From Macro to Micro: 
Heterogeneous Exporters in the Pandemic

Jean-Charles Bricongne\textsuperscript{1}, Juan Carluccio\textsuperscript{1,2}, 
Lionel Fontagné\textsuperscript{1,3,4}, Guillaume Gaulier\textsuperscript{1}, Sebastian Stumpner\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1}Banque de France \textsuperscript{2}U. of Surrey \textsuperscript{3}CEPII \textsuperscript{4}PSE 

The views put forward are those of the author and do not represent the official views of the Banque de France or the Eurosystem.

Franco-German Fiscal Policy Seminar, 9 Nov 2021
Introduction

Data

Trade margins

The collapse of top exporters

Supply versus demand
Motivation: trade collapse in early 2020

- French exports -42% y-o-y in April 2020 (world exports: -20%)

What we do

We study the microeconomic foundations of this collapse

- Use French transaction-level trade data Jan 2017 - Dec 2020
- Decompose trade growth into margins of adjustment
- Document heterogeneity according to exporter size
- Dig deeper into the underlying drivers of such heterogeneity: supply versus demand
- Study what is behind the collapse of top exporters
What we find

Most of the adjustment through the firm intensive margin

- Number of exporters fell by 25%, but exiters are very small

The largest firms drive the trade collapse

- 0.1% exporters (≈ 100 exporters) account for 57% of the export collapse (pre-crisis export share: 41%)
- Top exporters do not react more to GVC disruption (intermediate good imports)
- Top exporters react more to foreign demand shocks
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Disaggregated trade data

Monthly, firm-level export/import data, January 2017 - Dec 2020 (French Customs Office)

- Unit of observation:
  - Firm-by-CN8 product-by-destination (origin)-by-month
  - For destinations inside EU: ID of the foreign partner company

- Coverage:
  - >98% of aggregate exports flows from official statistics.
  - Roughly 100k exporters per year, 45k per month.
  - Extra-EU trade: exhaustive data
  - Intra-EU trade:
    → Exporters required to file the detail of their transactions (product code, destination) if annual exports exceed 460k euros: see Bergounhon et al. (mimeo ’18).
    → Importers required to file when cumulated yearly value imports exceed 460k euros
Firm-level balance sheets / Pandemic data

FiBEN

- Balance sheet data collected by Bank of France
- Turnover > 0.75 million euros
- 200k firms / year

Oxford stringency index

- Hale et al (2021)
- Collected daily for a sample of 180 countries
- Aggregated into indices that range from 0 to 100 and are increasing in the measures’ stringency
- Country-month averages of the index normalized to lie in the interval $[0, 1]$. 
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A sharp adjustment at the Extensive Margin

- The number of exporters fell substantially (-25% in April 2020)
Exiters hardly contribute to the aggregate collapse

- Average exports of exiters in April & May 2019: 64k Euros → 4.5% of average of all exporters (1.4m Euros)

Note: Distribution of exporters (in grey) and distribution of exiters (in red) in April & May 2019. Exiters are defined as firms with positive exports in April & May 2019, but zero exports in April & May 2020.
The contribution of the firm extensive margin is very small

Decomposition:  \[
\frac{\Delta X_t}{X_{t-1}} = \sum_{f \in S} \frac{\Delta X_{ft}}{X_{t-1}} + \sum_{f \in N} \frac{X_{ft} - \sum_{f \in X} X_{ft-1}}{X_{t-1}}
\]
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Ten firms (legal units): one fifth of aggregate French exports

- Group exporters into bins based on their total exports in 2019: \( \approx 100k \) firms
- To be in top 1% / 0.1% / 0.01%, a firm needs >65m / >600m / >3bn Euros of annual exports. Total French exports in 2019: 488bn.
Top exporters contributed more than their share to the collapse

- Contribution of group $i = \frac{\Delta X_i}{\Delta X}$
- Top 0.1% (~ 100 firms) contributed 57% (initial share: 41%)
- Top 0.01% (10 firms) contributed 32% (initial share: 19%)
A flexible empirical framework: midpoint growth rates by size

- Baseline estimation: For firm $f$, product $k$, destination (origin) $j$ and time $t$:

$$ g_{fjk,t} = \alpha_b(f)_t + \epsilon_{fjk,t} $$

- $g_{fjk,t}$: year-on-year midpoint growth rate.

- Group time periods into two-months intervals

- Then add controls
Top exporters’ growth rate fell by more in April-May

- Estimate coefficients on size dummies separately for Jan-Feb (pre-shock) and Apr-May (export collapse)
Zooming in on the top 1,000 firms

- Placing top 1,000 firms (∼ top 1%) into 100 bins

![Graph showing 2019 Log Exports for top 1% and top 0.1% firms]
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Covid as a supply/demand shock

- Pandemic and policy responses (especially lockdowns) led to strong supply and demand responses: Closing of workplaces, work from home, shops closed, etc.

- Exporters may be affected by:
  - Foreign lockdowns through supply disruptions from intermediate inputs
  - Domestic lockdown
  - Foreign lockdowns through a demand channel

- Top exporters may have a higher elasticity with respect to these shocks
The potential drivers of collapse of top exporters

- **Supply**
  - Higher exposure to foreign supply shocks of intermediate inputs?
  - Higher elasticity to foreign supply shocks of intermediate inputs?

- **Demand**
  - Higher exposure to foreign demand shocks?
  - Higher elasticity to foreign demand shocks?
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Intermediate imports to sales ratio as a proxy of the dependence on value chains

- Summarize a firm’s exposure to foreign supply shocks through imported intermediate inputs by its ratio of imported intermediate inputs to sales

\[ IIS_{f,2019} = \frac{X_{f,2019}}{Y_{f,2019}} \]

- Then control for IIS ratio in size-estimations
IIS ratio is increasing in exporter size

- But lots of variation across exporters within a size bin
- A regression of IIS on size bin dummies only gives an R2 of 5%
The size effect holds when controlling for the IIS ratio

- Control for dummies of IIS ratio in size regressions:
  \[ g_{fkjt} = \alpha_{b(f)t} + \gamma_{r(f)t} + \epsilon_{fkjt} \]
  - Bins: Exporter Size
  - Bins: IIS ratio

- Sort IIS ratio into deciles or bins of fixed length
and when controlling for origin-specific supply shocks

- Control alternatively for bins of constructed origin supply shocks:

\[
\text{Input Supply Shock}_{ft} = \frac{M_{f,2019}^{\text{inp}}}{Y_{f,2019}} \times \left( \sum_j \frac{M_{fj,2019}^{\text{inp}}}{M_{f,2019}^{\text{inp}}} \right) \text{Supply Shock}_{jt}
\]

- Supply shocks in origin \( j \) taken as lockdown stringency.
Effect of *Origin* Lockdown by Size Bin

\[ g_{fjk,t} = LockdownStringency_{j,t} \times \eta_b(f) + \beta_f t + \gamma_j + \delta_{kt} + \epsilon_{fjk,t} \]

**Figure**: Impact of Covid at origin on imports by exporter size

*Source*: French customs, Author’s calculation.
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Sectoral composition of bottom 99.9% vs top 0.1%

- Differences largely driven by aircrafts
Controlling for the composition effects

- Add sector FEs to the estimation

\[ g_{fjk,t} = \alpha b(f)_t + \beta_{st} + \epsilon_{fjk,t} \]

\( \beta_{st} \): Dummy for HS2 code of observed flow

- Add sector-by-destination FEs to the estimation

\[ g_{fjk,t} = \alpha b(f)_t + \beta_{jst} + \epsilon_{fjk,t} \]

\( \beta_{jst} \): Dummy for the sector-by-destination cell of observed flow
Higher exposure to foreign demand shock is only part of the story

- Composition effects only partly explain the larger collapse by top exporters

→ Top exporters also fall by more within markets
(Weighted) Oxford index as a direct measure of exposure to the demand shock

- Measure directly exposure to foreign demand shocks by size bin: “Oxford stringency” index from Hale et al (2021)
- Weighted average destination lockdown stringency across size bins

![Graph showing weighted average destination lockdown stringency from January to May for different size bins]
Demand effect is larger for the top exporters

- Interact destination lockdown stringency with dummies for size bins

\[ g_{fjk,t} = \text{Lockdown Stringency}_{j,t} \times \eta_{b(f)} + \beta_{ft} + \gamma_j + \delta_{kt} + \epsilon_{ijk,t} \]

- Could reflect larger absolute decline in exports or reallocation across destinations

**Figure**: Impact of Covid at destination by exporter size

*Source: French customs, Author’s calculation.*
Conclusion

- Firm intensive margin accounts for almost the entire decline of exports(imports)
- Top (top 0.1%) traders adjust procyclically
  - Differences not systematically related to GVC participation
  - Top exporters decline by more within sectors and destinations
  - Top exporters react more to foreign lockdowns during Covid
- These results point to a large reaction of top exporters to demand shocks
- Similar role of top exporters during Covid and GFC
THANK YOU
APPENDIX
Exporters with and without filing obligation
Midpoint growth rate accommodate churning with high frequency data

\[ g_t = \frac{X_t - X_{t-12}}{\frac{1}{2}(X_t + X_{t-12})} \]

- \( g_t \) varies between -2 (for exit) and +2 (for entry)
- Can accommodate entry and exit, which is important given the high level of detail (transaction = firm-by-product-by-destination)
  - see e.g. Haltiwanger et al. (Restat '13) on job creation by establishments
- For small values of \( \frac{X_t}{X_{t-12}} \), very close to \( \log\left(\frac{X_t}{X_{t-12}}\right) \)
Decomposing the Firm Intensive Margin

- Decomposition from Bernard et al. (2009)
- *Transaction*-level intensive margin accounts for roughly half of the total export collapse
Midpoint growth rate vs log change

![Graph showing the relationship between midpoint growth rate and log change. The x-axis represents the growth rate, while the y-axis represents the log change. Two curves are plotted, one for midpoint growth rate and one for log change. The x-axis scale ranges from -1 to 3, and the y-axis scale ranges from -4 to 2.](image-url)
The exceptional role of large exporters during the collapse

Distribution of growth within bins
Larger exporters more likely to import...

![Bar chart showing export share of firms that also import and share of exporting firms that also import. The chart indicates that as the percentage of entrants increases, the share of firms that also import decreases.](chart.png)
...and especially more likely to import intermediate goods
... sourcing concentrated in the US and Europe
Exporters also reduce their imports
FIBEN subsample is representative

- 37% of 2019 exporters have data in FIBEN
- Mostly larger firms → 71% of 2019 export value
Results of size estimations very similar in FIBEN subsample
Highly skewed distribution of IIS ratio
The role of top exporters during Covid and GFC

- Top exporters decline by more during both Covid and GFC (but differences more pronounced during Covid)
Data on lockdown stringency across countries and months

Stringency

- Main indicator “Stringency index”, composite indicator of:
  - School closures; workplace closures
  - Cancel public events; close public transport
  - Public information campaigns
  - Stay at home; restrictions on gatherings
  - Restrictions on internal movement; international travel controls

Coding of stringency

- Example of workplace closures
- 0 - No measures; 1 - recommend closing (or work from home)
- 2 - require closing (or work from home) for some sectors or categories of workers
- 3 - require closing (or work from home) all but essential workplaces (e.g., grocery stores, doctors)
Firm Intensive and Extensive Margins during GFC

- GFC: Export collapse in France started in Jan 2009
- Firm intensive margin explains almost the entire fall.
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COVID-19: Stringency Index, Apr 21, 2021

This is a composite measure based on nine response indicators including school closures, workplace closures, and travel bans, rescaled to a value from 0 to 100 (100 = strictest). If policies vary at the subnational level, the index is shown as the response level of the strictest sub-region.

Number of Partners vs Avg Value per partner

- Not driven by a breakup of connections with more clients.
- Instead, average exports per client fall by more for top exporters.
- Focus on intra-EU exports, and intensive margin of transactions. Then decompose
  \[ \Delta \log(X_{fsj}) = \Delta \log(N_{fsj}) + \Delta \log(\bar{X}_{fsj}) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12m log change</th>
<th>Number of Partners</th>
<th>Average value per partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-99.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.9-99.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;99.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top exporters overreact in crisis times

- Very similar growth rates prior to Covid
- Similar role of top exporters during the GFC

Note: Balanced Panel of exporters for each size bin. Exporters grouped into size bins based on their total exports in 2019.