
- Yu, Miaojie.** 2014. “Processing Trade, Tariff Reductions and Firm Productivity: Evidence from Chinese Firms.” *The Economic Journal*, 125(585): 943–988.

A Data Appendix

A.1 Market Changes Measured at Different Frequencies

Table A1 replicates Table 7 of [Alessandria, Arkolakis and Ruhl \(2021\)](#), using Chinese customs data. I divide the 7 years (=84 months) of data into intervals of 6, 12, 21, and 42 months. There are two key takeaways. First, within each time interval, the continuation rate decreases with the level of disaggregation. At the annual frequency, only 44.7% of firm-product destinations that exported within a 12-month window continue to export within the next 12-month window. In contrast, 88.0% of firms that exported within a 12-month window continued to export within the next 12-month window. This is a natural result, since demand tends to be less stable at more-disaggregated levels. For example, suppose the probability of receiving an order at the firm-product-destination level is x , and the firm has n feasible product-destination pairs. The probability of firm continuation is $1 - (1 - x)^n$, which increases with the number of product destinations the firm serves.

Second, within each aggregation level, the continuation rate decreases with the time span over which the statistics are calculated, consistent with the findings of [Alessandria, Arkolakis and Ruhl \(2021\)](#). This finding is more nuanced as, in principle, the continuation rate could go either way, depending on the underlying driving forces of firms' export participation decisions. On one hand, if the low continuation rate is primarily driven by infrequent shipping or lumpiness in demand, one might expect the continuation rate to increase with the time span over which the statistics are calculated. To clarify, consider a product that is shipped or demanded every 18 months. In this case, the continuation rate calculated at 6- and 12-month frequencies will be zero, while it jumps to 100% when calculated at 21- or 42-month frequencies. On the other hand, if the low continuation rate is predominantly driven by firm or product exits, one would expect it to decrease with the time span over which the statistics are calculated. For example, if the 6-month survival rate is constant at y , then the continuation rates at 12-, 24-, and 48-month frequencies will be y^2 , y^4 , and y^8 , respectively. Consistent with the findings of [Alessandria, Arkolakis and Ruhl \(2021\)](#), I find that the second force dominates and the continuation rate decreases with the time span.³²

Table A2 shows the corresponding within-firm market changes calculated at different aggregation levels and time spans. The market change to market (MCM) ratio increases with the time span over which the measure is calculated, consistent with the facts documented in Table A1.

³²The entrant share is a flip side of the coin. It increases with the level of disaggregation and the time span over which the statistics are calculated, reflecting the forces discussed above.

Table A1: Entry, Exit and Growth at Different Aggregation Levels and Time Spans

	Continuation Rate		Entrant Share	
	Count	Value	Count	Value
6-month frequency				
Firm level	90.5	98.8	17.9	3.1
Firm-sector level	78.2	97.6	29.0	4.5
Firm-product level	64.7	93.4	40.5	9.6
Firm-destination level	67.5	94.2	39.0	8.9
Firm-sector-destination level	57.7	91.7	47.9	11.6
Firm-product-destination level	48.1	85.2	56.9	18.1
12-month				
Firm level	88.0	97.9	27.6	5.9
Firm-sector level	74.9	96.7	37.6	7.9
Firm-product level	63.3	90.8	47.0	14.7
Firm-destination level	65.5	93.8	46.3	11.9
Firm-sector-destination level	54.8	90.9	55.3	15.7
Firm-product-destination level	44.7	83.5	63.4	24.1
21-month				
Firm level	83.8	96.4	39.3	10.5
Firm-sector level	71.1	94.4	48.1	12.5
Firm-product level	61.2	87.3	55.5	19.9
Firm-destination level	62.3	92.1	57.4	17.4
Firm-sector-destination level	50.5	88.4	64.7	21.2
Firm-product-destination level	40.6	78.2	71.4	30.3
42-month				
Firm level	75.7	92.1	61.0	22.5
Firm-sector level	64.3	89.2	67.3	25.3
Firm-product level	56.9	77.5	68.1	35.9
Firm-destination level	56.0	87.0	73.8	30.9
Firm-sector-destination level	44.6	82.4	78.5	35.5
Firm-product-destination level	34.1	69.2	83.0	47.5

Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

Note: The table shows the continuation and entrant shares by different aggregation levels and time spans over which the statistics are calculated. The continuation rate is the share of exporters that remain exporters across two windows; for example, 88.0% of firms who exported within a 12-month window export within the next 12-month window. The share of entrants indicates the share of total exporters accounted by the entrants; for example, 27.6% of exporters are firms that did not export 12 months prior. The value measures are defined analogously but for export values rather than for firm counts.

Table A2: Market Changes at Different Aggregation Levels and Time Spans

Freq.	N. of Dest.	MCM (count)	MCM (value)	DC (count)	DC (value)	Churning Prob.
Firm-product level (mean)						
6 Months	2.49	0.79	0.67	0.48	0.48	0.29
12 Months	2.90	0.86	0.72	0.47	0.46	0.27
21 Months	3.34	0.93	0.78	0.45	0.44	0.23
42 Months	4.17	1.03	0.86	0.42	0.41	0.13
Firm-sector level (mean)						
6 Months	4.10	0.72	0.51	0.47	0.47	0.34
12 Months	4.89	0.78	0.52	0.45	0.44	0.30
21 Months	5.69	0.86	0.56	0.43	0.42	0.24
42 Months	6.89	0.96	0.61	0.40	0.38	0.13
Firm-product level (median)						
6 Months	1.00	0.67	0.16	0.50	0.45	0.30
12 Months	1.00	0.67	0.24	0.50	0.42	0.27
21 Months	2.00	0.86	0.36	0.50	0.36	0.23
42 Months	2.00	1.00	0.54	0.45	0.27	0.06
Firm-sector level (median)						
6 Months	2.00	0.67	0.13	0.50	0.42	0.33
12 Months	2.00	0.67	0.15	0.50	0.37	0.25
21 Months	2.00	0.80	0.21	0.40	0.29	0.00
42 Months	3.00	1.00	0.29	0.33	0.18	0.00

Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

Note: This table shows the mean and median values of different measures of market changes by different time spans. The statistics are calculated at the firm-product level in panels (a) and (c) and at the firm-sector level in panels (b) and (d). The first column shows the time spans over which the statistics are calculated.

A.2 Supplementary Estimates and Statistics by Exporter Size Bins

Table A3: Regression Estimates by Exporter Size Bins

Size Bin	Quantity Elasticity to DC		Price Elasticity to DC	
	Count	Value	Count	Value
(a) Firm-product level				
1 (smallest)	-0.24***	-0.24***	0.01	0.00
2	-0.39***	-0.38***	0.01	0.00
3	-0.51***	-0.48***	0.02***	0.01*
4	-0.68***	-0.62***	0.01***	0.00*
5 (largest)	-0.92***	-0.78***	0.00	-0.01***
(b) Firm-sector level				
1 (smallest)	-0.29***	-0.31***	-0.01	-0.03
2	-0.41***	-0.43***	0.03**	0.02
3	-0.59***	-0.55***	0.03***	0.01
4	-0.73***	-0.65***	0.02**	0.00
5 (largest)	-0.77***	-0.63***	0.03***	0.01*

Note: This table presents the elasticities of the quantities and prices to the drop-to-change (DC) ratio by firm size at the firm-product level in panel (a) and at the firm-sector level in panel (b). The first column shows the firm size category, where the firm-products are ordered into 5 equal-sized bins, based on their size measured by their total sales value across all destinations and years. Each column shows the key estimates from regressing the quantity or price measures (indicated by the column header) on the count or value measure of the DC ratio. Each cell presents an estimate from a separate regression. The firm-product and year fixed effects are added for the panel (a) specifications and the firm-sector and year fixed effects are added for the panel (b) specifications. The statistical significance is calculated based on robust standard errors with ***, **, * representing statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, 10% level, respectively. Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

Table A4: Statistics by Exporter Size

Size Bins	N. of Dest.	MCM (Count)	MCM (Value)	DC (Count)	DC (Value)	Churning Rate
(a) Firm-product level (mean)						
1	1.52	0.98	0.96	0.49	0.49	0.23
2	1.79	0.93	0.89	0.49	0.48	0.25
3	2.13	0.88	0.80	0.48	0.48	0.26
4	2.89	0.83	0.68	0.47	0.46	0.28
5	6.15	0.73	0.42	0.45	0.44	0.32
(b) Firm-sector level (mean)						
1	1.82	0.81	0.76	0.48	0.48	0.17
2	2.63	0.82	0.69	0.48	0.47	0.22
3	3.55	0.80	0.58	0.46	0.46	0.27
4	5.34	0.77	0.45	0.45	0.44	0.35
5	11.40	0.68	0.25	0.43	0.41	0.49
(c) Firm-product level (median)						
1	1.00	0.67	0.66	0.50	0.48	0.23
2	1.00	0.67	0.51	0.50	0.47	0.25
3	1.00	0.67	0.39	0.50	0.44	0.26
4	2.00	0.67	0.29	0.50	0.40	0.29
5	3.00	0.67	0.12	0.44	0.35	0.33
(d) Firm-sector level (median)						
1	1.00	0.67	0.12	0.50	0.46	0.00
2	1.00	0.67	0.29	0.50	0.43	0.00
3	2.00	0.67	0.26	0.50	0.38	0.25
4	3.00	0.70	0.18	0.44	0.35	0.33
5	7.00	0.67	0.08	0.41	0.33	0.57

Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

Note: This table shows the mean and median values of different measures of market changes by firm size. The statistics are calculated at the firm-product level in panels (a) and (c), and at the firm-sector level in panels (b) and (d). The first column shows the firm size category, where the firm-products are ordered into 5 equal-sized bins, based on their size measured by their total sales value across all destinations and years. The number 5 refers to the largest firm size category.

A.3 Supplementary Estimates by Product and Firm Types

Table A5: Breakdown by Product and Firm Type: Number of Markets, DC Ratio, and Quantity and Price Elasticities, using the Value Measure of the DC Ratio

	N. of Dest.		DC (count)		DC (value)		Elasticity (value)	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Quantity	Price
Full sample	2.90	1.00	0.47	0.50	0.46	0.42	-0.61***	-0.00
Rauch classification								
Differentiated products	2.96	1.00	0.47	0.50	0.46	0.42	-0.62***	0.00
Reference priced	2.40	1.00	0.47	0.50	0.47	0.42	-0.51***	-0.00
Organized exchange	2.24	1.00	0.49	0.50	0.49	0.48	-0.54***	-0.02**
BEC classification								
Capital	3.14	1.00	0.46	0.50	0.46	0.41	-0.60***	0.01
Consumption	2.86	1.00	0.47	0.50	0.47	0.43	-0.60***	-0.00
Intermediate	2.69	1.00	0.46	0.50	0.46	0.40	-0.60***	-0.00
Company type								
State-owned enterprises	2.83	1.00	0.49	0.50	0.49	0.47	-0.56***	0.00
Private enterprises	2.88	2.00	0.45	0.50	0.43	0.36	-0.68***	0.01*
Foreign-invested enterprises	2.97	1.00	0.45	0.50	0.44	0.34	-0.65***	-0.02***
Form of commerce								
General trade	2.83	1.00	0.47	0.50	0.47	0.42	-0.60***	0.00
Processing trade	3.25	1.00	0.46	0.50	0.45	0.38	-0.67***	-0.03***

Note: This table supplements Table 3 by reporting additional statistics on the market changes and the quantity and price elasticities estimated using the value measure of the drop-to-change (DC) ratio. Trade patterns are calculated at the firm-product level. Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

A.4 Statistics by Industry

Table A6: By Industry:
Trade Patterns Calculated at the (2-digit HS) Firm-sector-year Level

	MCM		DC		Prob. of Churn	Obs
	Count	Value	Count	Value		
1-5 Live animals; animal products	0.40	0.02	0.50	0.49	0.00	20,807
6-14 Vegetable products	0.40	0.01	0.50	0.44	0.00	67,079
15 Animal/vegetable fats	0.36	0.02	0.50	0.44	0.00	2,302
16-24 Prepared foodstuffs	0.29	0.00	0.50	0.37	0.00	51,767
25-27 Mineral products	0.40	0.03	0.50	0.44	0.00	21,617
28-38 Products of chemical and allied industries	0.67	0.16	0.50	0.39	0.25	146,275
39-40 Plastics/rubber articles	0.67	0.19	0.50	0.35	0.33	153,920
41-43 Rawhides/leather articles, furs	0.75	0.19	0.50	0.42	0.33	75,491
44-46 Wood and articles of wood	0.67	0.12	0.50	0.41	0.25	62,147
47-49 Pulp of wood/other fibrous cellulosic material	0.77	0.25	0.50	0.34	0.25	75,932
50-63 Textiles and textile articles	0.67	0.15	0.50	0.37	0.25	353,130
64-67 Footwear, headgear, etc.	0.86	0.26	0.50	0.43	0.33	97,680
68-70 Misc. manufactured articles	0.74	0.21	0.50	0.38	0.33	110,541
71 Precious or semiprec. stones	0.86	0.25	0.50	0.37	0.17	16,984
72-83 Base metals and articles of base metals	0.67	0.17	0.50	0.35	0.25	248,422
84-85 Machinery and mechanical appliances, etc.	0.67	0.11	0.40	0.29	0.29	231,758
86-89 Vehicles, aircraft, etc.	0.67	0.13	0.43	0.32	0.33	46,603
90-92 Optical, photographic, etc.	0.67	0.16	0.50	0.37	0.33	66,768
93 Arms and ammunition	0.80	0.31	0.50	0.43	0.33	474
94-96 Articles of stone, plaster, etc.	0.76	0.19	0.50	0.41	0.33	178,790
97+ Others	0.67	0.06	0.50	0.44	0.00	5,069

Source: Chinese customs database, 2000-2006.

Note: This table reports the median values of the market-change-to-market ratio (MCM) and the drop-to-change ratio (DC), and the probability of churn. Both the count measure and the value measure of the MCM and DC ratios are reported. The last column shows the number of observations.

B Model Appendix

B.1 Price and Quantity Dynamics within a Market

Figure B1 replicates the empirical specification of Fitzgerald, Haller and Yedid-Levi (2023) (FHY), using Chinese customs data and simulated data from the calibrated model. The empirical results show strong support for the findings of FHY. In addition, my calibrated model is able to match the key quantity dynamics within a market. Under the benchmark calibration of my model, price is not destination-specific and its variation is fully differenced out by the firm-time fixed effect, leaving no price dynamics in (b2). It is straightforward to incorporate a small destination-specific cost component into the model to generate the exact data pattern observed in (b1).

For the purpose of illustrating the relative importance of firm-level cost and demand shocks, it is preferable not to include the firm-time fixed effects used in FHY because this absorbs all of the firm-time variations. Therefore, I have chosen to use the alternative specification presented in Section 4.2, which emphasizes the price and quantity dynamics as a firm grows and enters new markets. The empirical specification in Section 4.2 also allows me to conduct counterfactual exercises to highlight the importance of the common shock component (i.e., ρ) in driving a firm's export growth.




Figure B1: Quantity and Price Dynamics within a Market

Note: The data estimates are calculated based on firm-product-destination-level data of Chinese exporters from 2000-2006. Firm-product-time and destination-product-time fixed effects are added to the estimation equations. The survival years are top-coded at 5.

B.2 Additional Model Simulation Results




Figure B2: Number of Markets by Firm Size Bin

Note: This figure contrasts the mean number of markets by firm size bins in the data versus in the calibrated model in Section 4.1. The data statistics are calculated using firm-product-level data of Chinese exporters (2000-2006).




Figure B3: Relationship Between Empirical Measures and Model Parameters

Note: This figure plots the counterpart of Figure 3 (b) and (c) by adding the information on how the two elasticities change with the shock size σ (blue line). Each line shows the change in a given parameter, while keeping the other two parameters unchanged at their initial calibrated values, and the x-axis shows the value of the parameter being changed.