

THE NEXUS BETWEEN ANTIDUMPING PETITIONS AND EXPORTS DURING THE GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS: EVIDENCE ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Fa Qin Lin, Hsiao Chink Tang, and Lin Wang

NO. 131

.....
May 2014

**ADB WORKING PAPER SERIES ON
REGIONAL ECONOMIC INTEGRATION**

ADB Working Paper Series on Regional Economic Integration

The Nexus between Antidumping Petitions and Exports during the Global Financial Crisis: Evidence on the People's Republic of China

Fa Qin Lin,^{*} Hsiao Chink Tang,^{**}
and Lin Wang^{***}

No. 131 | May 2014

The authors thank the participants at the 2013 Chinese Society of International Trade Annual Meeting in Guangzhou, the People's Republic of China for very useful discussions and suggestions.

^{*}School of International Trade and Economics,
Central University of Finance and Economics,
39 South College Road, Haidian District,
Beijing, 100081, the People's Republic of China.
linfaqin@cufe.edu.cn

^{**}Office of Regional Economic Integration, Asian
Development Bank, 1550 Metro Manila, Philippines.
hctang@adb.org

^{***}Institute of Economics of the Chinese Academy of
Social Sciences, 2, Yuetanbeixiaojie, Fuwai, Xicheng
District, Beijing, 100836, the People's Republic of
China. wlqust@cass.org.cn

The ADB Working Paper Series on Regional Economic Integration focuses on topics relating to regional cooperation and integration in the areas of infrastructure and software, trade and investment, money and finance, and regional public goods. The Series is a quick-disseminating, informal publication that seeks to provide information, generate discussion, and elicit comments. Working papers published under this Series may subsequently be published elsewhere.

Disclaimer:

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent.

ADB does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this publication and accepts no responsibility for any consequence of their use.

By making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area, or by using the term “country” in this document, ADB does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.

Unless otherwise noted, “\$” refers to US dollars.

Contents

Abstract	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Data and Methodology	2
2.1. Antidumping Petitions Against the People's Republic of China	2
2.2. Trade Costs	3
2.3. Empirical Strategy	4
3. Results	5
3.1. Ordinary Least Squares Estimates	5
3.2. Reduced Form Estimates	6
3.3. Two-Stage Least Squares Estimates	7
3.4. Additional Results	7
3.5. Robustness Checks	8
4. Conclusions	10
References	11
ADB Working Paper Series on Regional Economic Integration	22
Tables	
1. Antidumping Investigations by the People's Republic of China (PRC)'s Major Trading Partners from 2006 to 2010	14
2. Antidumping Information against the People's Republic of China by Section at 2-digit HS Code from 2006 to 2010	15
3. Summary Statistics	16
4. Ordinary Least Squares Regression: Antidumping Petitions on Exports	17
5. Reduced Form Regression: Antidumping Petitions on Instrumental Variables	18
6. Two-Stage Least Squares: Antidumping Petitions on Exports	19
7. Two-Stage Least Squares (Additional Results): Antidumping Petitions on Exports	20
8. Two-Stage Least Squares (Robustness Checks): Antidumping Petitions on Export	21

Abstract

This paper quantifies how the People's Republic of China's (PRC) export volume to its major trading partners during the global financial crisis affects the antidumping (AD) petitions filed by the trading partners against the PRC. Focusing on the AD petitions at the Harmonized System (HS) Code 8-digit level and the PRC's exports at the HS 2-digit level, we construct three instrument variables at the same HS level for export volume. These instruments—documents required, time taken, and container charges incurred for goods traded across borders—represent trade costs obtained from the World Bank's Doing Business Project. We find rising exports from the PRC lead to rising AD petitions against the country. Instrumental variable estimates indicate that a 1 percentage point rise in the PRC's export volume raises the number of AD petitions against the country by about 0.3 percentage point, and the probability of receiving AD petitions by 3.6 %. These estimates are about 10 times larger than those found in ordinary least square regressions. Their quantitative significance underlines why it is important to consider the issue of export endogeneity in the estimation. Moreover, it highlights the failure of the current trade statistics to account for the true value-added of traded goods, and how this has particularly disadvantaged the PRC, given its position as the factory of the world.

Keywords: International trade, antidumping, instrument variable, the People's Republic of China

JEL Classification: F13, F14, F59

1. Introduction

The People's Republic of China (PRC), the world's largest exporter, accounts for 11.3 % of the world's total exports in 2012.¹ The country's export capacity threatens established trade patterns (Bown and Crowley 2010), prompting protectionist measures from its major trade partners, particularly in the United States (US) and the European Union (EU) (Zhou and Cuyvers 2009). Empirical literature supports this observation of a positive link between export volume and antidumping (AD) petitions. Mah (1999), Leipziger and Shin (1991), and Irwin (2004) point out that the US domestic industry is more likely to initiate an antidumping case if there has been a surge in imports from a particular country. Prusa and Skeath (2002) suggest that being a big exporter matters for AD petitions. Zhou and Cuyvers (2009) note that larger exporting countries to the EU are more likely to face AD actions compared to smaller exporting countries. The study on AD petitions is particularly relevant as there is a large literature that shows how AD petitions can lead to trade destruction and trade diversion, such as, Staiger and Wolak (1994), Prusa (2001), Niels (2003), Durling and Prusa (2006), and Ganguli (2008).

Despite of the well-established positive association between export volume and AD petitions, the presence of reverse causality from AD petitions to export volume makes the task of clearly delineating the causal effect of interest a perennial empirical challenge. This paper's main aim is, therefore, to identify the true causal effect of export volume on AD petitions based on a set of trade cost variables—documents required, time taken, and container charges incurred when goods are traded across borders—that help to pin down exogenous variations in the export volume. The focus on the PRC and on the years surrounding the financial crisis is helpful in providing benchmark results on how exports affect AD petitions. The PRC is chosen for being the main target of AD petitions, which quite naturally follows from its position as the world's largest exporter. During the global financial crisis, particularly during the world economic slump, the filing of AD petitions is likely to be more prevalent. Governments often use such a strategy to insulate domestic firms from import competition (Hillberry and McCalman 2011, Georgiadis and Gräb 2013).

This paper contributes to the literature on determinants of AD petitions by further confirming that export volume is a quantitatively significant factor in explaining AD petitions. In addition, it uses a novel empirical strategy to identify the true causal effect of export volume on AD petitions. There is a substantive literature that examines the determinants of AD petitions. For example, Leidy (1997), Mah (2000), Knetter and Prusa (2003), Feinberg (2005), Jallab et al. (2006), and Zhou and Cuyvers (2009), find that macroeconomic factors of the complainant country, such as, real GDP growth, unemployment rate, and exchange rate fluctuations, are important determinants of AD petitions. Meanwhile, Finger (1993), Prusa (2001), Sanguinetti and Bianchi (2005), Vandebussche and Zanardi (2008), and Prusa and Sketh (2002) investigate retaliation as a strategic motive for AD use. They find that countries tend to file AD petitions against those which have previously investigated them or are currently taking AD actions against them.

¹ See International Trade Centre's Trade Map at <http://www.trademap.org/>

Focusing on the AD petitions against the PRC by its major trade partners at the Harmonized System (HS) Code 8-digit level and the PRC's exports at HS 2-digit level to its major trade partners, we construct within 2-digit level variation three trade costs as instruments for export volume. Using the two-stage least squares methodology, we find that rising exports from the PRC is followed by significant rise in AD petitions against the country. Instrumental variable estimates indicate that a 1 percentage point increase in the PRC's export volume raises the number of AD petition by about 0.3 percentage point, and the probability of facing AD petition by 3.6 %. These estimates are 10 times larger than those found in ordinary least square regression (OLS).

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the data and methodology used, specifically some stylized facts on AD petitions against the PRC during the global financial crisis, and the construction of the trade cost instruments. Section 3 presents the main results and those from various robustness checks. Section 4 concludes with policy considerations.

2. Data and Methodology

Data used in this paper span from 2006 to 2010. The AD petition data come from Bown's (2012) Global Antidumping database. Our interest is on the AD petitions filed by the PRC's major trading partners, which comprise 29 trading partners that include 16 economies in the EU.² These 29 economies account for more than 50 % of the PRC's total export volume and 92 % of the total AD petitions filed against the PRC. (The export volume is the log of export value from the PRC to its trading partners at the HS two-digit level deflated by the US CPI. The value of exports is obtained from the United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics (UNComtrade). The 2005 US CPI is obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics).

2.1. Antidumping Petitions Against the People's Republic of China

From 2006 to 2010, the PRC's major trading partners filed a total of 777 AD investigations, of which 310 or 39.9% of the total number of cases were against the PRC (Table 1). The AD petitions filed by developed and developing countries totaled 110 and 200, respectively.³ The bulk of AD petitions came from India (59 cases), the US (47), and the EU (43). According to Bown and Tovar (2011), India's large number of ADB petitions against the PRC, despite the small PRC export to the country, is due to India's domestic political and economic pressures following tariff reforms.

Breaking down by product sections,⁴ the AD investigations filed by the developed and developing countries vary mostly in terms of the larger variety of products targeted by the

² See note to Table 1.

³ This paper follows the definition of United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) that classifies the US, EU, Canada and Australia, as developed countries; and Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Indonesia, India, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, Peru, Turkey, and South Africa as developing countries.

⁴ The 2-digit HS codes are classified based on 22 sections divided into 98 chapters. Notes to Table 2 provide the name of the product sections.

developing countries. The AD cases initiated by the developed countries are mostly concentrated at a particular sector, for example, steel products (Section 15) (Table 2). For developing countries, the scope of AD cases is more varied, ranging from chemical products (Section 6), textiles (Section 11), steel products (Section 15) to machinery and electrical products (Section 16). From 2006 to 2010, the UNComtrade data show that products in Sections 6, 11, and 16 also happened to be the main goods exported by the PRC, accounting for about 70 % of total exports volume. Machinery and electrical products (Section 16) alone comprised 45 % of total exports volume.

The AD petition data used in estimations are classified by chapter and country. Table 3 presents the AD petition data together with the other variables used in the estimations. Two dependent variables based on the AD information are used: *AD number*, and *AD dummy*. *AD number* is the number of AD petitions filed in a chapter by a country in a year against the PRC. The mean AD petition of 0.356, therefore, implies that on average, 0.356 petition is filed in a chapter by a country every year. *AD dummy* denotes whether or not an AD petition is filed in a chapter by a country each year. The dummy takes on a value of one if it is true, and zero otherwise. Its mean value of 0.067, therefore, says 6.7% of the chapters have AD petitions.

2.2. Trade Costs

Three measures of trade cost are collected for each country: documents required to import, time taken to import, and container cost to import. These are obtained from the *Doing Business Project* of the World Bank. Since 2006, the project has looked at the procedural requirements for exporting and importing a standardized cargo of goods by sea transport. *Documents* required to import refer to the number of documents required per shipment to import goods into a country. Documents required for clearance by government ministries, customs authorities, port and container terminal authorities, health and technical control agencies, and banks are taken into account. *Time* taken to import is the number of days calculated when a procedure to import is initiated until it is completed. It excludes ocean transport time, but includes the waiting time between procedures, such as during the unloading of a cargo. *Container* cost to import measures the total fees in US dollar levied on a 20-foot container. It covers all the fees associated with completing the procedures to import the goods, including costs for documents, administrative fees for customs clearance and technical control, customs broker fees, terminal handling charges, and inland transport. It does not include customs tariffs and duties or costs related to ocean transport.

Since the export volume is based on the 2-digit HS code and to account for the variations by chapter, country, and time, a modified trade cost is used and calculated as:

$$cost_{i,j,t} = \theta_{i,j,t-1} \log(measure_{j,t}) \quad (1)$$

where $\theta_{i,j,t-1}$ is the trade share that captures country j 's imports of chapter i goods to total imports from the PRC at period $t - 1$; $measure_{j,t}$ is *documents*, *time*, or *container* of country j at time t . The modified trade cost also takes into account the volume of certain goods being imported on trade cost—the larger the imports, the bigger its cost impact. The trade share is included as a lagged term because of its predetermined nature, but the results are not sensitive

to using contemporaneous trade share.⁵ The advantage of the cost instruments is that the trade cost index is constructed by interacting the lagged chapter-country-specific import shares with the country and time variant cost information when importing across the borders.

2.3. Empirical Strategy

We follow a two-step estimation strategy akin to the two-stage least squares methodology. The second stage Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) is the main estimated equation that relates $AD_{i,j,t}$, the AD petition in chapter i of country j against the PRC at year t :

$$AD_{i,j,t} = c_a + \beta \exp_{i,j,t} + \delta' z_{i,j,t} + \mu_{ij} + \mu_i + \mu_j + \mu_t + v_{i,j,t} , \quad (2)$$

where $\exp_{i,j,t}$, the log of export volume, is the main causal variable of interest; c_a is the constant term; $z_{i,j,t}$ represents the chapter-specific characteristics such as belonging to the same section and other controls such as exchange rate levels and retaliatory AD petition numbers that we controlled as the robustness checks in section 3.5; μ_{ij} represents the chapter-country specific characteristics that capture the time-invariant fixed-effects of cross-section panel data; μ_i represents the chapter fixed-effects that capture all time invariant chapter-specific characteristics and permanent divergence; μ_j represents the country fixed-effects that capture all time invariant country-specific characteristics and permanent differences; μ_t represents the time-varying macroeconomic shocks that affect all chapters identically; and $v_{i,j,t}$ is the idiosyncratic error term. Recall two indicators of AD petition as dependent variables are used: *AD number*; and *AD dummy*; β , therefore, measures the elasticity of AD petitions, and the average probability of AD petitions, with respect to export, respectively.

The key problem in estimating Equation 2 with OLS is that trade is likely to be endogenous to AD petitions, despite the controls included for chapter-specific, country, and year fixed-effects. The main source of endogeneity is due to simultaneity bias, wherein AD actions are also likely to affect export volume. This effect is likely to be negative, which means the OLS estimate of β is likely to be lower than the true effect. If we estimate a reverse causality equation and label the coefficient of the negative effect as δ and the error term as e , then the OLS estimation of β can be written as:

$$\beta^{OLS} = \beta + \frac{\delta}{1-\beta\delta} \frac{var(v)}{var(trade)} + \frac{1}{1-\beta\delta} \frac{cov(v,e)}{var(trade)} \quad (3)$$

The second and last term of the right-hand-side capture the simultaneity bias and omitted variable bias, respectively. After the controls, if there is no omitted variable bias, since δ is negative and β is positive, the OLS estimate of β will under-estimate the true effect of export volume on AD petitions.

One way to solve this reverse causality problem is to find appropriate instruments for export volume. To this end, we use each of the trade costs described above to pin down the

⁵ This is further discussed as a first robustness check in Section 3.5.

exogenous variations in the export volume. Hence, in the first step of the estimation strategy, we estimate the following equation that relates the log of export volume to each of the modified trade cost variables; the estimated log of export volume is then used as key explanatory variable in the second stage of the regression (Equation 2):

$$\exp_{i,j,t} = c_T + \alpha \text{cost}_{i,j,t} + \phi z_{i,j,t} + \mu_{ij} + \mu_i + \mu_t + \omega_{i,j,t}, \quad (4)$$

where c_T is the constant term; $\text{Cost}_{i,j,t}$ is each cost variable in chapter i , country j at year t ; $\omega_{i,j,t}$ is the idiosyncratic error term; and the rest are defined the same way as in Equation 2. We use three measurements of trade cost for robustness checks. In addition, to show that the cost variable affect AD through the export volume channel, we also estimate the following reduced form equation that directly relates AD petitions to each trade cost:

$$AD_{i,j,t} = c_b + \gamma \text{cost}_{i,j,t} + \psi z_{i,j,t} + \mu_{ij} + \mu_i + \mu_j + \mu_t + r_{i,j,t}. \quad (5)$$

3. Results

3.1. Ordinary Least Squares Estimates

Table 4 presents the one-step OLS estimate of Equation 2. While the OLS estimate of export volume is inconsistent due to the endogeneity issue mentioned above, it nonetheless provides a useful starting point for investigating the direction of bias in relation to the true estimate of trade volume on AD petitions.

A few results can be gleaned. First, the most basic regression without any controls produces a positive estimate of trade with respect to AD petitions (β) of 0.0945 (Column I, Table 4). Besides the endogeneity issue, a potential problem with the estimate is that it may be spurious, reflecting the presence of a third variable—specifically the time trends in influencing the movements of the export volume and AD petitions. If this were true, a large R^2 would be symptomatic. The computed R^2 , nonetheless, is in fact very small (0.013) suggesting that the estimate is unlikely to be spurious.

Second, when the section-specific dummy is included as an additional control, the estimated β becomes 0.101 and the model's fit as indicated by the R^2 improves. This and other controls are important to handle the omitted variables that affect AD petitions, but may be correlated with export volume.

Third, interestingly with the inclusion of all controls, the estimate of β decreases to 0.0212 while the model's fit significantly improves to 0.780 (Column IV). The inclusion of chapter-country specific dummy, which accounts for the cross-section fixed effects, together with the section specific dummy leads to a noticeable decline in β to 0.0111 (Column III) compared to the inclusion of the section specific dummy alone (Column II). The estimate only increases marginally afterward, when the chapter dummy and the country dummy, which accounts for the time invariant effects (Column IV), and the year dummy, which captures the broad

macroeconomic factors that affect all chapters and countries (Column V), are included. Finally, when the dependent variable is expressed AD dummy, the β estimate is still positive (0.0045) and the R^2 is 0.849.

Overall, Table 4 shows that the OLS estimates first decreases and then increases when the section, country–chapter, chapter, country, and year dummies are included in successive steps. This suggests that the OLS estimates are biased. One reason for this bias is the negative reverse causal relationship between AD petitions and export volume. A second possible reason could be the measurement error in the PRC’s economic data, which is common among developing countries (Deaton 2005). If this measurement error were classical,⁶ the OLS estimates would be biased towards zero and the estimated effect of trade volume on AD petitions would be attenuated. These factors confound the causal relationship when estimated using OLS regression. Hence, it is important to use instruments for exports in order to obtain consistent estimates of the causal effect of interest.

3.2. Reduced Form Estimates

Table 5 reports the OLS results of Equation 5, the reduced form equation of AD petitions on the different trade cost instrumental variables individually and then together in one estimation. (All the estimations include all the control variables).

Each individual trade cost (*DocumentsIV*, *TimeIV*, and *ContainerIV*) is a statistically significant predictor of AD petitions (Columns I to III, Table 5). However, when all trade cost variables are included in one estimation, *ContainerIV* is the only statistical significant predictor (Column IV). Specifically, a one standard deviation increase in the trade cost reduces the number of AD petitions from 12 percentage points (Column I) to 40 percentage points (Column III).⁷ Comparing the results across Columns I–III, the impact of *ContainerIV* is the largest. The same is true when all the trade costs are included in one equation (Column IV). What is notable is that *ContainerIV* is the only statistical significant variable, and it still has an impact as large as 40 percentage points on AD petitions— similar to the case when only *ContainerIV* is included in the estimation (Column III).

When the dependent variable is the *AD dummy*, the preceding observations are still evident. Individually, each trade cost is a statistical predictor of AD activities, but when combined, only *ContainerIV* is statistically significant. And more important, either individually or together, the estimated coefficient of *ContainerIV* is the largest—a one standard deviation increase in *ContainerIV* raises the probability of AD petitions by 5.3 percentage points (Column VIII), close to the 5.1 percentage points increase in Column VII.

⁶ Classical measurement error means that the measurement error in the explanatory variable has mean zero, is uncorrelated with the true dependent and other independent variables, and is also uncorrelated with the true error term in the equation.

⁷ To calculate the percentage point changes, the estimated coefficient of a trade cost is multiplied by its corresponding standard deviation from Table 3. For example, the 12 percentage points in Column I is $0.343 \times 0.350 \times 100\%$. The same calculation is done when all three trade costs are included in the estimation— calculate individual changes and then sum the results. We follow the same calculation in the first step of the two-stage least square estimations. See Lin and Sim (2013) for similar calculations.

3.3. Two-Stage Least Squares Estimates

Table 6 presents the two-stage least squares results of Equation 2. Likewise, the different columns indicate the inclusion of each trade cost individually or together in one equation.

Several key results can be observed. First, export volume is a statistically significant predictor of AD petition regardless of which trade cost is used (the first row of results of Table 6). Second, the estimated coefficient of export volume is relatively tight around 0.20 to 0.28 across the different specifications, highlighting the robustness of the overall estimation. Third, all the trade costs are useful instruments for export volume as they are statistically significant at the 1 % level as shown in the first-stage of the regression results. This is further supported by the large F-statistics of over 300 in the first stage regression, which is well above the rule-of-thumb of 10 suggested by Staiger and Stock (1997). Fourth, that said, the choice of ContainerIV as the key instrument rather than together with the other trade costs is preferable; it produces a marginally higher coefficient of 0.004 compared to Column III, but at a lower cost having only one instrument rather than three. Fifth, the one-step OLS estimate as shown in Table 4 clearly underestimates the impact of export volume on AD petitions. In particular, the OLS estimate (Column V, Table 4) only captures 7.6 % of the impact of about 0.3 estimated by the two-stage least squares (Column IV, Table 6). This is a large underreporting of the potential impact of the PRC's export volume on AD petitions—it underscores the importance of accounting for the endogeneity of export in this line of empirical literature.

Similar results are obtained from the use of *AD dummy* as the dependent variable. The two-stage least squares estimates are very tight ranging from 0.030 to 0.036 underpinning the robustness of the result across different specification. Still, the estimates in Column III and Column IV are identical indicating the relative importance of ContainerIV as a key instrument for export volume. Likewise, the two-stage least squares estimates affirm that the OLS estimates are downward biased. Comparing the case of all trade costs are included as instruments, the OLS estimate of around 0.0045 (Column VI, Table 4) only captures 12.5 % of the effect of the PRC's trade on the probability of AD petitions based on the two-stage least squares estimate of 0.036 (Column IV, Table 6).

3.4. Additional Results

Table 7 presents additional results focusing on the type of countries that instigated the AD petitions against the PRC (developed, developing, and Asian), and on the Sections where the AD petitions are concentrated (cluster and others). As discussed in Section 2 of the paper, the intensity in which developed and developing countries use AD petitions varies. Hence, there is no reason to assume that the earlier results apply to both developed and developing countries. In addition, we also look more closely on the case where the Asian countries⁸ (India, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, and Turkey) are the instigators, which may represent more direct competitors of the PRC. Separately, we compare the case where AD petitions are concentrated (in Sections 6, 11, 15, and 16) versus the remaining case (other Sections). The former represents more than 70 % of total AD petitions against the PRC.

⁸ For data consistency, we follow UNCTAD's definition.

Comparing with the baseline second-stage results of full sample of 0.278 (for *AD number*) and 0.036 (for *AD dummy*) in Column IV, Table 6, the export volume effect on *AD number* is higher for developed countries (0.348) than for developing countries (0.215). For *AD dummy*, the impact of export volume is greater for developing countries (0.039), compared with 0.035 for developed countries. This implies that although developed countries instigate more AD petitions than developing countries, the chances of developing countries doing so are greater. However, for the Asian countries, the export volume effect on AD petition is the greatest—the impact on *AD number* is 0.614, and for *AD dummy* is 0.108, which are larger than those for the overall developed and developing countries. This seems to suggest the presence of greater direct competition between the PRC and its Asian trading partners.

In the first-stage of the estimation results, the negative effect of trade costs on export is larger for developed countries, smaller for developing countries and even smaller for Asian developing countries. The total effect of a one standard deviation increase in trade cost is a decline in export by 317 % for developed countries, 125.6 % for developing countries, and 65.7 % for Asian developing countries. The baseline result from Column IV, Table 6, is 164.5 %. This suggests trade costs matter more in the developed countries than in the developing countries, even though the observed costs are less for the developed countries than the developing countries. Trade costs matter even less for the Asian developing countries. Since the trade costs of the developed countries are already low, the marginal effect of a one unit increase in the trade costs will be very large. In contrast, for the developing countries, since the trade costs are high, the marginal effect of a one unit increase in the costs will be lower.

The negative effect of trade costs on exports is smaller for cluster sections, and larger for other sections. The total effect of a one standard deviation increase in the trade costs is a decline in exports by 141.4 % for cluster sections and 257.1 % for other sections. This means that the increase in trade costs leads to a smaller fall in the export of cluster sections versus the export in other sections. The smaller fall in the export of cluster sections implies more cluster sections' goods will be exported, which in turn suggests that goods in the cluster sections are the ones that will face the most AD petitions. The latter as we know is consistent with the data—most AD petitions are concentrated at the cluster sections. Similar observations and interpretations apply to the results with *AD dummy*.

3.5. Robustness Checks

Table 8 presents the results of four robustness checks. First, instead of using the lagged trade share, $\theta_{i,j,t-1}$, in Equation 1, the contemporaneous trade share, $\theta_{i,j,t}$ is used (Column I). Second, instead of using the export volume sourced from exporting countries, the import volume from importing countries is used (Column II).⁹ Feenstra et al. (2005) mention that data reported by importing countries tend to be more accurate because exporting countries tend to underreport the trade value. For the PRC, goods sent to Hong Kong, China for reexport say to the US is not recorded in the PRC data, but these are recorded by the US. In addition,

⁹ The import volume is obtained by deflating a country's import value from the PRC by the 2005 US CPI. The import value is sourced from the UN Comtrade.

Ferrantino et al. (2008) find strong evidence of underreporting of PRC exports to avoid the value-added tax.

Third and fourth robustness checks comprise the inclusion of two explanatory variables which may be important in determining AD petitions: exchange rate levels (Column III),¹⁰ and retaliatory AD petitions (Column IV). Mah (2000), Irwin (2004), Jallab et al. (2006), and Zhou and Cuyvers (2009) find that exchange rate levels are an important determinant of AD actions. On the other hand, the AD petitions instigated by the PRC may also lead to retaliatory actions against the country. Prusa (2001), Sanguinetti and Bianchi (2005) and Vandebussche and Zanardi (2008), for example, find that many countries appear to file AD actions against countries that have previously investigated them or currently taking AD against them.¹¹

Overall, the results from the different robustness checks are supportive of the baseline results in Column IV, Table 6.¹² From Column I, Table 8, the baseline results are robust to using the contemporaneous trade share in the construction of chapter-specific trade costs. Note the estimated coefficients of exports with respect to *AD number* and *AD dummy* of 0.281 and 0.0034, respectively, are very close to 0.278 and 0.036, respectively, of the baseline results. In addition, in the first-stage of the regression, a one standard deviation in increase in the trade costs leads to an increase of the export volume by 193 percentage points. Again this is close to the 164.5 percentage points increase recorded in the baseline results.

From Column II, Table 8, if the export volume is recorded from the importing countries' perspective, the impact on AD activities are slightly greater: 0.345 for *AD number*, and 0.044 for *AD dummy*. These estimates are slightly greater than the benchmark results reported in Table 6 (Column IV, also using the three instruments), and hence are consistent with the a priori that the export numbers recorded by importing countries tend to be greater, which implies larger estimated coefficients.

Likewise from Columns III (exchange rate) and IV (petitions by the PRC), the second-stage and first-stage results are very close to the baseline numbers. From Column III, the estimated coefficient of trade to *AD number* is 0.278, and to *AD dummy* is 0.035; while from Column IV, there are 0.289, and 0.036, respectively. (Baseline results are 0.278 and 0.036, respectively.) Again, a one standard deviation in the trade costs increase export volume by 163.2 percentage points in Column III, and 169.9 percentage points in Column IV, which is close to the 164.5 percentage points in the baseline result.

¹⁰ Annual average exchange rates are obtained from the UNCTAD online database: <http://unctadstat.unctad.org/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx>. The local currency to the US dollar rate is used given that the bulk of international trade is carried in US dollar. Bank for International Settlements (2013) identifies that over 80% of daily foreign exchange turnover involves the US dollar.

¹¹ We use a dummy to measure whether a country has previously instigated AD petitions. If a country that has previously instigated or currently taking AD petition against the PRC, the dummy will take on a value of one, otherwise, zero.

¹² This refers to the second-stage results where DocumentsIV, TimeIV, and ContainerIV, are all included as instruments.

4. Conclusions

This paper quantifies the impact of the PRC's exports on the AD petitions filed against the country from 2006 to 2010, which coincide with the period of the global financial crisis, when AD petitions are more rampant. The PRC is an obvious focus, besides being the largest exporter in the world, it is also the country that receives the most AD petitions accounting for about 40% of the total number AD petitions filed by its major trade partners.

Based on the World Bank's *Doing Business* project, this study uses documents required, time taken, and container cost incurred when goods are traded across borders as instruments for export volume. It finds export volume to have a positive and statistically significant impact on AD petitions. Specifically, a unit rise in the PRC's export volume leads to an approximately 0.3 percentage point increase in the number of AD petitions against the PRC, and a 3.6 % chance of receiving an AD petition. These results are robust to differences in the construction of the instrument variables, and the definition of export volume, as well as the inclusion of additional explanatory variables. More important, these results are 10 times larger than the OLS estimates that ignore the endogeneity issue.

These results point to several policy implications. First, the magnitude by which a country (in this case, the PRC) faces AD petitions is actually much higher than the conventional OLS measure. This implies a big exporting country is likely to face a larger number of AD petitions than commonly thought. Second, since it is the exporting country that faces AD petitions, it is the exporting country that will be particularly disadvantaged by the inadequacy of the current trade statistics that fail to properly account for the prevalence of production fragmentations in international trade. In such an environment, it is the exporting country of final goods that is landed with the AD petitions even when various components of the final products—often higher value-added ones—are made in many other countries. The role of the exporting country is mainly that of lower value-added activity of assembling the components into final products for exports. The PRC stands out because half of its manufacturing exports are produced by processing plants that assemble imported parts and components into final goods for export (Feenstra and Hanson 2005). In addition, within export processing plants, especially those labeled as relatively sophisticated electronic devices, domestic value-added as a share of total exports is only about 30 % or less (Koopman et al., 2012). Third, the weakness of the current trade statistics, that fail to properly account for a country true value-added, presents an important policy role for international organizations. In this regard, given the absence of direct commercial and national interests, but a common world interest, international organizations should regularly convey in various regional and international the economic fallacy of using AD petitions against another country.

References

- Bank for International Settlements. 2013. *Triennial Central Bank Survey*. September.
- C.P. Bown. 2012. Global Antidumping Database. Available at <http://econ.worldbank.org/ttbd/gad/>
- C.P. Bown, and M. Crowley. 2010. [The People's Republic of] China's Export Growth and the [the People's Republic of China] Safeguard: Threats to the World Trading System? *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*. 5291.
- C.P. Bown and P. Tovar. 2011. Trade Liberalization, Antidumping, and Safeguards: Evidence from India's Tariff Reform. *Journal of Development Economics*. 96(1). pp. 115–125.
- A. Deaton. 2005. Measuring Poverty in a Growing World. *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 87(1). pp. 1–19.
- J.P. Durling and T.J. Prusa. 2006. The Trade Effects Associated with an Antidumping Epidemic: The Hot-Rolled Steel Market. *European Journal of Political Economy*. 22(3). pp. 675–695.
- R.C. Feenstra and G.H. Hanson. 2005. Ownership and Control in Outsourcing to [the People's Republic of] China: Estimating The Property Rights Theory of the firm. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 120(2). pp. 729–762.
- R.C. Feenstra, R.E. Lipsey, H. Deng, A.C. Ma, and H. Mo. 2005. World Trade Flows: 1962–2000. *NBER Working Paper*. 11040.
- R.M. Feinberg. 2005. U.S. Antidumping Enforcement and Macroeconomic Indicators Revisited: Do Petitioners Learn? *Review of World Economics*. 141(4). pp. 613–622.
- M. Ferrantino, X. Liu, and Z. Wang. 2008. Avoidance Behaviors of Exporters and Importers: Evidence from the US–[the People's Republic of] China Trade Data Discrepancy. *US International Trade Commission Working Paper*. 2008–09–B.
- M.J. Finger. 1993. The Origins and Evolution of Antidumping Regulation. In M.J. Finger (ed.) *Antidumping: How It Works and Who Gets Hurt*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- B. Ganguli. 2008. The Trade Effects of Indian Antidumping Actions. *Review of International Economics*. 16(5). pp. 930–941.
- G. Georgiadis and J. Gräß. 2013. Growth, Real Exchange Rates and Trade Protectionism Since the Financial Crisis. *European Central Bank Working Paper*. 1618.
- G.H. Hanson. 2012. The Rise of Middle Kingdoms: Emerging Economies in Global Trade. *NBER Working Paper*. 17961.

- R. Hillberry and P. McCalman. 2011. What Triggers an Antidumping Petition? Finding the Devil in the Detail. *Forum for Research in Empirical International Trade Working Paper*. 296.
- D. Irwin. 2004. The Rise of US Antidumping Actions in Historical Perspective. *NBER Working Paper*. 10582.
- M.S. Jallab, R. Sandretto, and M. Gbakou. 2006. Antidumping Procedures and Macroeconomic Factors: A Comparison between the US and the European Union. *Global Economy Journal*. 6(3). pp. 1–20.
- M.M. Knetter and T.J. Prusa. 2003. Macroeconomic Factors and Antidumping Filings: Evidence from Four Countries. *Journal of International Economics*. 61(1). pp.1–17.
- R. Koopman, Z. Wang, and S.J. Wei. 2012. Estimating Domestic Content in Exports when Processing Trade is Pervasive. *Journal of Development Economics*. 99(1). pp. 178–189.
- M.P. Leidy. 1997. Macroeconomic Conditions and Pressures for Protection under Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws: Empirical Evidence from the US. *IMF Staff Papers*. 44(1). pp.132–144.
- D.M. Leipziger and H. Shin. 1991. The Demand for Protection: A Look at Antidumping Cases. *Open Economies Review*. 2(1). pp.27–38.
- F.Q. Lin and N.C. Sim. 2013. Trade, Income and Baltic Dry Index. *European Economic Review*. 59. pp. 1–18.
- J.S. Mah. 1999. US Antidumping Decisions against the ASEAN countries. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*. 16(1). pp.18–27.
- . 2000. Antidumping Decisions and Macroeconomic Variables in the US. *Applied Economics*. 32(13). pp.1701–1709.
- G. Niels. 2003. Trade Diversion and Destruction Effects of Antidumping Policy: Empirical Evidence from Mexico. Mimeo.
- T.J. Prusa. 2001. On the Spread and Impact of Antidumping. *Canadian Journal of Economics*. 34(3). pp. 592–611.
- T.J. Prusa and S. Skeath. 2002. The Economic and Strategic Motives for Antidumping Filings. *Review of World Economics*. 138(3). pp. 390–413.
- P. Sanguinetti and E. Bianchi. 2005. Trade Liberalization, Macroeconomic Fluctuations and Contingent Protection in Latin America. *Economia*. 6(2). pp. 83–147.
- D. Staiger and J.H. Stock. 1997. Instrumental Variables Regression with Weak Instruments. *Econometrica*. 65(3). pp. 557–586.

- R.W. Staiger and F.A. Wolak. 1994. Measuring Industry Specific Protection: Antidumping in the United States. *NBER Working Paper*. 4696.
- H. Vandebussche and M. Zanardi. 2006. The Global Chilling Effects of Antidumping Proliferation. *CEPR Discussion Paper*. 5597.
- W. Zhou and L. Cuyvers. 2009. Determinants of EU Antidumping Actions against East Asian Countries. *Journal of International Trade Law and Policy*. 8(3). pp. 291–305.

Table 1. Antidumping Investigations by the People's Republic of China (PRC)'s Major Trading Partners from 2006 to 2010

Major Trading Partners of the PRC	Total	Investigations on the PRC	Share of the PRC
Australia	34	10	29.4
Canada	19	10	52.6
European Union	93	43	46.2
United States	78	47	60.3
Argentina	80	33	41.3
Brazil	96	31	32.3
Colombia	28	21	75.0
Indonesia	31	6	19.4
India	202	59	29.2
Korea, Republic of	30	7	23.3
Mexico	14	10	71.4
Peru	12	4	33.3
Turkey	45	21	46.7
South Africa	15	8	53.3
Total	777	310	39.9

Notes: The countries are the 29 major trading partners of the People's Republic of China, including 16 countries in the EU, which are Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

Source: Bown (2012).

Table 2. Antidumping Information against the People's Republic of China by Section at 2-digit HS Code from 2006 to 2010

Major Trading Partners of the PRC	Section													Total
	4	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	15	16	17	18	20	
Australia	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	10
Canada	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	1	0	0	1	10
EU	1	9	2	1	1	1	0	3	13	7	3	1	1	43
United States	0	11	2	1	3	4	0	1	16	6	0	0	3	47
Argentina	0	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	8	8	2	2	2	33
Brazil	0	2	4	0	0	5	1	2	4	4	1	3	5	31
Colombia	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	21
Indonesia	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	6
India	0	25	5	1	0	3	0	3	6	12	4	0	0	59
Korea, Rep. of	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	1	0	0	2	10
Peru	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Turkey	0	1	2	2	0	8	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	21
South Africa	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	8
Total	2	56	19	7	7	40	5	18	81	44	11	6	14	310

Notes: Only information on 13 sections is included. There is no antidumping information on the other nine sections. Section 1 refers to live animals, animal products; 2, vegetable products; 3, animal or vegetable fats and oils and their cleavage products, etc.; 4, prepared foodstuffs, beverages, spirits and vinegar, tobacco, etc.; 5, mineral products; 6, products of the chemical or industries allied; 7, plastics and articles thereof rubber and articles thereof; 8, raw hides and skins, leather, fur skins and articles thereof, etc.; 9, wood and articles of wood, wood charcoal, cork and articles of cork, etc.; 10, pulp of wood or of other fibrous cellulosic material, paperboard, etc.; 11, textiles and textile articles; 12, footwear, headgear, umbrellas, sun umbrellas, walking-sticks, seat-sticks, etc.; 13, articles of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos, mica or similar materials, etc.; 14, natural or cultured pearls, precious or semi-precious stones, precious metals, etc.; 15, base metals and articles of base metal; 16, machinery and mechanical appliances, electrical equipment, etc.; 17, vehicles, aircraft, vessels and associated transport equipment; 18, optical, photographic, cinematographic, measuring, checking, etc.; 19, arms and ammunition; parts and accessories thereof; 20, miscellaneous manufactured articles; 21, works of art, collectors pieces and antiques; 22, commodities and transactions not classified according to kind.

Source: Bown (2012).

Table 3. Summary Statistics

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
<i>AD number</i>	11,400	0.356	2.518	0	14
<i>AD dummy</i>	11,400	0.067	0.249	0	1
Trade share	10,998	0.013	0.043	2.81e-10	0.969
<i>Exports</i>	10,998	16.397	3.059	0	25.034
<i>Documents</i>	11,316	1.673	0.346	0.693	2.565
<i>Time</i>	11,316	2.540	0.576	1.609	3.871
<i>Container</i>	11,316	6.992	0.294	6.402	7.626
<i>DocumentsIV</i>	10,950	1.656	0.350	0.0425	2.565
<i>TimeIV</i>	10,950	2.515	0.577	0.055	3.871
<i>ContainerIV</i>	10,950	6.902	0.412	0.222	7.626

AD=antidumping, Obs. = observation, Std. Dev. = standard deviation, Min = minimum, Max = maximum.

Notes: *AD number* refers to the number of AD petitions filed in a chapter by a country in each year from 2006 to 2010. *AD dummy* refers to the case where a country files an AD petition in a chapter in a year. and takes on a value of one, otherwise, zero. Trade share is the ratio of a country import of chapter *i* goods from the PRC over its total imports from the PRC. *Exports* are in real or volume terms derived as the log of nominal exports deflated by the US CPI. *Documents* refer to the log of the number of documents required per shipment to import goods into a country. *Time* refers to the log of the number of days calculated for a procedure (trade contract) that is initiated until it is completed. *Container* refers to the log of the fees levied on a 20-foot container in US dollar. *DocumentsIV*, *TimeIV*, and *ContainerIV*, are derived from the multiplication of each trade share with *Documents*, *Time*, and *Container*, respectively.

Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 4. Ordinary Least Squares Regression: Antidumping Petitions on Exports

	<i>AD Number</i>			<i>AD Dummy</i>		
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
<i>Exports</i>	0.0945*** (0.0112)	0.101*** (0.0142)	0.0111 (0.0121)	0.0260** (0.0130)	0.0212** (0.0102)	0.00450*** (0.00119)
Section	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter×Country	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
n	10,998	10,998	10,998	10,998	10,998	10,998
R ²	0.013	0.041	0.772	0.779	0.780	0.849

AD=Antidumping.

Notes: *AD Number*, *AD Dummy*, and *Exports* are defined as per the note to Table 3. Robust standard errors are reported in the parentheses. Statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels are indicated by *, **, and *** respectively.

Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 5. Reduced Form Regression: Antidumping Petitions on Instrumental Variables

	<i>AD Number</i>				<i>AD Dummy</i>			
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
<i>DocumentsIV</i>	-0.343*** (0.109)			-0.165 (0.121)	-0.039** (-0.018)			-0.0065 (0.019)
<i>TimeIV</i>		-0.534*** (0.171)		0.120 (0.204)		-0.083*** (0.021)		0.0001 (0.023)
<i>ContainerIV</i>			-0.960*** (0.224)	-0.997*** (-0.242)			-0.124*** (0.028)	-0.123*** (-0.030)
Section	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter×Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	10,950	10,950	10,950	10,950	10,950	10,950	10,950	10,950
R ²	0.780	0.780	0.780	0.780	0.846	0.846	0.846	0.820

AD=Antidumping.

Notes: *AD number*, *AD dummy*, *DocumentsIV*, *TimeIV*, and *ContainerIV*, are defined as per the note to Table 3. Robust standard errors are reported in the parentheses. Statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels are indicated by *, ** and *** respectively.

Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 6. Two-Stage Least Squares: Antidumping Petitions on Exports

	I	II	III	IV
Second Stage				
Dependent Variable: <i>AD Number</i>				
<i>Exports</i>	0.270*** (0.086)	0.204*** (0.064)	0.282*** (0.048)	0.278*** (0.047)
R ²	0.780	0.776	0.779	0.780
Dependent Variable: <i>AD Dummy</i>				
<i>Exports</i>	0.030** (0.014)	0.032*** (0.008)	0.036*** (0.006)	0.036*** (0.006)
R ²	0.843	0.846	0.844	0.845
First Stage				
Dependent Variable: <i>Exports</i>				
<i>DocumentsIV</i>	-1.269*** (0.144)			-0.266* (0.148)
<i>TimeIV</i>		-2.613*** (0.154)		-0.374* (0.207)
<i>ContainerIV</i>			-3.409*** (0.367)	-3.242*** (0.388)
Section	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter×Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	10,950	10,950	10,950	10,950
IV- F-statistics	420	457	312	300
R ²	0.908	0.910	0.916	0.916

AD=Antidumping.

Notes: *AD Number*, *AD Dummy*, *Exports*, *DocumentsIV*, *TimeIV*, and *ContainerIV*, are defined as per the note to Table 3. IV-F-statistics is the first-stage weak instrument F-statistics. Robust standard errors are reported in the parenthesis. Statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels are indicated by *, ** and *** respectively.

Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 7. Two-Stage Least Squares (Additional Results): Antidumping Petitions on Exports

	Developed	Developing	Asian	Cluster	Others
Second Stage					
Dependent Variable: <i>AD Number</i>					
<i>Exports</i>	0.348*** (0.070)	0.215*** (0.054)	0.614** (0.304)	0.376*** (0.072)	0.076*** (0.023)
R ²	0.780	0.776	0.817	0.779	0.780
Dependent Variable: <i>AD Dummy</i>					
<i>Exports</i>	0.035*** (0.008)	0.039*** (0.008)	0.108*** (0.039)	0.042*** (0.009)	0.024*** (0.005)
R ²	0.941	0.725	0.805	0.894	0.763
First Stage					
Dependent Variable: <i>Exports</i>					
<i>DocumentsIV</i>	1.014*** (0.305)	0.595** (0.260)	0.298* (0.170)	-0.066 (0.221)	-0.685*** (0.184)
<i>TimeIV</i>	-4.382*** (0.728)	0.329 (0.223)	-0.129 (0.234)	-0.498* (0.285)	0.027 (0.240)
<i>ContainerIV</i>	-2.419*** (0.527)	-4.014*** (0.465)	-1.667*** (0.231)	-2.678*** (0.373)	-5.697*** (0.294)
Section	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter×Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	6,599	4,351	1,437	5,367	5,583
IV- F-statistics	286	145	203	150	227
R ²	0.953	0.926	0.804	0.932	0.915

AD=Antidumping.

Notes *AD Number*, *AD Dummy*, *Exports*, *DocumentsIV*, *TimeIV*, and *ContainerIV*, are defined as per the note to Table 3. IV-F-statistics is the first-stage weak instrument F-statistics. Robust standard errors are reported in the parenthesis. Statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels are indicated by *, **, and *** respectively.

Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 8. Two-Stage Least Squares (Robustness Checks): Antidumping Petitions on Export

	I	II	III	IV
Second Stage				
Dependent Variable: <i>AD Number</i>				
<i>Exports</i>	0.281*** (0.048)	0.345*** (0.055)	0.278*** (0.047)	0.289*** (0.049)
R ²	0.779	0.784	0.780	0.780
Dependent Variable: <i>AD Dummy</i>				
<i>Exports</i>	0.034*** (0.006)	0.044*** (0.007)	0.036*** (0.006)	0.035*** (0.006)
R ²	0.838	0.850	0.845	0.846
First Stage				
Dependent Variable: <i>Exports</i>				
<i>DocumentsIV</i>	-0.382*** (0.147)	-0.090 (0.129)	-0.291** (0.150)	-0.252* (0.147)
<i>TimeIV</i>	-1.077*** (0.171)	-0.529*** (0.207)	-0.321 (0.215)	-0.485** (0.213)
<i>ContainerIV</i>	-2.851*** (0.327)	-2.500*** (0.426)	-3.264*** (0.394)	-3.224*** (0.389)
Section	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter×Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chapter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
n	10,950	10,492	10,950	10,950
IV- F-statistics	317	345	294	294
R ²	0.912	0.934	0.916	0.916

AD=Antidumping.

Note: *AD Number*, *AD Dummy*, *Exports*, *DocumentsIV*, *TimeIV*, and *ContainerIV*, are defined as per the note to Table 3. IV-F-statistics is the first-stage weak instrument F-statistics. Robust standard errors are reported in the parenthesis. Statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels are indicated by *, ** and *** respectively.

Source: Authors' calculations.

ADB Working Paper Series on Regional Economic Integration *

1. “The ASEAN Economic Community and the European Experience”
by Michael G. Plummer
2. “Economic Integration in East Asia: Trends, Prospects, and a Possible Roadmap”
by Pradumna B. Rana
3. “Central Asia after Fifteen Years of Transition: Growth, Regional Cooperation,
and Policy Choices” by Malcolm Dowling and Ganeshan Wignaraja
4. “Global Imbalances and the Asian Economies: Implications for Regional
Cooperation” by Barry Eichengreen
5. “Toward Win-Win Regionalism in Asia: Issues and Challenges in Forming
Efficient Trade Agreements” by Michael G. Plummer
6. “Liberalizing Cross-Border Capital Flows: How Effective Are Institutional
Arrangements against Crisis in Southeast Asia” by Alfred Steinherr, Alessandro
Cisotta, Erik Klär, and Kenan Šehović
7. “Managing the Noodle Bowl: The Fragility of East Asian Regionalism”
by Richard E. Baldwin
8. “Measuring Regional Market Integration in Developing Asia: A Dynamic Factor
Error Correction Model (DF-ECM) Approach” by Duo Qin, Marie Anne Cagas,
Geoffrey Ducanes, Nedelyn Magtibay-Ramos, and Pilipinas F. Quising
9. “The Post-Crisis Sequencing of Economic Integration in Asia: Trade as a
Complement to a Monetary Future” by Michael G. Plummer and Ganeshan
Wignaraja
10. “Trade Intensity and Business Cycle Synchronization: The Case of East Asia”
by Pradumna B. Rana
11. “Inequality and Growth Revisited” by Robert J. Barro
12. “Securitization in East Asia” by Paul Lejot, Douglas Arner, and Lotte Schou-
Zibell
13. “Patterns and Determinants of Cross-border Financial Asset Holdings in East
Asia” by Jong-Wha Lee
14. “Regionalism as an Engine of Multilateralism: A Case for a Single East Asian
FTA” by Masahiro Kawai and Ganeshan Wignaraja

15. “The Impact of Capital Inflows on Emerging East Asian Economies: Is Too Much Money Chasing Too Little Good?” by Soyoung Kim and Doo Yong Yang
16. “Emerging East Asian Banking Systems Ten Years after the 1997/98 Crisis” by Charles Adams
17. “Real and Financial Integration in East Asia” by Soyoung Kim and Jong-Wha Lee
18. “Global Financial Turmoil: Impact and Challenges for Asia’s Financial Systems” by Jong-Wha Lee and Cyn-Young Park
19. “Cambodia’s Persistent Dollarization: Causes and Policy Options” by Jayant Menon
20. “Welfare Implications of International Financial Integration” by Jong-Wha Lee and Kwanho Shin
21. “Is the ASEAN-Korea Free Trade Area (AKFTA) an Optimal Free Trade Area?” by Donghyun Park, Innwon Park, and Gemma Esther B. Estrada
22. “India’s Bond Market—Developments and Challenges Ahead” by Stephen Wells and Lotte Schou- Zibell
23. “Commodity Prices and Monetary Policy in Emerging East Asia” by Hsiao Chink Tang
24. “Does Trade Integration Contribute to Peace?” by Jong-Wha Lee and Ju Hyun Pyun
25. “Aging in Asia: Trends, Impacts, and Responses” by Jayant Menon and Anna Melendez-Nakamura
26. “Re-considering Asian Financial Regionalism in the 1990s” by Shintaro Hamanaka
27. “Managing Success in Viet Nam: Macroeconomic Consequences of Large Capital Inflows with Limited Policy Tools” by Jayant Menon
28. “The Building Block versus Stumbling Block Debate of Regionalism: From the Perspective of Service Trade Liberalization in Asia” by Shintaro Hamanaka
29. “East Asian and European Economic Integration: A Comparative Analysis” by Giovanni Capannelli and Carlo Filippini
30. “Promoting Trade and Investment in India’s Northeastern Region” by M. Govinda Rao

31. “Emerging Asia: Decoupling or Recoupling” by Soyoung Kim, Jong-Wha Lee, and Cyn-Young Park
32. “India’s Role in South Asia Trade and Investment Integration” by Rajiv Kumar and Manjeeta Singh
33. “Developing Indicators for Regional Economic Integration and Cooperation” by Giovanni Capannelli, Jong-Wha Lee, and Peter Petri
34. “Beyond the Crisis: Financial Regulatory Reform in Emerging Asia” by Chee Sung Lee and Cyn-Young Park
35. “Regional Economic Impacts of Cross-Border Infrastructure: A General Equilibrium Application to Thailand and Lao People’s Democratic Republic” by Peter Warr, Jayant Menon, and Arief Anshory Yusuf
36. “Exchange Rate Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region and the Global Financial Crisis” by Warwick J. McKibbin and Waranya Pim Chanthapun
37. “Roads for Asian Integration: Measuring ADB’s Contribution to the Asian Highway Network” by Srinivasa Madhur, Ganeshan Wignaraja, and Peter Darjes
38. “The Financial Crisis and Money Markets in Emerging Asia” by Robert Rigg and Lotte Schou-Zibell
39. “Complements or Substitutes? Preferential and Multilateral Trade Liberalization at the Sectoral Level” by Mitsuyo Ando, Antoni Esteveordal, and Christian Volpe Martincus
40. “Regulatory Reforms for Improving the Business Environment in Selected Asian Economies—How Monitoring and Comparative Benchmarking can Provide Incentive for Reform” by Lotte Schou-Zibell and Srinivasa Madhur
41. “Global Production Sharing, Trade Patterns, and Determinants of Trade Flows in East Asia” by Prema-chandra Athukorala and Jayant Menon
42. “Regionalism Cycle in Asia (-Pacific): A Game Theory Approach to the Rise and Fall of Asian Regional Institutions” by Shintaro Hamanaka
43. “A Macroprudential Framework for Monitoring and Examining Financial Soundness” by Lotte Schou-Zibell, Jose Ramon Albert, and Lei Lei Song
44. “A Macroprudential Framework for the Early Detection of Banking Problems in Emerging Economies” by Claudio Loser, Miguel Kiguel, and David Mermelstein
45. “The 2008 Financial Crisis and Potential Output in Asia: Impact and Policy Implications” by Cyn-Young Park, Ruperto Majuca, and Josef Yap

46. “Do Hub-and-Spoke Free Trade Agreements Increase Trade? A Panel Data Analysis” by Jung Hur, Joseph Alba, and Donghyun Park
47. “Does a Leapfrogging Growth Strategy Raise Growth Rate? Some International Evidence” by Zhi Wang, Shang-Jin Wei, and Anna Wong
48. “Crises in Asia: Recovery and Policy Responses” by Kiseok Hong and Hsiao Chink Tang
49. “A New Multi-Dimensional Framework for Analyzing Regional Integration: Regional Integration Evaluation (RIE) Methodology” by Donghyun Park and Mario Arturo Ruiz Estrada
50. “Regional Surveillance for East Asia: How Can It Be Designed to Complement Global Surveillance?” by Shinji Takagi
51. “Poverty Impacts of Government Expenditure from Natural Resource Revenues” by Peter Warr, Jayant Menon, and Arief Anshory Yusuf
52. “Methods for Ex Ante Economic Evaluation of Free Trade Agreements” by David Cheong
53. “The Role of Membership Rules in Regional Organizations” by Judith Kelley
54. “The Political Economy of Regional Cooperation in South Asia” by V.V. Desai
55. “Trade Facilitation Measures under Free Trade Agreements: Are They Discriminatory against Non-Members?” by Shintaro Hamanaka, Aiken Tafgar, and Dorothea Lazaro
56. “Production Networks and Trade Patterns in East Asia: Regionalization or Globalization?” by Prema-chandra Athukorala
57. “Global Financial Regulatory Reforms: Implications for Developing Asia” by Douglas W. Arner and Cyn-Young Park
58. “Asia’s Contribution to Global Rebalancing” by Charles Adams, Hoe Yun Jeong, and Cyn-Young Park
59. “Methods for Ex Post Economic Evaluation of Free Trade Agreements” by David Cheong
60. “Responding to the Global Financial and Economic Crisis: Meeting the Challenges in Asia” by Douglas W. Arner and Lotte Schou-Zibell
61. “Shaping New Regionalism in the Pacific Islands: Back to the Future?” by Satish Chand

62. “Organizing the Wider East Asia Region” by Christopher M. Dent
63. “Labour and Grassroots Civic Interests In Regional Institutions” by Helen E.S. Nesadurai
64. “Institutional Design of Regional Integration: Balancing Delegation and Representation” by Simon Hix
65. “Regional Judicial Institutions and Economic Cooperation: Lessons for Asia?” by Erik Voeten
66. “The Awakening Chinese Economy: Macro and Terms of Trade Impacts on 10 Major Asia-Pacific Countries” by Yin Hua Mai, Philip Adams, Peter Dixon, and Jayant Menon
67. “Institutional Parameters of a Region-Wide Economic Agreement in Asia: Examination of Trans-Pacific Partnership and ASEAN+ α Free Trade Agreement Approaches” by Shintaro Hamanaka
68. “Evolving Asian Power Balances and Alternate Conceptions for Building Regional Institutions” by Yong Wang
69. “ASEAN Economic Integration: Features, Fulfillments, Failures, and the Future” by Hal Hill and Jayant Menon
70. “Changing Impact of Fiscal Policy on Selected ASEAN Countries” by Hsiao Chink Tang, Philip Liu, and Eddie C. Cheung
71. “The Organizational Architecture of the Asia-Pacific: Insights from the New Institutionalism” by Stephan Haggard
72. “The Impact of Monetary Policy on Financial Markets in Small Open Economies: More or Less Effective During the Global Financial Crisis?” by Steven Pennings, Arief Ramayandi, and Hsiao Chink Tang
73. “What do Asian Countries Want the Seat at the High Table for? G20 as a New Global Economic Governance Forum and the Role of Asia” by Yoon Je Cho
74. “Asia’s Strategic Participation in the Group of 20 for Global Economic Governance Reform: From the Perspective of International Trade” by Taeho Bark and Moonsung Kang
75. “ASEAN’s Free Trade Agreements with the People’s Republic of China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea: A Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis” by Gemma Estrada, Donghyun Park, Innwon Park, and Soonchan Park

76. “ASEAN-5 Macroeconomic Forecasting Using a GVAR Model” by Fei Han and Thiam Hee Ng
77. “Early Warning Systems in the Republic of Korea: Experiences, Lessons, and Future Steps” by Hyungmin Jung and Hoe Yun Jeong
78. “Trade and Investment in the Greater Mekong Subregion: Remaining Challenges and the Unfinished Policy Agenda” by Jayant Menon and Anna Cassandra Melendez
79. “Financial Integration in Emerging Asia: Challenges and Prospects” by Cyn-Young Park and Jong-Wha Lee
80. “Sequencing Regionalism: Theory, European Practice, and Lessons for Asia” by Richard E. Baldwin
81. “Economic Crises and Institutions for Regional Economic Cooperation” by C. Randall Henning
82. “Asian Regional Institutions and the Possibilities for Socializing the Behavior of States” by Amitav Acharya
83. “The People’s Republic of China and India: Commercial Policies in the Giants” by Ganeshan Wignaraja
84. “What Drives Different Types of Capital Flows and Their Volatilities?” by Rogelio Mercado and Cyn-Young Park
85. “Institution Building for African Regionalism” by Gilbert M. Khadiagala
86. “Impediments to Growth of the Garment and Food Industries in Cambodia: Exploring Potential Benefits of the ASEAN-PRC FTA” by Vannarith Chheang and Shintaro Hamanaka
87. “The Role of the People’s Republic of China in International Fragmentation and Production Networks: An Empirical Investigation” by Hyun-Hoon Lee, Donghyun Park, and Jing Wang
88. “Utilizing the Multiple Mirror Technique to Assess the Quality of Cambodian Trade Statistics” by Shintaro Hamanaka
89. “Is Technical Assistance under Free Trade Agreements WTO-Plus? A Review of Japan–ASEAN Economic Partnership Agreements” by Shintaro Hamanaka
90. “Intra-Asia Exchange Rate Volatility and Intra-Asia Trade: Evidence by Type of Goods” by Hsiao Chink Tang

91. “Is Trade in Asia Really Integrating?” by Shintaro Hamanaka
92. “The PRC’s Free Trade Agreements with ASEAN, Japan, and the Republic of Korea: A Comparative Analysis” by Gemma Estrada, Donghyun Park, Innwon Park, and Soonchan Park
93. “Assessing the Resilience of ASEAN Banking Systems: The Case of the Philippines” by Jose Ramon Albert and Thiam Hee Ng
94. “Strengthening the Financial System and Mobilizing Savings to Support More Balanced Growth in ASEAN+3” by A. Noy Siackhachanh
95. ”Measuring Commodity-Level Trade Costs in Asia: The Basis for Effective Trade Facilitation Policies in the Region” by Shintaro Hamanaka and Romana Domingo
96. “Why do Imports Fall More than Exports Especially During Crises? Evidence from Selected Asian Economies” by Hsiao Chink Tang
97. “Determinants of Local Currency Bonds and Foreign Holdings: Implications for Bond Market Development in the People’s Republic of China” by Kee-Hong Bae
98. “ASEAN–China Free Trade Area and the Competitiveness of Local Industries: A Case Study of Major Industries in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic” by Leebeer Leebouapao, Sthabandith Insisienmay, and Vanthana Nolintha
99. “The Impact of ACFTA on People’s Republic of China–ASEAN Trade: Estimates Based on an Extended Gravity Model for Component Trade” by Yu Sheng, Hsiao Chink Tang, and Xinpeng Xu
100. “Narrowing the Development Divide in ASEAN: The Role of Policy” by Jayant Menon
101. “Different Types of Firms, Products, and Directions of Trade: The Case of the People’s Republic of China” by Hyun-Hoon Lee, Donghyun Park, and Jing Wang
102. “Anatomy of South–South FTAs in Asia: Comparisons with Africa, Latin America, and the Pacific Islands” by Shintaro Hamanaka
103. “Japan’s Education Services Imports: Branch Campus or Subsidiary Campus?” by Shintaro Hamanaka
104. “A New Regime of SME Finance in Emerging Asia: Empowering Growth-Oriented SMEs to Build Resilient National Economies” by Shigehiro Shinozaki

105. “Critical Review of East Asia – South America Trade ” by Shintaro Hamanaka and Aiken Tafgar
106. “The Threat of Financial Contagion to Emerging Asia’s Local Bond Markets: Spillovers from Global Crises” by Iwan J. Azis, Sabyasachi Mitra, Anthony Baluga, and Roselle Dime
107. “Hot Money Flows, Commodity Price Cycles, and Financial Repression in the US and the People’s Republic of China: The Consequences of Near Zero US Interest Rates” by Ronald McKinnon and Zhao Liu
108. “Cross-Regional Comparison of Trade Integration: The Case of Services” by Shintaro Hamanaka
109. “Preferential and Non-Preferential Approaches to Trade Liberalization in East Asia: What Differences Do Utilization Rates and Reciprocity Make?” by Jayant Menon
110. “Can Global Value Chains Effectively Serve Regional Economic Development in Asia?” by Hans-Peter Brunner
111. “Exporting and Innovation: Theory and Firm-Level Evidence from the People’s Republic of China” by Faqin Lin and Hsiao Chink Tang
112. “Supporting the Growth and Spread of International Production Networks in Asia: How Can Trade Policy Help?” by Jayant Menon
113. “On the Use of FTAs: A Review of Research Methodologies” by Shintaro Hamanaka
114. “The People’s Republic of China’s Financial Policy and Regional Cooperation in the Midst of Global Headwinds” by Iwan J. Azis
115. “The Role of International Trade in Employment Growth in Micro- and Small Enterprises: Evidence from Developing Asia” by Jens Krüger
116. “Impact of Euro Zone Financial Shocks on Southeast Asian Economies” by Jayant Menon and Thiam Hee Ng
117. “What is Economic Corridor Development and What Can It Achieve in Asia’s Subregions?” by Hans-Peter Brunner
118. “The Financial Role of East Asian Economies in Global Imbalances: An Econometric Assessment of Developments after the Global Financial Crisis” by Hyun-Hoon Lee and Donghyun Park

119. “Learning by Exporting: Evidence from India” by Apoorva Gupta, Ila Patnaik, and Ajay Shah
120. “FDI Technology Spillovers and Spatial Diffusion in the People’s Republic of China” by Mi Lin and Yum K. Kwan
121. “Capital Market Financing for SMEs: A Growing Need in Emerging Asia” by Shigehiro Shinozaki
122. “Terms of Trade, Foreign Direct Investment, and Development: A Case of Intra-Asian Kicking Away the Ladder?” by Konstantin M. Wacker, Philipp Grosskurth, and Tabea Lakemann
123. “Can Low Interest Rates be Harmful: An Assessment of the Bank Risk-Taking Channel in Asia” by Arief Ramayandi, Umang Rawat, and Hsiao Chink Tang
124. “Explaining Foreign Holdings of Asia’s Debt Securities” by Charles Yuji Horioka, Takaaki Nomoto, and Akiko Terada-Hagiwara
125. “The Nexus between Antidumping Petitions and Exports during the Global Financial Crisis: Evidence on the People’s Republic of China” by Hasmik Hovhanesian and Heghine Manasyan
126. “Enlargement of Economic Framework in Southeast Asia and Trade Flows in Lao PDR” by Sithanoxay Suvannaphakdy, Hsiao Chink Tang, and Alisa DiCaprio
127. “The End of Grand Expectations: Monetary and Financial Integration After the Crisis in Europe” by Heribert Dieter
128. “The Investment Version of the Asian Noodle Bowl: The Proliferation of International Investment Agreements (IIAs)” by Julien Chaisse and Shintaro Hamanaka
129. “Why Do Countries Enter into Preferential Agreements on Trade in Services?: Assessing the Potential for Negotiated Regulatory Convergence in Asian Services Markets” by Pierre Sauvé and Anirudh Shingal
130. “Analysis of Informal Obstacles to Cross-Border Economic Activity between Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan” by Roman Vakulchuk and Farrukh Irnazarov

*These papers can be downloaded from (ARIC) <http://aric.adb.org/archives.php?section=o&subsection=workingpapers> or (ADB) <http://www.adb.org/publications/series/regional-economic-integration-working-papers>

The Nexus between Antidumping Petitions and Exports during the Global Financial

Crisis Evidence on the People's Republic of China

This paper quantifies how the People's Republic of China's (PRC) export volume to its major trading partners during the global financial crisis affects the antidumping (AD) petitions filed by the trading partners against the PRC. The study finds that rising exports from the PRC lead to rising AD petitions against the country. These estimates are about 10 times larger than those found in ordinary least square regressions.

About the Asian Development Bank

ADB's vision is an Asia and Pacific region free of poverty. Its mission is to help its developing member countries reduce poverty and improve the quality of life of their people. Despite the region's many successes, it remains home to approximately two-thirds of the world's poor: 1.6 billion people who live on less than \$2 a day, with 733 million struggling on less than \$1.25 a day. ADB is committed to reducing poverty through inclusive economic growth, environmentally sustainable growth, and regional integration.

Based in Manila, ADB is owned by 67 members, including 48 from the region. Its main instruments for helping its developing member countries are policy dialogue, loans, equity investments, guarantees, grants, and technical assistance.



ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City

1550 Metro Manila, Philippines

www.adb.org

Publication Stock No. WPS146548

Printed in the Philippines