

Pass-through and Exposure

Gordon M. Bodnar*
The Paul H. Nitze School of Advance International Studies,
The Johns Hopkins University
1740 Massachusetts Ave NW
Washington DC 20036
202 663 7731
bodnar@jhu.edu

Bernard Dumas
INSEAD
Boulevard de Constance
77305 Fontainebleau Cedex
France
33 1 60 72 4992
bernard.dumas@insead.fr

Richard C. Marston
Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
2300 SH-DH
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6367
215 898 7626
weisscen@wharton.upenn.edu

September 2000

We would like to thank Jose Campa, George Allayannis, Michael Knetter, and participants in seminars at Dartmouth, the London School of Economics, New York University, the New York FRB, Princeton, Wharton, and the 1997 NBER Summer Institute for their comments. The paper was also presented at the 1998 AFA meetings in Chicago. Dumas acknowledges the financial support of the HEC School of Management, and Marston acknowledges the support of the George Weiss Center for International Financial Research.

* Contact author

PASS-THROUGH AND EXPOSURE

Abstract

Firms differ in the extent to which they “pass-through” changes in exchange rates into the prices they charge in foreign markets. They also differ in their “exposure” to exchange rates--the responsiveness of their profits to changes in exchange rates. Because pricing directly affects profitability, the exposure of a firm’s profits to exchange rates should be governed by many of the same firm and industry characteristics that determine the firm’s pricing behavior. This paper will develop models of firm and industry behavior, which will be used to study these closely related phenomena together.

We consider an imperfectly competitive environment where a local exporting firm competes against a foreign import-competing firm in the export market. From this specification, we derive the optimal pass-through decisions and from these determine the exchange rate exposure that would result.

The models are estimated on Japanese export industry data which combines both the price data used in pass-through studies and the financial data used in exposure studies.

JEL Classifications: F3, L1

Keywords: Pass-through, Exchange rate exposure, Industrial structure

I. INTRODUCTION

Exchange rates can have a major influence on the pricing behavior and profitability of exporting and importing firms. Firms differ in the extent to which they “pass-through” changes in exchange rates into the prices they charge in foreign markets. They also differ in their “exposure” to exchange rates--the responsiveness of their profits to changes in exchange rates. Previous papers have studied either pass-through or exposure, but none has studied these two phenomena together. Yet, because pricing directly affects profitability, the exposure of a firm’s profits to exchange rates should be governed by many of the same firm and industry characteristics that determine pricing behavior. This paper will develop models of firm and industry behavior that will be used to study these closely related phenomena together. It will also provide estimates of pass-through and exposure behavior using data from Japanese export industries.

To examine pass-through behavior and exchange rate exposure, we will model a firm with sales to a foreign export market. This exporting firm will compete with a foreign firm in that export market. The costs of the exporting firm are based primarily in the local (domestic) currency, while the foreign firm has only foreign currency costs. Thus, changes in exchange rates will affect the relative competitiveness of the two firms’ products.

Industries typically differ in a number of dimensions such as the substitutability between their products, their dependence on imported inputs, their relative marginal costs of production, and the form of competition between firms in the industry. We will specify demand behavior that allows for a wide degree of substitutability between products as well as a variety of relative cost structures between a local exporting firm and competing firms in the foreign market. The form of competition between firms may significantly affect pricing and profitability. We will study industry behavior under both quantity competition and price competition.

In the empirical section of the paper, we will estimate equations for export prices and profits simultaneously. The equation specification will be directly based on the theoretical model of the exporting firm, although we will modify that model by adding a domestic market for the exporting firm. We will estimate the model using Japanese price and share price data. Eight Japanese industries will be studied, all of them major exporters. One goal of the investigation will be to determine whether exposures observed in the stock market are in line with model prediction or are, for instance, too small to be rationalized by the model.

Section II of the paper reviews the literatures on pass-through and exposure. Section III of the paper describes the basic duopoly model that we use as a workhorse. Section IV lays down a simple framework for the comparison of pass through and exposure across industries. Section V explains the data. Section VI describes the empirical methodology and gives the empirical results. Section VII concludes.

II. BRIEF LITERATURE REVIEW

Most previous studies of *pass-through* have been empirically oriented. Pass-through behavior has been studied extensively using export and import price data from the United States, Japan, Germany, and other countries. Some studies such as Mann (1986), Feenstra (1989), and Ohno (1989) examine the adjustment of export or import prices to exchange rate changes after taking into account any changes in marginal costs. Others studies such as Krugman (1987), Marston (1990), and Knetter (1989, 1993) examine “pricing to market”, the variation of export

prices relative to the domestic prices of the same producers.¹ Most of these studies are based implicitly on a model of a monopoly firm with no strategic behavior relative to its competitors. Dornbusch (1987), Krugman (1987), Froot and Klemperer (1989), Feenstra, Gagnon and Knetter (1996) and Yang (1997), however, analyze pricing behavior under various types of oligopoly. We would like to extend their analysis by considering the profits as well as the price behavior of firms producing similar, but not identical products.

Most previous studies of *exchange rate exposure* such as Adler and Dumas (1984), Hekman (1985), Shapiro (1975), Flood and Lessard (1986), von Ungern-Sternberg and von Weizsacker (1990), Levi (1994), and Marston (1996) have investigated exposure in theoretical models of firm behavior. None of these studies have attempted to provide empirical estimates of their models. Empirical papers on exchange rate exposures (Jorion (1990), Bodnar and Gentry (1993), Griffin and Stulz (1997), and He and Ng (1998)) report estimates of exposure elasticities using share price data in place of direct measures of profits, but these estimates do not constitute direct tests of specific models of exposure. Campa and Goldberg (1995) and Allayannis and Ihrig (1997) examine the relation between exposure elasticities and industry structure. However, papers examining exchange rate exposure have rarely analyzed pricing behavior even though the extent of pass-through undoubtedly affects the profitability of a firm, and therefore affects the exchange rate exposure of that firm. This study will specify a theoretical model of exchange rate exposure that explicitly incorporates optimal export pricing behavior, and will provide direct estimates of this structural model. Most empirical studies measuring exposures on stock market data tend to conclude that exposures seem excessively small or, in other words, that the stock market may not recognize the extent to which firms are involved in exchange-rate sensitive activities. This point is made, in particular, by Griffin and Stulz (1997). None of these studies are based on an explicit model of firm-level behavior, however, so it is difficult to assess whether estimated exposures are too small or too large. A byproduct of our investigation will be to provide a benchmark for judging the size of the exposure coefficients.

Researchers in the area of Industrial Organization have estimated models that are in many ways similar to the ones we estimate in the present paper. A recent survey by Slade (1995) distinguishes static vs. dynamic games. Our paper belongs obviously in the category of static games. That is, the players play only once and simultaneously so; furthermore, the decisions of each player are one-period in nature. A further classification concerns the type of goods considered: differentiated or homogenous. We assume that goods are differentiated although we allow the degree of substitutability to vary. In that subcategory, the survey paper lists three published papers.² All three papers discuss and estimate the degree of (tacit) collusion between firms, a task which we do not undertake here: we assume that exporting and foreign firms do not collude in the foreign market. One of these papers (Slade (1986)) empirically tests the first-order condition of the firm whereas the other two empirically fit the price and quantity behaviors that are implied by the theory. All three papers rely on more types of data than are available to us. In

¹ For a recent survey of this literature, see Goldberg and Knetter (1996).

² These are: Slade (1986) which studies the gasoline distribution market in one area of Vancouver, Bresnahan (1987) which considers the US automobile market in 1954, 1955 and 1965, and Gasmi *et al.* (1992) which analyzes the soft-drink market. A fourth study by Brander and Zhang concerning the airline industry is apparently misclassified by Slade as it truly concerns a homogenous product.

particular, in contrast to these studies we use only price data and do not use quantity variables.³ Finally, we consider here only prices or quantities as the decision variables in the duopoly game whereas Gasmi *et al.* (1992) also include the level of advertising expenditure. While the research in the area of Industrial Organization makes use of cost data to explain pricing strategy, we, instead, make use of profit data (represented by stock prices) and attempt to establish a relationship with prices of goods.

III. BASIC MODEL SETUP

A. Demand behavior

Since the currency pass-through and exchange rate exposure are both dependent on the degree of substitutability between the export goods and those produced locally in the foreign market, we would like to start with a framework that allows the degree of substitutability to vary. One utility function, which permits variation in the degree of substitutability between these products, is the CES function, which has the form:

$$(1) \quad U(X_1, X_2) = [\alpha X_1^\rho + (1 - \alpha) X_2^\rho]^{1/\rho}$$

where: $U(\cdot)$ is the utility function of the consumers in the foreign market

X_1 is the quantity of the exporting firm's product sold in the foreign market

X_2 is the quantity of the foreign import-competing firm's product sold in the foreign market

α is a preference weighting parameter

ρ is a parameter measuring the substitutability between these products.

This utility function is similar to that used by Dixit and Stiglitz (1977) in their study of imperfect competition.⁴

As in the case of the CES production function, ρ is related to the elasticity of substitution, σ , by the relationship $\sigma = 1 / (\rho - 1)$. As ρ approaches 1, substitutability becomes perfect (i.e., $\sigma \rightarrow -\infty$). At the other extreme, the two goods remain substitutes (so that demands are positively related to the price of the other good) as long as $\rho > 0$. So we will assume that $0 < \rho < 1$ and, therefore, that $-\infty < \sigma < -1$. We will use this utility function as the basis for our models of an exporting firm's behavior under both quantity and price competition assumptions.

The demand functions for the two products relate prices in the currency of the export market, P_1 and P_2 , to outputs as follows:⁵

$$(2a) \quad P_1 = D_1(X_1, X_2) = \frac{\alpha X_1^{(\rho-1)} Y}{[\alpha X_1^\rho + (1 - \alpha) X_2^\rho]}$$

$$(2b) \quad P_2 = D_2(X_1, X_2) = \frac{(1 - \alpha) X_2^{(\rho-1)} Y}{[\alpha X_1^\rho + (1 - \alpha) X_2^\rho]}$$

³ Slade (1986) also uses data on marginal cost.

⁴ Previous papers in the pass-through literature that use a similar specification include Feenstra, Gagnon, and Knetter (1996) and Yang (1997).

⁵ The quantity competition model is more conveniently solved using inverse, rather than direct demand functions (the latter of which relate output to prices in the two markets).

where Y equals total expenditure on this industry's products.⁶ The own and cross price derivatives of these demand functions are negative (i.e., $D_{ii} < 0$ and $D_{ij} < 0$), which means that increases in outputs of either good lead to declines in price.

The market shares of the exporting firm and foreign import-competing firm will play a central role in the analysis. Define λ as the market share of the exporting firm in the foreign market. Using (2a), this market share can be written as:

$$(3) \quad \lambda = \frac{P_1 X_1}{Y} = \frac{\alpha X_1^\rho}{\alpha X_1^\rho + (1-\alpha) X_2^\rho}$$

The share of the foreign good in its own market is then given by $(1 - \lambda)$. Unless otherwise stated, we assume that both firms sell in the foreign market, so $0 < \lambda < 1$.

Using these expressions for market shares, we can express the partial elasticities of demand as functions of ρ and λ as follows:

$$(4) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial P_1 / \partial X_1}{P_1 / X_1} & \frac{\partial P_1 / \partial X_2}{P_1 / X_2} \\ \frac{\partial P_2 / \partial X_1}{P_2 / X_1} & \frac{\partial P_2 / \partial X_2}{P_2 / X_2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho(1-\lambda)-1 & -\rho(1-\lambda) \\ -\rho\lambda & \rho\lambda-1 \end{bmatrix},$$

or, by matrix inversion:

$$(5) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial X_1 / \partial P_1}{X_1 / P_1} & \frac{\partial X_1 / \partial P_2}{X_1 / P_2} \\ \frac{\partial X_2 / \partial P_1}{X_2 / P_1} & \frac{\partial X_2 / \partial P_2}{X_2 / P_2} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{1-\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \rho\lambda-1 & \rho(1-\lambda) \\ \rho\lambda & \rho(1-\lambda)-1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the market share of the exporter in the foreign market is assumed to lie between zero and one, a rise in product substitutability (higher ρ) raises (the absolute value of) these price elasticities.

B. Firms' profits

Recall that firm 1 is the exporting firm whose production is based in its home country, while firm 2 is the foreign import-competing firm with sales only in the foreign market.

Exchange rate exposure is going to be measured with respect to a firm's own currency, so we define each firm's profits measured in its own currency. First, define the exchange rate, S , as the price of the foreign currency in units of the exporting firm's home currency. (So, if Japan is the exporter and the dollar is the currency of the foreign market, then the exchange rate is measured in yen/dollar). The exporting firm is assumed to produce its product using inputs from its home market as well as imports from abroad. So its total costs can be written $(C_1^* + S C_1) \cdot X_1$ where C_1^* (C_1) is the marginal cost of the exporting firm in its home (foreign) currency. Note that the stars are used to denote home currency amounts.⁷ The profit of the exporting firm in its home currency is given as:

$$(6) \quad \pi_1^* = S P_1 X_1 - (C_1^* + S C_1) X_1.$$

⁶ Thus we assume that this industry's product is weakly separable from all other goods in the consumer's utility function. See Varian (1984 pp. 148-149).

⁷ Since the model focuses on competition in the foreign export market, we depart from the usual convention of denoting foreign variables with stars.

The profit of the import-competing firm in the foreign market measured in the foreign currency is given as:

$$(7) \quad \pi_2 = P_2 X_2 - C_2 X_2.$$

The import-competing firm (firm 2) sells only in the foreign market and has costs based only in the foreign currency.

C. Solutions of the Models

Since the steps of the model derivations are well-known, we merely provide the results in tabular form:

	Quantity Competition model	Price Competition model
Cost ratio	(8) $R = \frac{SC_2}{C_1^* + SC_1}.$	
Equilibrium market share	(9a) $\lambda = \frac{aR^\rho}{1 + aR^\rho}$ where: $a = \alpha/(1-\alpha).$	To be obtained as solution of: (9b) $\lambda = \frac{aR^\rho Z^\rho}{1 + aR^\rho Z^\rho}$ (9c) $Z = \frac{[1 - \rho(1 - \lambda)]}{1 - \rho\lambda};$
Exporter's price in the foreign market	(10a) $P_1 = \frac{C_1^* + SC_1}{S\rho(1 - \lambda)}$	(10b) $P_1 = \frac{C_1^* + SC_1}{S} \frac{1 - \rho\lambda}{\rho(1 - \lambda)}$
Exporter's quantity sold in the foreign market	(11a) $X_1 = \lambda Y \frac{S\rho(1 - \lambda)}{C_1^* + SC_1}$	(11b) $X_1 = \frac{\rho(1 - \lambda)}{1 - \rho\lambda} \frac{S\lambda Y}{C_1^* + SC_1}$
Import-competing firm price	(12a) $P_2 = \frac{C_2}{\rho\lambda}$	(12b) $P_2 = \frac{[1 - \rho(1 - \lambda)]C_2}{\rho\lambda}$
Import-competing firm quantity sold	(13a) $X_2 = (1 - \lambda)Y \frac{\rho\lambda}{C_2}$	(13b) $X_2 = \frac{\rho\lambda(1 - \lambda)Y}{[1 - \rho(1 - \lambda)]C_2}$
Exporter's profit	(14a) $\pi_1^* = SY\lambda[1 - \rho(1 - \lambda)]$	(14b) $\pi_1^* = SY\lambda \frac{1 - \rho}{(1 - \rho\lambda)}$

The exchange rate enters the price expressions in two ways. Both prices are a function of the exchange rate through its impact on market shares. In addition, the exporter's price is proportional to its marginal cost converted into foreign currency using the exchange rate. Under quantity competition, the exporting firm's profits are the product of the exporter's share of the total expenditures in foreign market, $SY\lambda$, and its percentage markup in that market, $[SP_1 - (C_1^* + SC_1)]/SP_1 = 1 - \rho(1 - \lambda)$. Under price competition, the percentage markup is instead, $[SP_1 - (C_1^* + SC_1)]/SP_1 = (1 - \rho)/(1 - \rho\lambda)$.

IV. PASS-THROUGH AND EXPOSURE COMPARED ACROSS INDUSTRIES

In this section, we discuss the determinants of the two elasticities of interest in this paper, pass-through and exposure. We focus our discussion on the more transparent quantity competition version of the model. Some remarks in the last subsection will alert the reader to

some differences in the specification of pass-through and exposure for the case of price competition.

A. Pass-through

In this paper, the term “pass-through” refers to the effect of the exchange rate on the exporter’s price in foreign currency. Changes in exchange rates should lead to proportionate changes in the exporter’s foreign currency price except for two factors. First, the exporting firm has foreign-currency based costs, so changes in exchange rates will change marginal costs in its home currency. Second, changes in exchange rates should cause the exporting firm to change its markup. For both reasons, the pass-through is likely to be less than proportionate.

An expression for the exporter’s pass-through can be obtained by differentiating (10a) with respect to S . First, define γ as the fraction of marginal costs due to foreign currency-based inputs:

$$(15) \quad \gamma = \frac{SC_1}{C_1^* + SC_1}.$$

Then pass-through can be expressed in the form of an elasticity as follows:⁸

$$(16) \quad \eta_1 = -\frac{d \ln P_1}{d \ln S} = (1 - \gamma)(1 - \rho\lambda).$$

Since ρ and λ are assumed to be between 0 and 1, the pass-through elasticity must be less than one. A depreciation of the exporter’s currency ($dS > 0$) leads to a fall in its price in foreign currency, but the fall in price is *less than proportionate*. That is, the pass-through is generally *incomplete*. Since $\gamma < 1$, the pass-through elasticity must be greater than zero, so in that case, $0 < \eta_1 < 1$.

It is important to understand why pass-through is incomplete even if there are no imported inputs ($\gamma = 0$). Partial pass-through occurs because the demand functions derived from the CES specification permit price elasticities, and therefore markups, to vary as prices change. If markups were constant, as in the case of a Cobb-Douglas demand function, a depreciation of the exporter’s currency would lead to an equally proportionate fall in the exporter’s price in the foreign market, resulting in pass-through of 1. But with the CES utility specification used here, a depreciation of the exporter’s currency leads to an increased markup (in the exporter’s currency) and partial pass-through. The markup of the exporter’s home-currency price in the foreign market over its costs in percentage terms (i.e., its profit margin) is given by

$$(17) \quad M_1 = \frac{SP_1 - (C_1^* + SC_1)}{SP_1} = 1 - \rho(1 - \lambda).$$

The pass-through is incomplete because the adjustment of this markup,

$$(18) \quad \frac{d \ln M_1}{d \ln S} = \frac{(1 - \gamma)\rho^2\lambda(1 - \lambda)}{(1 - \rho(1 - \lambda))} > 0,$$

reduces the pass-through. When the exporter’s currency depreciates ($dS > 0$), the exporter’s costs relative to the foreign competitor improve causing it to increase its market share. This increase in market share reduces the exporter’s elasticity of demand giving him more market power.

⁸ Since $d \ln P_1 / dS < 0$, this derivative is multiplied by minus 1 to ensure that the elasticity is positive.

Increased market power, in turn, causes the exporter to increase its home currency markup by passing through less than the full exchange rate change. Thus pass-through will be less than proportional.⁹

B. Pass-through: Comparative Statics

First, let us consider the impact of differences in the degree of substitutability for the quantity competition model. As one would expect, the impact of higher product substitutability (higher ρ) is to **moderate** the pass-through of exchange rate changes into foreign currency prices. To show this, we differentiate η_1 from (16) with respect to ρ , holding market shares constant:¹⁰

$$(19) \quad \frac{d\eta_1}{d\rho} = -\lambda(1-\gamma) < 0 \quad \text{if } \gamma < 1$$

The reason for this is that the increase in substitutability raises the elasticity of demand faced by the exporter and, as a result, smaller price changes are necessary to achieve the new profit maximizing level of sales in the foreign market.¹¹

The degree of substitutability is not the only factor that influences pass-through. From expression (16) for η_1 , it is evident that a higher market share, (9a), **lowers** pass-through. The reason is that higher market share increases the sensitivity of the markup to the exchange rate. Market share, in turn, is a function of the preference parameter, a , and relative marginal costs, R , as well as ρ . An increased preference for the export (higher a) raises the market share of the exporter, so it lowers pass-through. Similarly, a decrease in the exporter's relative marginal cost (higher R) also raises the market share of the exporter, so it lowers pass-through.¹²

⁹ The price behavior of the foreign import competing firm is also of interest. Expressing the change in P_2 as an elasticity, we obtain:

$$\eta_2 = -\frac{d \ln P_2}{d \ln S} = \rho(1-\lambda)(1-\gamma).$$

As long as $\gamma < 1$, meaning that the exporter has costs based in its own currency, a depreciation of the exporter's currency ($dS > 0$) forces the foreign firm to lower its price.

¹⁰ Higher product substitutability also affects the market shares of the two firms:

$$d\lambda/d\rho = \lambda(1-\lambda) \ln R = -d(1-\lambda)/d\rho.$$

As long as the marginal costs of the two firms are close together, however, $R \cong 1$ and $\ln R \cong 0$, so this indirect effect of substitutability on pricing can be ignored. An alternative interpretation of the comparative static equation (19) is reached by viewing the pair (ρ, λ) as a sufficient representation of the full set of parameters: $(\rho, \alpha, C_1, C_1^*, C_2)$. Holding λ fixed when we change ρ implies that the other parameters adjust.

¹¹ On the other hand, the foreign import competing firm's price adjustment is positively related to product substitutability:

$$\frac{d\eta_2}{d\rho} = (1-\lambda)(1-\gamma) > 0 \quad \text{if } \gamma < 1.$$

The more substitutable are the two firm's products, the more the price of the local firm adjusts to match the adjustment of the exporter's price in response to an exchange rate change.

¹² While changes in relative marginal costs have this direct effect on pass-through, values of R different from one also allow substitutability to influence the market share. When the exporter has a cost advantage (lower marginal costs) an increase in substitutability will lead to a bigger increase in his market share than with similar costs. Thus, with a cost advantage, the sensitivity of pass-through to substitutability should be even greater.

C. Exchange Rate Exposure

The value of a firm, V , can be expressed as the present value of present and future cash flows. The simplest measure of economic exposure is $d\ln V/d\ln S$.¹³ The value of the firm, V , is equal to the discounted value of after tax profits. With taxes, discount and growth rates assumed constant, economic exposure can be measured by the derivative:

$$(20) \quad \frac{d \ln V}{d \ln S} = \frac{d \ln \pi}{d \ln S}.$$

Thus, economic exposure is equal to the percentage change in profits induced by a one- percent change in the exchange rate. It is this latter derivative, $d\ln\pi/d\ln S$, that we want to derive. This term, denoted δ (delta), is obtained by differentiating (14a) with respect to S .

$$(21) \quad \delta = \frac{d \ln \pi_1^*}{d \ln S} = 1 + (1 - \gamma)\rho(1 - \lambda) + \frac{(1 - \gamma)\lambda\rho^2(1 - \lambda)}{[1 - \rho(1 - \lambda)]}$$

This elasticity captures three different impacts of the exchange rate change on profits. The first term, 1, captures the proportional impact of the exchange rate change on profits (the simple “*translation*” effect). The second term captures the impact of the exchange rate change on the share of total expenditures accruing to the exporter (the market share effect). Recall that the exchange rate changes the relative prices, R , and therefore the exporter’s market share. The third term captures the impact of the change in the exchange rate on the domestic-currency profit margin of the exporter. As we saw above, the change in market share induced by the exchange rate change causes the exporter’s pass-through to be less than proportional, resulting in a change in the profit margin in domestic currency (see (17)). Together these three effects constitute the full impact of the exchange rate change on profits. Since the first two terms together are greater than one and the third term is positive (unless $\gamma = 1$), the exposure elasticity of the exporter is always greater than one. Thus, the profits of a pure exporting firm are more exposed than a foreign currency cash position. This exposure would be reduced, however, if the exporter also sold goods in its own market.

D. Exchange Rate Exposure: Comparative Statics

The size of the exporter's exposure changes with both the degree of substitutability between the two products in the export market and the relative market shares of the firms. The impact of a change in substitutability on exposure can best be understood by recalling that δ is determined by the ratio of the change in profits from an exchange rate change to the level of profits. Substitutability has its greatest impact on the level of profits rather than on the sensitivity of profits to the exchange rate. The sensitivity of profits to the exchange rate is determined primarily from the size of the net foreign currency cash flows, which is affected most directly by market share. For a given level of market share, increasing substitutability implies more elastic demand, lower markups, and *smaller profits*. Thus δ will increase as substitutability increases and market share is held fixed. This intuition is verified by taking the derivative of (21) with respect to ρ , holding λ fixed:

¹³ In standard terminology, exposure is defined as dV/dS , but we will be estimating exposure coefficients using rate of return data, so the percentage formulation, or δ , of the firm is more appropriate to derive analytically. Whereas normal exposure measures are measured as an amount of foreign currency, our measurement of the exchange rate delta of the firm measures the exposure as a percentage of current firm value.

$$(22) \quad \frac{d\delta}{d\rho} = (1-\gamma)(1-\lambda) \frac{(1-\rho)^2 + 2\lambda^2\rho^2 + \lambda\rho(4-3\rho)}{[1-\rho(1-\lambda)]^2} > 0.$$

This expression is always positive since $0 < \rho, \lambda < 1$.

This prediction of the structural model is consistent with the results of Campa and Goldberg (1995) and Allayannis and Ihrig (1997) who find that exposures are generally higher the more competitive the industry. Competitive industries, defined in their work as industries with low markups, correspond in our model to industries with high substitutability. From (22) it is apparent that higher ρ results in higher δ .

Market share also has an impact on exposure. Differentiating (21) with respect to λ , holding ρ fixed, we can see the effect of market share on δ :

$$(23) \quad \frac{d\delta}{d\lambda} = -\rho(1-\gamma) + \frac{(1-\gamma)[\rho^2(1-2\lambda) - \rho^3(1-\lambda)^2]}{[1-\rho(1-\lambda)]^2}.$$

This derivative is negative, except for a small region where λ is low and ρ is high.¹⁴ The negative value implies that δ decreases as market share increases. This occurs because higher market share has a stronger effect on the level of profits than on the amount by which profits change when the exchange rate changes. For a fixed ρ , an increase in market share increases the level of profits not only by increasing total sales but also increasing the profit margin which increases monotonically with market share (see (17)). Since lower relative marginal costs for the exporter (higher R) and increased preference for exports (higher a) raise market share, they both generally lead to lower exchange rate exposure for the exporter.

E. Relation between Exposure and Pass-through

A firm's pass-through behavior and exchange rate δ are closely related because they are both functions of product substitutability. As discussed above, for any given market share, higher product substitutability *lowers* pass-through and *raises* δ . Thus, there is an inverse relationship between pass-through and δ as depicted in Figure 1a. The points that make up each path in this figure correspond to a different level of market share. Along each path, substitutability increases from zero to one moving right to left.

F. Comparing the Quantity Competition and Price Competition Models

An expression for the exporter's pass-through under price competition can be obtained by differentiating (10b) with respect to S . Recall that γ is the fraction of marginal costs due to imported inputs. Pass-through can be expressed in the form of an elasticity as follows:¹⁵

$$(24) \quad \eta_1 = -\frac{d \ln P_1}{d \ln S} = (1-\gamma) \left\{ \frac{(1-\lambda\rho)}{1-\rho^2\lambda(1-\lambda)} \right\}.$$

¹⁴ These combinations correspond to low levels of λ (< 0.15) and high values for $\rho \in (.5, 1)$. These are situations where the exporter has very low market power. For these values, the proportional impact of higher market share on profits holding profit margins fixed is smaller in absolute value than the proportional impact of higher market shares on the profits through the exchange rate induced profit margin adjustment. The result is a positive change in exposure for increased market share in these cases. However, once market power is sufficiently large, either through market share or low substitutability, this derivative turns everywhere negative.

¹⁵ Since $d \ln P_1 / dS < 0$, this derivative is multiplied by minus 1 to ensure that the elasticity is positive.

With $\gamma > 0$, and with ρ and λ assumed to be between 0 and 1, the pass-through elasticity must be less than one. A depreciation of the exporter's currency ($dS > 0$) leads to a fall in its price in foreign currency, but once again the fall in price is less than proportionate.

As above, the exchange rate exposure of the exporter, $d\ln\pi_1^*/d\ln S$, can be derived from differentiating the profit function (18b) with respect to S :

$$(25) \quad \delta = \frac{d\ln\pi_1^*}{d\ln S} = 1 + \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\gamma)\rho[1-\rho(1-\lambda)]}{(1-\rho)[1-\rho^2\lambda(1-\lambda)]}.$$

Since the numerator and denominator of the second term are greater than zero, the exposure expression is always greater than one. Thus, as in the case of quantity competition, a depreciation of the exporter's currency leads to a more than proportional increase in exporting profits.

The variation of pass-through and exposure across industries under price competition is fundamentally similar to the relation under quantity competition. Figure 1b displays the relation between pass-through and exposure for different levels of fixed market share as ρ increase from right to left (high levels of substitutability (>0.99) are not shown in the figure). As in the quantity competition case, the curves have a negative slope.¹⁶ However, in contrast to the quantity competition case, the slope of the relationship increases drastically as substitutability increases because δ goes to infinity as $\rho \rightarrow 1$ while pass-through reaches a finite limit with a fixed market share.¹⁷

V. DATA FOR THE EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

One reason why empirical studies of pass-through and exposure have been done independently in the past is that they use very different data sets. Pass-through regressions typically relate export or import price series changes to exchange rate changes, while exchange rate exposure regressions relate firm value changes to exchange rates changes. The export price series are either price indexes developed by national statistical authorities or unit values derived from customs data. Changes in firm value are derived from equity return data, which are either used at a firm-level basis or aggregated to form industry-level indexes of returns.

In this paper, we use goods price and share price data from Japanese industries to examine whether the relation between pass-through behavior and exchange rate exposure suggested by the model outlined above is consistent with real world behavior. We choose Japanese data for

¹⁶ For low enough market shares, however, the curve bends backward as $\rho \rightarrow 1$.

¹⁷ In addition, when market share is allowed to be endogenous a strange feature of the price competition model with respect to pass-through becomes apparent. From formula (24) it can be shown that pass-through under price competition is equal to 100% of foreign cost $(1 - \gamma)$ as $\rho \rightarrow 0$, regardless of the market share. This result is directly intuitive: when the two goods are poor substitutes, the duopolist is in effect a monopolist facing a constant-price-elasticity demand curve; his price is proportional to marginal cost. What is less clear is the result as $\rho \rightarrow 1$ and market share is endogenous. One might think that perfect substitution would cause the exporting firm to pass-through very little of its costs variations. However, when substitutability becomes perfect in this model, we reach a situation of pure Bertrand competition. In this case, it is known that the two firms behave separately like pure competitors. They price at marginal cost and based upon cost and demand preferences one firm grabs the entire market or if relative prices and demand preferences are perfectly balanced, the two firms perfectly split the market. In the case where conditions imply that the exporter will take the full market as $\rho \rightarrow 1$, he behaves increasing like a perfect competitor and $\eta_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $\rho \rightarrow 1$. In contrast, in the case where conditions imply that the exporter will lose the market as $\rho \rightarrow 1$, he increasingly behaves as a monopolist as his market share shrinks to zero, and $\eta_1 \rightarrow (1 - \gamma)$ as $\rho \rightarrow 1$. Finally, conditions are perfect such that the both the exporter and foreign competitor maintain a positive market share when $\rho \rightarrow 1$, then pass-through has a limit between 0 and $(1 - \gamma)$ while δ goes to infinity.

several reasons. First, we want to study oligopolistic industries that are heavily export-oriented because the model developed above yields clear-cut results for such cases. In Japan, exports are concentrated in three industries: general machinery (18.1 % of exports), electrical machinery (31.3 %), and transport equipment (24.2%),¹⁸ thus providing a concentrated set of export-oriented firms. Although Japanese firms have recently become more like American multinationals in their reliance on overseas production, they remain much more export-oriented than firms in the United States. Evidence from international exchange rate exposure comparisons (see, e.g., Bodnar and Gentry (1993)), moreover, suggests that exchange rate exposures are economically and statistically more significant in Japan than in other industrialized countries.

In addition, we want export price series that are genuine price indexes rather than unit value series as the latter suffer from well-known drawbacks. Japan has high quality export and domestic wholesale price indexes for a variety of manufactured products at various levels of aggregation. This disaggregation is important as we need to match the export categories as closely as possible with share price series. Share price data generally determines the level of aggregation of the industries. If a particular export product is produced by an identifiable set of firms, then we chose to include that product in the estimation. In the case of the motor vehicle industry, for example, while there are several disaggregated output price series for automobiles and other motor vehicles, most of this equipment is made by a common set of firms. So the level of aggregation for this industry was dictated by the stock market data, not the price data.

We choose eight Japanese industries with heavy export ratios and major foreign competitors. These industries are: Construction Machinery, Copiers, Electronic Parts, Motor Vehicles, Cameras, Measuring Equipment, Film, and Magnetic Recording Products. Export and domestic price series for the goods produced by each industry we examine are taken from the Bank of Japan's Price Index Annual. The Japanese stock price data are taken from Datastream[®] and are self-constructed value-weighted total-return indexes for each industry based upon constituent lists of firms provided by Datastream[®] or the Japan Company Handbook. All of the portfolios contain only firms listed on the first section of the Tokyo stock exchange. We use the Nikkei 225 index as a measure of the overall market movement.

In traditional studies of exchange rate exposure, end-of-month stock returns are related to end-of-month exchange rates. In this study, we are relating stock returns to real exchange rates as well as expenditure. Real exchange rates are calculated using monthly average prices, while expenditure is also measured as a monthly average. So the stock returns that we use in the exposure equations are monthly averages based on the daily stock prices during that month. Similarly, the nominal exchange rates used to calculate the real exchange rate are monthly averages. The use of monthly average exchange rates implies that our measurement of exposure is somewhat unconventional, when compared with previous studies of exposure. In Subsection VI.C below, we compare our exposure estimates to those obtained from end-of-month stock and exchange rate data.

Exchange rates enter the structural model in two ways. In both the price and profit equation, market share is a function of relative marginal costs, proxied by foreign wholesale prices, which are converted into yen using yen/fc exchange rates. In the profit equation, total foreign expenditures, proxied by foreign GDP, are converted into yen, again using yen/fc

¹⁸ These weights are from the 1995 export price series.

exchange rates. To create the foreign marginal cost index, we form a weighted-average of foreign wholesale price indexes using the export weights of 22 of Japan's 23 most important export markets.¹⁹ The 22 countries represent 85% of Japan's exports. Table 1 lists the countries together with their respective shares in the foreign price index. Yen/fc exchange rates are used to convert the 22 national price indexes into yen. Note that some countries do not have wholesale price indexes for the entire period in which case we substituted consumer price indexes. To create the foreign expenditure index, we form a weighted sum of foreign GDP series for the 13 countries (of the 22 above) which report quarterly GDP. The GDP series are in national currency units, so we convert them into yen using the yen/fc exchange rates. The weights for the resulting aggregate GDP exchange rate series are the relative GDPs themselves. Since all of the other data are monthly, we convert each quarterly GDP series into a monthly series through interpolation.²⁰ All the wholesale, GDP and exchange rate data are taken from the International Financial Statistics database.

Our estimation period is from January 1986 to December 1995. This 10-year period represents a compromise between the competing objectives of longer sample size and stable parameter estimation. With monthly data, ten years gives us 120 observations. On the other hand, we believe that over ten years the form of competition in Japanese industry is stable enough to yield meaningful estimates of pricing and profit behavior.

In the estimation below, we also require estimates of the degree of involvement of Japanese firms in foreign markets. Table 2 displays this data. The first quantity displayed is "gamma", the share of imported inputs in total costs. This data is taken from Japanese input-output tables. We observe that, for most industries in our sample, the share is small. Second, "theta" is the share of profits that each Japanese industry derives from abroad. As a surrogate measure, (since this information is not revealed by most Japanese firms) we use the sales-weighted ratio of export and foreign sales to total sales for the firms in each industry portfolio. The use of this sales ratio imposes the assumption that average operating profitability is equal at home and abroad. These data are from various editions of the Japan Company Handbook.

VI. ESTIMATES OF PASS-THROUGH AND EXPOSURE

The estimation in this paper is a noteworthy departure from the previous empirical studies of pass-through and exposure. Unlike previous studies that estimate reduced form equations of either pass-through or exposure, we estimate equations for pass-through and exposure jointly using a common theoretical framework.

A. Equation Specification

The models of pass-through and exposure outlined in Section III have two major drawbacks as far as estimation is concerned. First, the models describe the behavior of a pure exporting firm, whereas the Japanese exporters that we will study also have significant domestic markets. Second, the models specify export prices and profits as functions of marginal costs, but marginal costs are notoriously difficult to estimate. We attempt to solve both problems by introducing a simple markup model of pricing in the domestic Japanese market rather than trying to model

¹⁹ China was omitted because it does not have a price index available for the entire period.

²⁰ Since it is permanent income that belongs in the demand equation, the resulting smoothed series should be an acceptable proxy.

competition among the Japanese exporting firms in that market. Japanese domestic prices in many of our industries are quite sticky, so the assumption of a fixed domestic markup may not be a bad approximation.

If P_1^* is the price of the Japanese good in its own market (in yen), then the markup equation is given by:

$$(26) \quad P_1^* = m^* (C_1^* + SC_1)$$

and the domestic price can be used to control for costs. Substituting (26) into (10a) for the quantity competition model, or (10b) for the price competition model, and linearizing around a value of λ equal to the unconditional expected value of market share, we obtain for industry j :

$$(27) \quad d \ln(SP_{1,j}) - d \ln(P_{1,j}^*) = (1 - \eta_{0,j}) [d \ln S + d \ln C_2 - d \ln P_{1,j}^*]$$

with $\eta_0 = \eta / (1 - \gamma)$, where η is the original pass-through coefficient from the theoretical model, which is given by (16) for the quantity competition model and by (24) for the price competition model.²¹

Linearizing similarly the profit equations (Equations (14a) and (14b) respectively) after substituting (26), we obtain:

$$(28) \quad d \ln \pi_1^* = d \ln(SY) + (\delta_0 - 1) d \ln \left[\frac{SC_2}{P_1^*} \right]$$

with $(\delta_0 - 1) = (\delta - 1) / (1 - \gamma)$, where δ is the exposure elasticity from the theoretical model given by (21) for the quantity competition model and by (25) for the price competition model.

The original models outlined in the previous section were nonlinear, which implies that the coefficients of the linearized equations are not constant over time. The assumption we are making implicitly when we assume that the coefficients are constant is that market share λ does not move much over time. This is an assumption we shall have to return to.

We make several important modifications to our empirical profit Equation (28) to facilitate estimation. Because accounting data for profits are considered so unreliable and available only infrequently, we transform the profit equation into an equation explaining the firm's value so that we can use share price data. To account for valuation changes for the market as a whole (which are driven by the discount factor changes in the Japanese stock market, as well as other common macro-factors), we include the stock market index (V_{NIK}) in the equation and estimate a coefficient (beta) for the market's influence on the industry's stock price (V_j). Hence, $d \ln \pi_1^*$ in (28) is interpreted for industry j as being $d \ln V_j$ purged of the Japanese market-wide movement:

$$(29) \quad d \ln \pi_j = d \ln(V_j) - \beta_j d \ln(V_{NIK})$$

where: V_j = the market value of industry j (in yen), V_{NIK} = the market value of the Nikkei 225 index, and β_j is the beta of industry j with the Nikkei 225 index.

The second modification involves taking into account the impact of domestic sales on the exporting firm's profits. If some firms derive only 25% of their profits from exports while others derive 75% of their profits from exports, the exposure estimates will differ even if competitive behavior is identical across industries. We don't attempt to model demand behavior in the domestic market. Were we to estimate the share of profit coming from abroad, any degree of

²¹ The reason why η_0 replaces η is that the expression for P_1^* eliminates the direct influence of γ from the model.

foreign exchange exposure would be tautologically explainable because the share of profit would be a free parameter in the profit equation. To solve this problem, we assume that the share of total profit coming from abroad, expected at the beginning of each period, is a constant equal to θ_j , the share of sales from abroad (see Table 2).

Starting with Equations (14a and b), which give us the profits of a pure exporting firm and denoting the profits from exporting in industry j as π_j^{EXPORT} , we have:

$$(30) \quad \frac{\pi_j^{EXPORT}}{\pi_j^{TOTAL}} = \theta_j.$$

If exchange rates affect only export profits, taking log differences of Equation (30) and substituting Equation (28) gives:

$$(31) \quad d \ln(\pi_j^{TOTAL}) = \theta_j \left\{ d \ln(SY) + (\delta_{0,j} - 1) d \ln \left[\frac{SC_2}{P_{1,j}^*} \right] \right\}.$$

From our use of market adjusted stock returns as a proxy for profit changes we define

$$(32) \quad d \ln \pi_i^{TOTAL} = d \ln \bar{r}_i - \beta_i d \ln \bar{r}_{NIK},$$

and we can then rewrite Equation (31) as:²²

$$(33) \quad d \ln \bar{r}_j - \theta_j d \ln SY = \beta_j d \ln \bar{r}_{NIK} + \theta_j (\delta_{0,j} - 1) \left[d \ln S + d \ln C_2 - d \ln P_{1,j}^* \right]$$

The two-equation empirical model (Equations (27) and (33)) to be estimated for each industry involves two fundamental parameters from the utility function. The key parameter is ρ_j , the degree of substitutability between the export good and the competing product in the foreign market. Higher values of ρ_j indicate higher levels of substitutability, with a value of unity representing perfect substitutability between export and foreign product. At the other extreme, values of ρ_j close to zero represent low levels of substitutability and relatively large market power. The other fundamental parameter is a product of the utility preference parameter, α , and the price-cost markup in the domestic market, m^* . Since these parameters appear together they cannot be separately identified, we simply denote their combination as a^* .

B. Estimates of the Structural Models

B.1 Quantity competition

In order for our own model of exposure to be properly interpreted in terms of behavior, we need to estimate pass-through equations along with exposure equations. The reason why pass-through equations are needed is that the exposure regression alone cannot identify the key structural parameter, ρ_j , along with the market share, λ_j , which is a function of ρ_j , and a^* . If the pass-through and exposure equations are estimated jointly, then ρ_j and λ_j are **just identified** as Equations (27) and (33) make clear.

The two-equation model of pass-through and exposure is estimated using a generalized least square (GLS) estimation procedure.²³ We then use the estimates of $(1 - \eta_{0,j})$ and $(\delta_{0,j} - 1)$ to solve for the structural parameters of our models, ρ_j , and a^* , choosing their values in such a way that the model will reconstruct the average values of passthrough and exposure over time.

²² In Equations (33) and (34) below, we adopt the convention of placing on the right-hand side the terms that involve a parameter to be estimated, and which, for that reason, will generate an orthogonality condition.

²³ Intercept terms are included in the two equations.

Table 3 reports the estimates of $(1 - \eta_{0,j})$ and $(\delta_{0,j} - 1)$ together with the implied estimates of the structural parameters for the quantity competition model. The table also shows in parentheses, below each estimate, the standard error of that estimate.²⁴ In addition, because our estimation technique requires market share, passthrough and exposure to be constant, (even though the structural model allows them to be time varying), we report one more standard deviation, shown in a second row of parentheses, which measures the variation of these variable *over time*. This last standard deviation will be used to validate the linearization that has been performed prior to performing the estimation of the model. The conclusion to be drawn from this table is that in all industries, the pass-through and exposure estimates are outside the limits of the model.

Consider Figure 1a which shows combinations of $\eta_{0,j}$ and $\delta_{0,j}$ consistent with different market shares. In three of these industries, viz. Construction Machinery, Motor Vehicles, and Cameras, the estimate of exposure is “too low” to be consistent with the quantity competition model. That is, the estimates are below the lower limit of exposure of 1.0 permitted by the model. These estimates, however, are not measured very precisely. The figure also shows one standard deviation bands around the point estimates. For all three industries, the estimates are within one standard deviation of parameter values consistent with the model.

The other five industries – Copiers, Electronic Parts, Film, Measuring Equipment, and Magnetic Recording Instruments -- exhibit common characteristics, so we shall discuss them together. For these five industries, the estimated pass-through and exposure coefficients lie **northwest** of all the curves in Figure 1a. We can interpret these estimates in two alternative ways:

- (a) In these five sectors, pass-through is “too low” to be consistent with the quantity competition model. That is, estimated values of pass-through are so low that they imply ρ_j s that are greater than one. Previous studies of Japanese pricing had found pass-through coefficients which seemed “too low”, but we are able to more precise about the meaning of “too low” because our joint model of pass-through and exposure allows us to extract structural parameters from the estimates.
- (b) It is equally valid to say that in these five industries, exposure is “too high” to be consistent with the quantity competition model. In the case of Film, for example, a lower estimate of $\delta_{0,j}$ together with the estimated value of pass-through would give values of ρ_j and λ_j consistent with the model (See Figure 1a). So in the case of five industries, rather than finding estimates of exposure that are “too low”, we have found

²⁴ Consider several variables such as time-averaged pass-through, η , exposure, δ , or market share, λ , explained by our theory in relation to two parameters, ρ and a^* :

$$\eta = \eta(\rho, a^*); \delta = \delta(\rho, a^*); \lambda = \lambda(\rho, a^*).$$

Suppose we know the variance-covariance matrix, Ω , of the estimates of η and δ . Then, the variance-covariance matrix, Σ , of the estimates of ρ and a^* is given by:

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \partial\eta/\partial\rho & \partial\eta/\partial a^* \\ \partial\delta/\partial\rho & \partial\delta/\partial a^* \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \Omega \begin{bmatrix} \partial\eta/\partial\rho & \partial\delta/\partial\rho \\ \partial\eta/\partial a^* & \partial\delta/\partial a^* \end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

And the variance of the estimate of λ is provided by:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \partial\lambda/\partial\rho & \partial\lambda/\partial a^* \end{bmatrix} \Sigma \begin{bmatrix} \partial\lambda/\partial\rho \\ \partial\lambda/\partial a^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

exposure estimates that are “too high”. In only three industries do we find corroboration for the view in the exposure literature that estimates are “too low”. We should not over-emphasize this finding, however, since in the case of all five industries, the estimates are within one standard error of parameter values acceptable to the model. (That is, the standard error bands around the estimates lie within the range permitted by the model). The most we can say is that we find no strong evidence that exposure is “too low”, even in the case of the three industries where the point estimates lie below the permitted range for exposure.

B.2 Price Competition

The estimates of $\eta_{0,j}$ and $\delta_{0,j}$ can also be interpreted in terms of the price competition model. That is, estimates of $(1 - \eta_{0,j})$ and $(\delta_{0,j} - 1)$ can be solved for the underlying parameters using the price competition model rather than the quantity competition model. The results are reported in Table 4 according to the same format as in Table 3. For three of the industries, viz. Construction Machinery, Motor Vehicles, and Cameras, the exposure estimates lie below the lower limit of 1.0 (although just as in the case of quantity competition, the estimates are within one standard error of 1.0). (Figure 1b plots all eight industries for the price competition case). In the case of the other five industries, the price competition model can simultaneously rationalize observed exposure and passthrough behavior. These are the five industries, viz. Electronic Parts, Film, Copiers, Magnetic Recording Products and Electronic Parts, which could not satisfactorily be “explained” by the quantity competition model. This is primarily because the price competition model is able to cover a larger area of the pass-through-exposure space. In many of those sectors, however, the implied estimates for market share are implausibly large. Examples would be Copiers, Motor Vehicles, and Film. In the case of film, Fuji and Konica share the world market with Kodak, and the Japanese market share is far smaller than the 0.936 estimate.

Some industries in Table 4 show time-variations of the three variables, market share, pass-through and exposure--which call into question the legitimacy of the linearization. In the case of Electronic Parts, the standard error of the pass-through estimate assumed constant is 0.043 while the time variation of the variable in the model is equal to 0.031. The latter is not negligible next to the former. A similar picture emerges as far as market share is concerned. For Magnetic Recording Products, all three variables appear to have significant variation over time, so the linearization is also suspect in this case. It may be true that for those industries, non-linearities are important enough to require estimation of the actual (non-linear) structural equations.

C. Comparison with Previous Estimates of Exposure

In previous empirical studies (see references in Section II), the most common approach used for estimating exchange rate exposure was to regress the stock return of firm/industry j on a market return and the change in a nominal exchange rate variable. In our notation, this common specification can be written as:²⁵

$$(34) \quad d \ln V_j - \beta_j d \ln V_{NIK} = h_j d \ln S$$

where $d \ln S$ is the percentage change in the nominal effective exchange rate. The coefficient h_j , which is rightfully used as a hedge ratio between the stock price and the exchange rate, is

²⁵ For simplicity, we do not write constant terms in both specifications (33) and (34) but they are present. For purposes of comparison, we have moved the term $\beta_j d \ln V_{NIK}$ to the left-hand side in (34), retaining here the value of β_j estimated under (33).

generally reported as the exchange rate exposure of the firm. This is then often analyzed as representing the behavior of the firm's profits in response to the exchange rate.

It is interesting to consider the difference between this standard estimate of exposure and our estimate given by (33). In contrast to h_j above, the coefficient δ_{0j} from (33) is the exposure measure that can be interpreted in economic terms, using a model of the firm like the ones presented in this paper. In general, the two coefficients will be different, and it is only the latter coefficient, δ_{0j} , which can be interpreted as "too small" or "too large" in relation to the activities of the firm. While being the correct measure of a hedge ratio, Equation (34) is mis-specified as a representation of the economic behavior of the firm.

Variations of the traditional equation for estimating exposure that specify changes in value as functions of the *real* exchange rate rather than the *nominal* exchange rate are also mis-specified for yet another reason. According to the models of this paper, an exposure regression relating stock prices to the real exchange rate must separately include a nominal exchange rate, to take into account the "translation effect" of changes in nominal exchange rates on nominal profits. In Equation (33) for example, the translation effect is captured in the $d\ln(SY)$ term, whereas the exposure effect is measured by the coefficient of the real exchange rate, $d\ln[SC_{2j}/P_{1j}^*]$.

Table 5 displays the hedge ratios estimated with specifications like those found in the rest of the literature (as in Equation (34)) and compares them with the delta coefficients estimated from our model. For all eight industries, these hedge ratios reported in column (4) of the table are much smaller than the deltas reported in column (1) of the table. However, one of the reasons for which $h_j < \delta_{0j}$ is that the latter is not adjusted for the ratio of export profits to total profits θ_j . Once that adjustment is made as in the column (2) of the table, the adjusted deltas $\theta_j \times \delta_{0j}$ and estimated hedge ratios h_j are much closer in size.²⁶

Apart from the adjustment for the non-export activities of the firm, the difference between h_j and $\theta_j \times \delta_{0j}$ is due to the fact that, in general, variables appearing in (33) but not in (34), viz. Y , C_2 and P^* , are correlated with the nominal exchange rate and the stock price. It is straightforward to classify the differences between the two equations as being related to the terms on the left-hand side of (33) or to the terms on the right-hand side. The term on the left-hand side that differs is: $\theta_j d\ln SY$, representing the translation effect and the effect of higher expenditure on exposure. It can be regressed on the right-hand side variable to produce a first type of adjustment. Equivalently, the effect of removing it is shown in column (3) of Table 5. That leaves, as a second adjustment, the fact that, in (36), profit is regressed on the real exchange rate $d\ln S + d\ln C_2 - d\ln P^*_{1j}$ whereas, in (34), it is regressed on the nominal rate $d\ln S$. This effect is reflected in the difference between columns (3) and (4).

Our estimates of exposure are not inconsistent with those based on the hedge ratio specification. It is our interpretation of these estimates that differs from the traditional literature. Because our estimates are based on an explicit model of industry behavior, we are able to interpret whether the exposure estimates are "too small". And for our eight industries, our exposure estimates are not significantly too small. Indeed, for several of the industries in the case of the quantity model, our estimates of exposure are "too large".

²⁶ Studies such as Jorion (1990) relate the coefficient h_j to the ratio of foreign to total sales, the same data that we use as a proxy for θ_j , the ratio of foreign-based profits to total profits.

One last word of clarification is in order. Previous researchers have traditionally estimated hedge ratios on the basis of end-of-month-to-end-of-month exchange rate and stock price moves. This was indeed appropriate since a hedging transaction needs to be timed and synchronized properly. In this paper, however, the empirical work has been used with monthly average data because that corresponded better to the measurement of the firms' flows (flow of sales during the month, flow of profits, etc.). The comparisons we have made between our model and traditional hedge ratio estimates -- and the conclusion we have drawn that they are not systematically "too low" -- could conceivably be undermined by this discrepancy in measurement. Such would be the case if end-of-month hedge ratio estimates were generally lower than monthly-average hedge ratio estimates, or indeed if they differed from each other in a random fashion. Column (5) in Table 5 shows that the comparisons conclusions we have reached are not due to the difference in measurement method. All end-of-month hedge ratio estimates, save one,²⁷ are actually higher in our sample than the corresponding monthly-average hedge ratio estimates. Whenever we stated that hedge ratios were not "too low" or even "too high" relative to our model, the same statement would have been true a propos end-of-month hedge ratio estimates.

VII. CONCLUSION

We have developed a duopoly model of an exporting firm and solved it under the alternative assumptions of quantity and price competition to explain simultaneously the behavior of the prices of goods and the profits for a firm that competes with a local firm in a foreign market. We have illustrated the crucial role played in this matter by the elasticity of substitution between the home-produced and the foreign-produced goods: Keeping market share fixed, as substitutability increases, pass through declines and exposure increases. Market share also impacts these values. Holding substitutability fixed, increases in market share reduce both pass-through and exposure elasticities.

In empirical tests of the models conducted on Japanese data, we have found that these models are capable of explaining some, but certainly not all, of the features of the data. Our weakest empirical results are found for the quantity competition models where estimates for none of the eight industries are within the theoretical limits specified in the model, although they are not significantly outside these limits. Estimates for all but three of the industries are within the theoretical limits of the price competition model (which generally allows for greater range of pass-through – exposure pairs than does the quantity model). While the parameter estimates that were obtained from the joint estimation were generally economically meaningful, in many industries estimates of the degree of substitution and of market share seemed to be "too large". These large market shares and high substitutability estimates are necessary for the structural model to generate the observed combination of *low pass-through* and *high exposure* for many of these Japanese industries. Thus it appears that for some industries pass-through is too low when compared to exposure, or exposure is too high relative to pass-through. Further research along the same lines as this study – examining pass-through and exposure simultaneously – may be able to explain these industries better by using more complex models of competition.

²⁷ In the case of Measuring Equipment, a lower hedge-ratio is obtained from end-of-month measurements. One could show that that value of exposure would still be "too high" relative to the quantity competition model, which means that our previous conclusion is unchanged.

Overall, the empirical versions of our models do not point to the conclusion, reached by other studies, that the exposure measured in the stock market tends to underestimate the true degree of involvement of firms in exchange-rate sensitive industries.

REFERENCES

- Adler, Michael, and Bernard Dumas, 1984, "Exposure to Currency Risk: Definition and Measurement," *Financial Management*, Summer, 41-50.
- Allayannis, G. and X. Ihrig, 1997, "Exchange Rate Exposure and Industry Structure," University of Virginia working paper.
- Bodnar, Gordon M., and William M. Gentry, 1993, "Exchange Rate Exposure and Industry Characteristics: Evidence from Canada, Japan, and the USA," *Journal of International Money and Finance*, February, 29-45.
- Campa, Jose and Linda S. Goldberg, 1995, "Investment, Pass-through and Exchange Rates: A Cross-Country Comparison," NBER working paper no 5139.
- Bresnahan, T. F., 1987, "Competition and Collusion in the American Automobile Industry: the 1955 Price War," *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, XXXV, 457-482.
- Dixit, Avinash, and Joseph Stiglitz, 1977, "Monopolistic Competition and Optimum Product Diversity," *American Economic Review*, 67, June, 297-308.
- Dornbusch, Rudiger, 1987, "Exchange Rates and Prices," *American Economic Review*, March, 93-106.
- Feenstra, Robert C., Joseph E. Gagnon, and Michael M. Knetter, 1996, "Market Share and Exchange Rate Pass-through in World Automobile Trade," *Journal of International Economics*, 40, 187-207.
- Feenstra, Robert C., 1987, "Symmetric Pass-Through of Tariffs and Exchange Rates Under Imperfect Competition: An Empirical Test," *Journal of International Economics*, 27, August, 25-45.
- Froot, Kenneth A., and Paul Klemperer, 1989, "Exchange Rate Pass-Through When Market Share Matters," *American Economic Review*, September, 637-654.
- Flood, Eugene Jr., and Donald R. Lessard, 1986, "On the Measurement of Operating Exposure to Exchange Rates: A Conceptual Approach," *Financial Management*, Spring, 25-37.
- Gasmi, F., J.-J. Laffont and Q. Vuong, 1992, "Econometric Analysis of Collusive Behavior in a Soft-drink Market," *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 1, 277-311.
- Goldberg, Pinelopi K., and Michael M. Knetter, 1996, "Goods Prices and Exchange Rates: What Have We Learned?," working paper.
- Griffin, J., M. and R. Stulz, 1997 "International Competition and Exchange Rate Shocks: A Cross-Country Industry Analysis of Stock Returns", Dice Center WP 98-7 OSU.
- He J. and L. K. Ng, 1998 "the Foreign Exchange Exposure of Japanese Multinational Firms" *Journal of Finance*, 53, 733-54.
- Hekman, Christine, 1985, "A Financial Model of Foreign Exchange Exposure," *Journal of International Business Studies*, Summer, 83-99.

- Jorion, Phillippe, 1990, "The Exchange-Rate Exposure of U.S. Multinationals," *Journal of Business*, July, 331-345.
- Knetter, Michael M., 1989, "Price Discrimination by U.S. and German Exporters," *American Economic Review*, 79, March, 198-210.
- Knetter, Michael M., 1993, "International Comparisons of Pricing-to-Market Behavior," *American Economic Review*, 83, June, 473-486.
- Krugman, Paul, 1987, "Pricing to Market When the Exchange Rate Changes," in S.W. Arndt and J.D. Richardson, editors, *Real-Financial Linkages among Open Economies*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 49-70.
- Levi, Maurice D., 1994, "Exchange Rates and the Valuation of Firms," in Yakov Amihud and Richard M. Levich, editors, *Exchange Rates and Corporate Performance*. New York: Irwin, 37-48.
- Mann, Catherine L., 1986, "Prices, Profit Margins, and Exchange Rates," *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, 72, 366-379.
- Marston, Richard C., 1990, "Pricing to Market in Japanese Manufacturing," *Journal of International Economics*, 29, November, 217-236.
- Marston, Richard C., 1996, "The Effects of Industry Structure on Economic Exposure," NBER Working Paper No. 5518, March.
- Ohno, Kenichi, 1989, "Export Pricing Behavior of Manufacturing: A U.S.-Japan Comparison," *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers*, 36, September, 550-579.
- Shapiro, Alan C., 1975, "Exchange Rate Changes, Inflation, and the Value of the Multinational Corporation," *Journal of Finance*, May, 485-502.
- Slade, Margaret E., 1986, "Conjectures, Firm Characteristics, and Market Structure," *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 4, 347-369.
- Slade, Margaret E., 1995, "Empirical Games: the oligopoly case," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, XXVIII, 368-402.
- Tirole, Jean, 1988, *The Theory of Industrial Organization*, MIT Press.
- Varian, Hal R., 1984, *Microeconomic Analysis*, Norton, second edition.
- von Ungern-Sternberg, Thomas, and C.C. von Weizsacker, 1990, "Strategic Foreign Exchange Management," *Journal of Industrial Economics*, June, 381-395.
- Yang, Jiawen, 1997, "Exchange Rate Pass-through in U.S. Manufacturing Industries," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, pp. 95-103.

Table 1: Japanese Exchange Rate Index

The tables display the countries, the percentage weights and the price index used to create the 22 country trade-weighted average index for the real value of the Japanese yen and the 13 country GDP weighted average index for the Japanese yen . Trade weights are based upon total bilateral trade flows for the year 1994. Wholesale price indices (WPI) are used when available and consumer price indices (CPI) are used otherwise. China is not included in the list, despite being a major trading partner of Japan, due to a lack of price data over part of the sample period. GDP weights are based upon Jan 1990 relative GDP weights in yen.

Panel A: Composition of Japanese 22 Country Real Exchange Rate Index

Country	Trade Weight	Price Index
U.S.	35.41%	WPI
Korea	7.27%	WPI
Taiwan	7.10%	WPI
Germany	5.31%	WPI
Australia	2.60%	WPI
Indonesia	2.29%	WPI
U.K.	3.80%	WPI
Canada	1.76%	WPI
Netherlands	2.54%	WPI
Philippines	1.76%	WPI
Mexico	1.25%	WPI
S. Africa	0.55%	WPI
Spain	0.63%	WPI
Hong Kong	7.68%	CPI
Singapore	5.85%	CPI
Thailand	4.39%	CPI
Malaysia	3.69%	CPI
France	1.57%	CPI
Italy	1.00%	CPI
Panama	1.76%	CPI
Belgium	1.13%	CPI
Switzerland	<u>0.67%</u>	CPI
	100.0%	

Panel B: Composition of Japanese 13 country GDP weighted exchange rate series

Country	GDP Weight
United States	46.94%
Germany	12.01%
France	9.66%
Italy	8.72%
United Kingdom	7.86%
Canada	4.87%
Australia	2.48%
Netherlands	2.29%
Mexico	1.92%
Switzerland	1.76%
South Africa	0.88%
Korea	0.49%
Philippines	0.10%

Table 2. Some data on Japanese industries' involvement in foreign markets

Industry data on gamma, the percentage of imported inputs in the Japanese firms' input costs, and theta, the percentage of foreign sales to total sales.

Industry	Gamma % imported inputs	Theta % foreign sales
Camera	4.38%	70%
Construction Machinery	1.32%	38%
Electronic Equipment/Parts	4.23%	33%
Film	6.01%	34%
Magnetic Tapes	2.05%	41%
Motor Vehicles	1.39%	46%
Measuring Equipment	4.80%	32%
Copiers	3.32%	48%

Sources:

Gamma Imported input ratio as a percentage of costs with data from Japanese I-O tables. Measured as the ratio of imported inputs to the sum of gross output less operating surplus and depreciation of fixed capital. Data taken from "1990 Input Output Tables for Japan, Summary in English, March 1995," Management and Coordination Agency, 1995.

Theta: Export ratio measured as the simple average of the export ratio (foreign sales plus exports tot total sales) reported in the Japanese Company Handbook over the years 1985, 1990, and 1994, converted weighted into portfolios based upon the 1990 total sales figures. Data collected at firm level and formed into portfolio data.

Table 3: Estimation of Pass-through and Exposure Equations for the Quantity Competition Model

	Estimates of pass-through, $\eta_{0,j}$, and exposure, $\delta_{0,j}$ (pure exporter) (Eq. 27 & 33)		Implied estimates of structural parameters under quantity competition model		Resulting time-average of market share
Industry j	$1 - \eta_{0,j}$	$\delta_{0,j} - 1$	ρ_j	$a^*_j = a_j \times (m^*_j)^{-\rho_j}$	Average(λ_j)
Construction Machinery	0.194 (0.025)	-0.287 (0.400)			>1 Exposure is “too low”
Copiers	0.716 (0.036)	.686 (0.363)	>1 Passthrough is “too low”		
Electronic Parts	0.756 (0.043)	0.981 (0.582)	>1 Passthrough is “too low”		
Motor Vehicles	0.738 (0.029)	-0.022 (0.317)			>1 Exposure is “too low”
Cameras	0.529 (0.062)	-0.090 (0.206)			>1 Exposure is “too low”
Measuring Equipment	0.250 (0.074)	1.788 (0.761)	>1 Passthrough is “too low”		
Film	0.854 (0.043)	0.740 (0.519)	>1 Passthrough is “too low”		
Magnetic Recording Products	0.782 (0.057)	0.527 (0.437)	>1 Passthrough is “too low”		

Table Notes: The two-equation model of pass-through and exposure is estimated using a generalized least square (GLS) estimation procedure (Intercept terms are included in the two equations.). We then use the estimates of $(1 - \eta_{0,j})$ and $(\delta_{0,j} - 1)$ to solve for the structural parameters of our models, ρ_j , and a^*_j , choosing their values in such a way that the model will reconstruct the average values of passthrough and exposure over time. Table 3 reports the estimates of $(1 - \eta_{0,j})$ and $(\delta_{0,j} - 1)$.

1) together with the implied estimates of the structural parameters for the quantity competition model. The table also shows in parentheses, below each estimate, the standard error of that estimate. In addition, because our solution technique requires the market share, passthrough and exposure to be constant (even though the structural model allows them to be time varying), we also report one more standard deviation, shown in a second row of parentheses, which measures the variation of these variable *over time*. This last standard deviation is used to validate the linearization that has been performed prior to performing the estimation of the model.

Table 4: Estimation of Pass-through and Exposure Equations for the Price Competition Model

Industry j	Estimates of pass-through, $\eta_{0,j}$, and exposure, $\delta_{0,j}$ (pure exporter)		Implied estimates of structural parameters under price competition model		Resulting time-average of market share
	$1 - \eta_{0,j}$	$\delta_{0,j} - 1$	ρ_j	$a_j \times (m_j^*)^{-\rho_j}$	Average(λ_j)
Construction Machinery	0.194 (0.025)	-0.287 (0.400)			>1 Exposure is “too low”
Copiers	0.716 (0.036) (0.016)	.686 (0.363) (0.073)	0.847 (0.082)	2.429 (1.635)	0.872 (0.071) (0.014)
Electronic Parts	0.756 (0.043) (0.031)	0.981 (0.582) (0.203)	0.890 (0.050)	2.054 (0.825)	0.8743 (0.046) (0.027)
Motor Vehicles	0.738 (0.029)	-0.022 (0.317)			>1 Exposure is “too low”
Cameras	0.529 (0.062)	-0.090 (0.206)			>1 Exposure is “too low”
Measuring Equipment	0.250 (0.074) (0.049)	1.788 (0.761) (0.027)	0.834 (0.078)	0.930 (0.121)	0.453 (0.080) (0.052)
Film	0.854 (0.043) (0.011)	0.740 (0.519) (0.117)	0.921 (0.041)	2.536 (1.389)	0.936 (0.035) (0.010)
Magnetic Recording Products	0.782 (0.057) (0.042)	0.527 (0.437) (0.235)	0.867 (0.1085)	3.059 (3.816)	0.917 (0.027) (0.038)

Table Notes: The results are reported in Table 4 according to the same format as in Table 3.

Table 5: Comparison of Model Delta with Standard Estimates of Hedge Ratio

Equation (33)	$d \ln V_j - \beta_j d \ln V_{NIK} - \theta_j d \ln SY = \theta_j \times (\delta_{0,j} - 1) [d \ln S + d \ln C_2 - d \ln P_{1,j}^*]$				
Intermediate Equation	$d \ln V_j - \beta_j d \ln V_{NIK} = k_j [d \ln S + d \ln C_2 - d \ln P_{1,j}^*]$				
Equation (34)	$d \ln V_j - \beta_j d \ln V_{NIK} = h_j d \ln S$				
(Column)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Industry j	Delta, $\delta_{0,j}$, from structural model (pure exporter) (Equation (33))	$\delta_{0,j} \times \theta_j$	Hedge ratio, k_j , with respect to real rate (Intermediate Equation)	Hedge ratio, h_j (Equation (34))	Hedge ratio, h_j (Equation (34), end-of-month data)
Construction Machinery	0.384 (0.269)	0.145 (0.101)	0.143 (0.102)	0.152 (0.101)	0.272 (0.115)
Copiers	1.087 (0.231)	0.522 (0.111)	0.501 (0.109)	0.516 (0.111)	0.664 (0.123)
Electronic Parts	1.651 (0.482)	0.552 (0.161)	0.539 (0.159)	0.587 (0.160)	0.728 (0.189)
Motor Vehicles	0.711 (0.227)	0.328 (0.105)	0.325 (0.105)	0.338 (0.105)	0.325 (0.122)
Cameras	0.687 (0.143)	0.484 (0.101)	0.388 (0.106)	0.584 (0.108)	0.610 (0.133)
Measuring Equipment	2.282 (0.629)	0.750 (0.207)	0.750 (0.205)	0.811 (0.200)	0.675 (0.219)
Film	1.494 (0.446)	0.509 (0.152)	0.494 (0.150)	0.462 (0.155)	0.644 (0.178)
Magnetic Recording Products	1.433 (0.383)	0.588 (0.157)	0.416 (0.160)	0.875 (0.192)	1.062 (0.224)


Table Notes: Column (1) displays the “pure exporter” delta estimate from the Quantity Competition model (Table 3). Column (2) shows this delta scaled down for non export activity by θ , the proxy for the average percentage of foreign income for each industry. Column (3) displays the real hedge ratio, k_j , of the industry with respect to the change in the real exchange rate. Column (4) displays the more standard estimates of exposure as a simple hedge ratio, h_j , (from equation (34)). The difference between $\theta_j \times \delta_{0,j}$ and h_j , is due to one difference between the equations on the left-hand and two differences on the right-hand side of (33). The term

of the left-hand side that differs is $\theta_j d\ln SY$ and the first term on the right-hand side that differs is $\theta_j (d\ln S + d\ln C_2 - d\ln P_{1,j}^*)$. The effect of removing these terms is to remove the nominal translation effect and is shown in column (3). The second difference is that in equation (33) profit is regressed on the real exchange rate $d\ln S + d\ln C_2 - d\ln P_{1,j}^*$ whereas, in (34), it is regressed on the nominal rate $d\ln S$. This effect is reflected in the difference between columns (3) and (4). Column (5) contains hedge ratio estimates based on end-of-month measurements of stock returns and exchange rate changes. All estimates in this table are obtained by joint estimation with Equation (27).

Figure 1a: Relation between passthrough and delta for pure exporter as ρ changes, for different levels of market share:

Quantity competition model

The figure shows combinations of passthrough and exposure (delta) consistent with different market shares and elasticities of substitutions (ρ) under the quantity competition model. The figure also shows point estimates of passthrough and exposure, along with



one-standard deviation bands around the point estimates.

Figure 1b: Relation between passthrough and delta for pure exporter as ρ changes, for different levels of market share: price competition model.

The figure shows combinations of passthrough and exposure (delta) consistent with different market shares and elasticities of substitutions (ρ) under the price competition model. The figure also shows point estimates of passthrough and exposure, along with one-standard deviation bands around the point estimates.

