STOCKHOLM SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS
THE ECONOMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Exchange Rate Uncertainty and the Microeconomic Benefits of EMU

Richard Friberg
Anders Vredin

Working Paper No. 127
September1996

Working Paper Series
in Economics and Finance

Summary: This paper attempts to review the argument that EMU leads to benefits from lower exchange rate uncertainty. Two questions are adressed. First, there is the microeconomic question of how exchange rate uncertainty affects firms. Second, there is the macroeconomic question of how EMU affects uncertainty. Most of the paper is devoted to the first question. For instance, we look at correlations between exchange rates on the one hand and stock prices and output prices on the other. The following facts speak against the idea that EMU will be beneficial for Swedish firms: firms can adjust to exchange rate uncertainty, for instance by pricing-to-market; exchange rate changes may work as ”automatic stabilizers”; there is no strong empirical evidence that exchange rate uncertainty hampers trade, investment or growth; and important Swedish trading partners, like the U.S., the U.K. and Denmark, are not likely to participate in the monetary union in the near future. For EMU speak the facts that exchange rate uncertainty stems from policy uncertainty, which may be lower inside EMU; that EMU may lower protectionist pressures; and, in particular, that it is very hard for firms to hedge against total economic exchange rate risk (as opposed to mere transaction risk).

This report has been written as a background paper for the Swedish Government Commission on EMU. The authors would like to thank Christina Kvarnström (NUTEK), Mats Morin (LO), Ingvar Karlsson and Robert Wiklund (The Central Bank of Sweden), and Karl Olof Ohlson, Ola Salmen and Juhani Toivonen (STORA) for help with the data; Emil Ems, Harry Flam, Nils Gottfries, Marianne Svensen and participants at seminars at the Stockholm School of Economics and the Swedish Ministry of Finance for helpful discussions; and the Swedish Economic Council and the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation for financial support.

Introduction

Evaluations of the potential economic costs and benefits of a European monetary union, in comparison with present monetary policies or some alternative arrangements, are usually primarily concerned with the impact on macroeconomic stability and microeconomic efficiency. Regarding macroeconomic stability, the main benefit is typically expected to come from lower and less volatile inflation. The loss of monetary autonomy may on the other hand give rise to a cost in terms of higher output and employment instability. It also involves a potential microeconomic efficiency cost, since the optimal inflation tax and seignorage cannot be determined on a national basis. Other microeconomic efficiency arguments however point at benefits. Lower transaction costs and lower exchange rate uncertainty are believed to foster trade, investment and growth, and to lead to higher efficiency and welfare.

This paper attempts to shed some light on the argument that EMU leads to benefits from lower exchange rate uncertainty. Two questions need to be addressed. First, how are firms affected by exchange rate uncertainty? Second, how does EMU affect uncertainty? We pay most attention to the first - microeconomic - question. The second - macroeconomic - question is discussed in more detail in, e.g., other reports to the Swedish Government Commission on EMU.

It should be noted from the outset that the division between the macroeconomic and microeconomic arguments is not clear-cut. If EMU leads to lower overall exchange rate uncertainty, this may have macroeconomic implications through lower interest rates (because of lower risk premia). If, on the other hand, the loss of monetary autonomy is associated with higher output volatility, the overall uncertainty may increase and interest rates (and risk

premia) go up. The nature of shocks and the sources of uncertainty, with and without EMU, are usually regarded as macroeconomic issues, but they have strong implications for exchange rate uncertainty and are therefore connected to the microeconomic arguments as well. For instance, one of the important questions is whether closer monetary integration between EU countries leads to lower or higher exchange rate uncertainty vis-à-vis countries outside EU[1].

The interdependence of micro- and macroeconomic issues points to the desirability of a general equilibrium framework. Unfortunately we lack a suitable micro-based general equilibrium model of international monetary economics in which to evaluate different nominal exchange rate regimes[2]. Our lack of a suitable general equilibrium model of course also spills over to difficulties as to empirical quantification of microeconomic gains from EMU. In this study we thus apply a partial equilibrium view.

We would like to stress already at this point that it is not possible to equate national - Swedish - welfare effects of EMU with how firms would be affected. The performance of Swedish entities and the Swedish economy may differ from the performance of "Swedish firms". To take an extreme example, a Swedish-owned multinational company may be essentially unaffected by an appreciation of the Krona by switching production to other locations. This would perhaps have adverse consequences (e.g. unemployment) on the local economy as a result, even though the multinational company as a whole may be hurt little. It is also true that the degree of foreign ownership is increasing in many companies, providing another reason for not equating Swedish welfare effects of EMU with how "Swedish" firms would be affected. With these words of caution we proceed.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In section 1 we provide some information on Swedish industries' exposure to exchange rate changes, as indicated by correlations between stock prices and exchange rates. In section 2 we take a closer look at the relations between exchange rates and profits. In section 2.1 we investigate correlations between exchange rates and prices of Swedish exports and imports. Since nominal price rigidities apparently are important, section 2.2 presents some information about whether trade prices are set in domestic or foreign currencies. We then look at how the relations between exchange rates and profits may be affected by market competition (section 2.3), factor prices and other variables which affect profits (section 2.4) and intertemporal aspects such as adjustment costs (section 2.5). Section 2 concludes with a discussion of why exchange rate fluctuations matter for firms (section 2.6)

Having discussed how exchange rate uncertainty affects firms' profits, we next turn to the question of how EMU might affect uncertainty. Section 3 thus follows a macroeconomic track, and discusses the relation between monetary policy and exchange rate uncertainty. Section 4 contains a discussion of some microeconomic aspects that are often put forward in discussions about EMU, but which are overlooked in the framework used in section 2. Conclusions are presented in section 5.

---

[1] While the volatility (monthly standard deviation of intra-European exchange rates was lower in 1984-1989 than in 1974-1983, the volatility versus the U.S. dollar was higher (but not versus Yen). Cf. European Economy (1990), ch. 3.

[2] It is important to realize that in a frictionless world all nominal exchange rate regimes are equally efficient. To evaluate the effects of EMU in a general equilibrium framework we would need a model with three countries that incorporates real world imperfections that we believe to be central to the choice of nominal exchange rate regime. Extending the work by Obstfeld and Rogoff (1995) to include three countries and pricing-to-market issues (see Betts and Devereux, 1996) is one avenue that would seem promising at this point.

1. MEASURES OF EXCHANGE RATE EXPOSURE

The exchange rate exposure of a firm may generally be defined as ”the sensitivity of the value of the firm to movements in exchange rates” (Adler and Dumas, 1992). In the literature on this subject, one often sees a distinction between economic exposure, which refers to the total impact of exchange rates on the economic value of the firm, and accounting exposure, which merely measures the extent to which exchange rate changes cause accounting gains and losses. Accounting exposure is often divided into translation exposure and transaction exposure. Translation exposure is concerned with the impact of exchange rates on the home currency value (in accounting statements) of foreign assets and liabilities. Transaction exposure is generally taken to denote the balance of known payments and receivables denoted in foreign currency[3].

The exact definition of accounting exposure will vary between countries, because of differences in accounting standards, but it has other deficiences as well as a measure of exchange rate exposure. It ignores all effects from exchange rates that are not recorded on the books. Exchange rate changes may affect expected profits and hence the firm’s value through planned (certain but not recorded) contracts, through expected demand for the firm’s products, through changes in the firm’s actions because of exchange rate changes, etc. Such effects may be large even for firms without any foreign currency assets, liabilities or transactions, i.e. even for firms whose accounting-based measures of exchange rate exposure are zero.

In the financial literature economic exposure is commonly estimated simply by regressing changes in stock prices on changes in exchange rates (see e.g. Adler and Dumas, 1984 and Jorion, 1990). Such estimates provide a natural starting point for our discussion of how firms are affected by exchange rate changes. In Table 1 we present some different estimates of exchange rate exposure for the Swedish stock market. We also study one large corporation in the forest products industry, STORA[4]. The total economic exposure to exchange rate fluctuations is the point estimate of β from the following regression:

$$(1)\quad \ln(P_{t+1}/P_t)=\alpha+\beta\ln(S_{t+1}/S_t)+\varepsilon_{t+1}$$

where P is the stock price index and S is the effective nominal exchange rate, the weighted average of Krona prices of foreign currencies. Two measures of the effective exchange rate have been used, based on IMF’s so called MERM or TCW weights respectively[5]. The regression has been estimated on monthly data from a period during which the Krona

---

[3] See Tornianen (1992) for a thorough discussion.

[4] The reson for the choice of STORA is simply that we have received the permission to look at unofficial internal material from this company, which has helped us to organize our thinking about exchange rate uncertainty. Some of this information (on prices) is used in e.g. section 2.1

[5] The MERM weights are based on IMF’s Multilateral Exchange Rate Model. This is an econometric model which tries to estimate the effects on trade flows from exchange rate changes. The model includes estimated and calibrated behavioral (supply and demand) equations. IMF has recently abandoned the MERM weights in favor of the so called Total Competitiveness Weights (TCW) which are easier to calculate. They are similar to simple bilateral trade weights, although adjustments are made to account for competition in third markets.

exchange rate has been flexible (December 1992 to February 1996), as well as the longer period covering 1980 and onwards which includes the pegged exchange rate regime(s).

It can be seen from the upper panel of Table 1 that a depreciation of the Krona, defined using the TCW weights, with one per cent is associated with an increase in the total value of the stock market by .4 per cent[6]. This estimate is not affected by the choice of sample period. The corresponding estimate for STORA is 1.24 based on the flexible exchange rate period, and 0.65 for the longer period. This company is thus more exposed to exchange rates than the stock market as a whole. (From regressions we have chosen not to report, it can be seen that this also holds for the forest products industry on average.) When the effective exchange rate is defined using the MERM weights, which give a larger role to the U.S. dollar, all estimates of exposure are somewhat higher.For hedging purposes, one might want to estimate the economic exposure to different foreign currencies (see Adler and Dumas, 1984, and Adler and Jorion, 1992). This can be done simply by running the multiple regression,

$$(2)\ \ln(P_{t+1}/P_t)=\alpha+\beta\Sigma\ln(S_{i,t+1}/S_{i,t})+\eta_{t+1}$$

where S_i is the price of currency i in terms of the domestic currency (Krona). Some indications of which foreign currencies that are likely to be most important are given in Table 2. The first two columns show the shares of Swedish exports to and imports from, respectively, the most important trading partners. The third and fourth columns give IMF's TCW and MERM weights, respectively. These are constructed in order to take account of the degree and composition of competition in export and import markets. The most important trading partners are Germany, the U.K., the U.S., and the Nordic countries, Norway, Denmark and Finland. According to the MERM weights in column 4 (but not the TCW), Japan, Italy and France are more important than the U.K. and the Nordic countries. For STORA, Germany, Sweden, the U.K. and France are the most important markets. Almost 90% of total sales (external and internal) are on European markets. The first two columns on STORA in Table 3 give the percentage of sales and costs denominated in different currencies. It is seen that much more of costs are denominated in Swedish Kronor (43%) than sales (19%). The third column of Table 3 gives the composition of the known, but not yet received, net flows in different currencies for STORA's Swedish entities as of June 1995. It can be seen that the DM, the U.S. dollar and the British Pound are about equally important for transaction exposure, and that these currencies are far more important than any other currency. Only in Finnish Marks and Ecu is there a net outflow of currency. A depreciation of the Krona would thus, if flows were not hedged, lead to aggregate net flows becoming more worth in Kronor. The economic exposure might however be quite different from the transaction exposure, not least because half of STORA's equity is located outside Sweden.

We have chosen to estimate (2) using the Krona prices on the currencies from Germany, Finland, the U.K., and the U.S. This set appears to capture exchange rates which have developed somewhat independently in the past and/or can be expected to do so in the future. It can be seen from the results reported in the lower panel of Table 1 that a depreciation of the Krona against the U.S. dollar or the Finnish Mark raises stock prices significantly, both for STORA and for the stock market as a whole. A depreciation against the DM seems to lower stock prices. The regression coefficients for the individual currencies (the β_i's) do not add up

[6] We have also run regressions with the change of the nominal interest rate as an additional explanatory variable. This increases the explanatory power of the regression, but does not affect the point estimate of β very much.

to the measure of total economic exposure (β). The important reason is not that we have only included a subset of all relevant currencies, but that the different Krona exchange rates are not entirely independent. Therefore, an unambigous decomposition of total economic exposure to different currencies cannot be made.

The results nevertheless provide important information about exchange rate exposure among Swedish firms. First, there are reasons to expect overall exchange rate risk, so called economic exposure, to be quite different from narrow accounting-based measures of exchange rate risk, such as transaction exposure. Second, Swedish firms' exchange rate exposure is not only determined by the fluctuations in the value of the Krona versus DM and other potential EMU currencies. Fluctuations in the Krona/U.S. dollar rate may be equally (or even more) important[7].

2. EXCHANGE RATE FLUCTUATIONS AND FIRM PROFITS

The estimates of exchange rate exposure reported above does not give any information about the mechanisms whereby exchange rate fluctuations affect firm profits. Furthermore, the estimated β's are probably not invariant to a change in the monetary policy regime.Even though casual observations and more careful interviews studies (see e.g. Torniainen, 1992, and European Economy, 1990), suggest that firm managers worry about exchange rate fluctuations, it is not clear why exchange rate uncertainty should matter for the firms' owners. In a frictionless world with complete markets, investors should be able to hedge against exchange rate uncertainty by choosing a proper portfolio of firm shares (according to a version of the so called Modigliani-Miller theorem). There is obviously a need to go beyond the statistical measures of exchange rate exposure, to try to understand the relations between exchange rate fluctuations and firm profits and to discuss if exchange rate uncertainty is harmful or not.

Exchange rate changes affect firm profits through prices, unit costs and produced quantities, and through market values of physical assets and financial assets and liabilities. Only the effects through short-term assets and liabilities are captured in measures of accounting exposure. This also seems to be the only channel of exchange rate uncertainty that is considered when it is argued, as is frequently done, that firms now have access to forward foreign exchange markets which allow them to hedge against changes in exchange rates. But in order to understand the full importance of exchange rate uncertainty one needs to know rather much about "the nature of the good and the industry structure" (Dumas, 1994, p 18).

In the following, we will review analyses of the links between exchange rates and firm profits. The analyses show how the links depend on the nature of the good and the industry structure. We start in sections 2.1 - 2.3 with analyses of the relations between exchange rates and prices which are based on the assumption that firms solve a static profit maximization problem,

---

[7] Wihlborg (1993, 1994) reports that a depreciation of the Swedish Krona on average *lowers* the stock market value of Swedish industries. For STORA, he finds significant negative effects form a depreciation versus the DM and the Yen. His results are however based on a study of monthly data from January 1987 - February 1992. The fact that the value of the Krona was fixed (within a target zone) versus a currency basket between September 1982 and May 1991 means that during this period a depreciation should have been expected to be followed by an appreciation (if the target zone was credible). Furthermore, the construction of the currency basket implied that a depreciation against the DM typically was associated with an appreciation against the U.S. dollar.

where the exchange rate is the only source of uncertainty. In this context firms are assumed to be risk neutral, i.e., they want to maximize expected profits but do not care about the degree of uncertainty (variance). Within this framework one cannot answer questions about optimal hedging strategies. But the analyses are useful for our understanding of the effects of exchange rate fluctuations. Correlations between exchange rates and other variables (than prices) which affect firm profits are discussed in section 2.4. Intertemporal aspects are considered in section 2.5, and we return to the question of hedging in section 2.6.

One thing that deserves to be emphasized on an early stage is the distinction between nominal and real exchange rates. Empirically, it is well known that relative prices between different countries are more volatile when nominal exchange rates are more flexible (see e.g. Obstfeld, 1995). Consumer price indices are more stable in the short run than nominal exchange rates, so short run fluctuations in real exchange rates (relative consumer prices expressed in the same currency) largely reflect fluctuations in nominal exchange rates. Price stickiness is probably an important explanation for why nominal exchange rates are correlated with relative prices, real profits and other real variables. Most of the theoretical models discussed below are also based on assumptions of some kinds of nominal rigidities. In these models changes in nominal and real exchange rates are often equivalent. Nevertheless, the EMU issue that we want to focus on in this paper primarily concerns fluctuations in nominal exchange rates. Monetary policy cannot directly control real exchange rates (or other relative prices of goods or services), and nominal exchange rate uncertainty is a different problem for firms than uncertainty about relative prices[8].

2.1 Prices and exchange rates

If Swedish exporting and importing firms face prices that are exogenously determined in foreign currency on the world market, i.e., if the ”small, open economy” hypothesis is valid, they cannot deliberately change their prices when exchange rates fluctuate. If costs are fixed in domestic currency, which may be a realistic assumption in the short run, exchange rate changes may have strong effects on firms’ profitability.

It is well known that exporters in large economies such as the U.S., Germany and Japan can pursue policies of price discrimination. The empirical evidence suggests that they ”price to market”, and that relative export prices between different markets are affected by nominal exchange rates; see e.g. Giovannini (1988) and Knetter (1989). Froot and Klemperer (1989) and Kasa (1992) show why a firm with some market power may want to adjust relative export prices in response to changes in real exchange rates. For instance, if the real exchange rate between the U.S. and Germany appreciates, say because aggregate demand in the U.S. goes up relative to Germany, exporters may want to raise their export prices to the U.S. in relation to the German market. The relation between relative export prices and nominal exchange rates cannot, however, be explained in terms of price discrimination only. Some kind of nominal rigidity must also be present. If exporters keep prices (temporarily) fixed in the importing countries’ currencies - so called ”local currency price stability” - relative export prices will be perfectly correlated with nominal exchange rates. If the U.S. dollar appreciates against the DM ($S_{US,D}$ goes down), the price of exports to the U.S. in the exporters’ currency (P^{US}), will go up relative to the price of exports to Germany (P^{D}). In this case the nominal exchange rate $S_{US,D}$ will be positively correlated with the relative price P^{D}/P^{US}. According to Giovannini (1988), empirical evidence on pricing-to-market suggests that changes in relative export prices

[8] See Adler and Dumas (1983) for a further discussion of this point.

reflect both staggered nominal price setting and deliberate price discrimination (which could be present even in the absence of nominal rigidities).

Pricing-to-market may be a way for firms to manage their exchange rate exposure. Is this an option also for Swedish exporting and importing firms, or is Sweden a ”small, open economy”? The investigation of pricing-to-market in Swedish exports by Alexius and Vredin (1996) suggests that pricing-to-market is a common phenomenon, and that the degree of pricing-to-market depends not only on real exchange rates (because of price discrimination), but that nominal rigidities also play an important role. Correlations between relative export prices and nominal and real exchange rates are presented for a selection of industries and export markets in Table 4 a - b. It can be seen that the correlations are often significantly positive, which is consistent with pricing-to-market. The fact that relative export prices are correlated with real exchange rates suggests that there is price discrimination. Whether the correlations between relative export prices and nominal exchange rates are due to local currency pricing at the industry level, or to the fact that nominal and real exchange rates are correlated at the macro level, is an open question. Prices are not completely rigid in local currencies, since the correlations between relative export prices and nominal exchange rates are not perfectly positive. It is encouraging that the - admittedly relatively few - observations on genuine prices on an individual product (newspaper paper from STORA) roughly are consistent with the data on aggregated unit values (export values divided by export volumes).

The literature on pricing-to-market is related to the literature on ”exchange rate pass-through” (see e.g. Knetter, 1993). The latter concept usually refers to the effect on import prices from changes in exchange rates. If e.g. exporters price-to-market and stabilize prices in the local (importer’s) currency, the degree of pass-through will be low. Local currency price stability tends to stabilize the quantity of demand for the exported product. Exchange rate fluctuations will then predominantly affect the mark-up, i.e. the ratio between the export price and domestic marginal costs (which for the sake of the argument may be assumed to be constant). The larger the degree of pass-through to export prices in foreign currency, the more will quantities demanded fluctuate, leading to more volatile production. This may lead to more or less volatility in profits. The exporting firms’ profits will be affected no matter what the degree of pass-through is.

Unfortunately, the literature on exchange rate pass-through (see the survey by Menon, 1995) is often concerned with the effects of changes in real, rather than nominal, exchange rates. Nevertheless, the degree of pass-through into Swedish import prices is important for how Swedish firms and consumers are affected by exchange rate changes. Focusing on firms, we note that the degree of pass-through to imported inputs as well as to the prices of foreign competitors’ exports to Sweden is important for how much profits will be affected by exchange rate changes. Casual inspection of Swedish import prices suggests that pass-through is incomplete but also that it differs between industries. On average, the immediate pass-through is greater than zero but far from complete; cf. Figure 1 a. Adolfson (1996) reports an estimate of the contemporaneous pass-through for aggregate imports of 21%. The corresponding pass-through coefficients for the industries depicted in Figure 1 b - c, basic metals (SNI 37) and transport equipment (SNI 384), are 26% and 33%, respectively. Adolfson’s econometric analysis, which also takes world market prices into account, suggests that there is 100% long run pass-through in the transport equipment industry, but not in imports of basic metals.

The conclusion from the data on prices and exchange rates presented in this section is that nominal exchange rate changes are associated with changes in relative prices of exports and

imports. The apparent ability of Swedish firms to price to market, and the apparent less than full immediate exchange-rate pass-through into Swedish import prices, seems to suggest economic exposure to exchange rate fluctuations is more limited than the ”small open economy” hypothesis implies. But it should also be emphasized that the economic mechanisms behind the pricing-to-market behavior among domestic and foreign exporters are not fully understood. For instance, as one goes beyond the partial analysis of firm behavior and applies a general equilibrium approach, exchange rate volatility cannot be treated as an exogenous variable which is independent of the factors which determine the degree of pricing-to-market[9] .

2.2 The role of invoicing currency

Since correlations between exchange rates on the one hand and export and import prices on the other partly depend on nominal price rigidities, the currency of denomination of prices - the invoicing currency - is important (see Giovannini, 1988, for a formal analysis)[10] . According to European Economy (1990, p 72), most trade among the major industrialized countries is invoiced in the exporters' currency, which is supposed to be explained by the exporters' wish to eliminate exchange rate risk.

Using data from 1968, Grassman (1973) reported that the Swedish Krona was indeed the most important invoicing currency for Swedish exports, its share being 66%. The corresponding figure for imports was 26%. That exports are predominantly invoiced in the exporters' currency, which is sometimes called ”Grassman's law”, has been confirmed in other studies (Page, 1977, Van Nieuwkerk, 1979). The law seems to hold stronger for large exporting countries than small. For instance, exports to the U.S. are often priced in the U.S. dollar.

Table 5 suggests that there has been a drastic change in the invoicing practices of Swedish exporters since Grassman's study. The share of the Krona is now down to 37%. Judging from the figures for different manufacturing sectors, the Krona is still the most important invoicing currency in most cases, followed by the U.S. dollar or the DM. One exception is the wood products industry (SNI 33), for which the British pound is much more important than the dollar. In this industry the Krona is about as important as in the aggregate of Swedish exports in Grassman's study. Another exception is the basic metals (iron and steel) industry (SNI 37), where the share of the dollar is almost twice as large as that of the Krona or the DM.

Comparing Table 5 with Table 1, we see that the dollar share of export revenue is much higher than the share of the U.S. market in Swedish exports. While 8% of Swedish exports are directed to the U.S., 37% of the non-Krona export revenues are quoted in dollars (23.4/(100-37.1) 0.37). The DM and the French franc are also somewhat more important as invoicing currencies than the German and French markets are in Swedish exports. In the wood products industry, where the Krona appears to be unusually important in invoicing, the export shares of the U.S. and German markets are unusually small. The share of the DM is still much higher than the German market share (14.5% versus 2.1%). Similarly, the role of the U.S. dollar is much more important in invoicing in the iron steel industry than the share of the U.S. market (27.3% versus 8.7%).

---

[9] See e.g. Betts and Devereux (1996). In their analysis the degree of pricing-to-market is exogenous while exchange rate volatility is endogenous.

[10] In principle a firm may quote price in one currency (the price setting currency) and a buyer may agree to pay that price in another currency (the invoicing currency). In practice, the two usually appear to be the same.

If pricing exports in domestic currency is a way to hedge against exchange rate risk, as argued in European Economy (1990), why do Swedish producers invoice their exports in foreign currencies? And why do they invoice exports to a certain country in a third country's currency (usually the U.S. dollar or the DM)? Part of the answer is probably that the price setting and invoicing currencies are often the same and that pricing exports in domestic currency does not mean that risk is eliminated. Suppose that nominal exchange rates are the only source of uncertainty. If export prices are set before exchange rates are realized, which is a common and reasonable assumption, domestic currency pricing means that there is no uncertainty about the export price - but also that the exported quantity is uncertain. If, on the other hand, the export price is fixed in the importer's currency (local currency pricing), the exported quantity is certain while the value in domestic currency is not[11]. The resulting exposure is then the so called transaction exposure.

Investigations by the Confederation of Swedish Industries show that invoicing practices differ very much also within industries. The investigations give the, hardly surprising, impression that the U.S. dollar is somewhat more important for the Swedish industry than the simple trade weights suggest. This is also reflected in the MERM (but not the TCW) weights in Table 2, and to some extent in the regression results in Table 1. The investigations also verify that market and currency composition are not all that matters, but that the origin of competitors also plays a role. For instance, Swedish exporters of paper pulp to the European countries compete with North American producers for market shares when it comes to softwood pulp, which is invoiced in dollars. In the case of hardwood pulp, however, the main competitors come from Spain and Portugal, and the products are invoiced in Ecu[12].

2.3 The role of competition

As discussed above, the degree of pricing-to-market and exchange rate pass-through depends both on the degree of competition (price discrimination) and the degree and type of nominal price rigidity (see Giovannini, 1988, for a more detailed discussion), There are also reasons to expect that there is a link between the degree of competition and price rigidity. Consider the case discussed in the previous section, where an exporter is to decide whether to peg his price in his own or the importer's currency. If we add competition from a third country to this set-up, assuming that the competitor's price is set in his own currency, demand for the exporter's product as a function of exchange rates is uncertain no matter what price setting currency that is chosen. The choice of invoicing and price-setting currency, and hence the correlation between nominal exchange rates and relative export prices, can thus be expected to be affected by the degree of competition. This is discussed in more detail by Friberg (1996).

Kim (1992) summarizes the effects of market conditions on the pass-through coefficient. The analyses surveyed by Kim generally assume prices to be set under certainty, which implies that the pricing currency is irrelevant. He does note however that pricing in the importer's currency tends to lead to a lower pass-through coefficient. The degree of pass-through to the local (importer's) currency price decreases with the degree of market concentration, and

---

[11] This is discussed in Giovannini (1988), Donnenfeld and Zilcha (1991) and Friberg (1996).

[12] Adolfson (1990) investigates whether industry differences with respect to invoicing practces matter for the degree of exchange rate pass-through in Swedish imports. For each industry, she calculates indexes of world market prices and effective exchange rates using both weights based on each country's share in Swedish imports and each currency's share in import payments. In most industries, similar estimates of pass-through coefficients are obtained when the two different sets of weights are used.

increases with the extent of substitutability between goods and with the market share of foreign firms relative to local competitors. The standard reference for the last effect is Dornbusch (1987) who studies various modes of competition. Also Feenstra, Gagnon and Knetter (1996) show (in a model of Bertrand competition in differentiated goods) that pass-through should be high for imports from a source country with a large market share. The predictions of their model seem to be borne out by the empirical analysis of the automobile industry.

The links between market share and pass-through imply that one should be interested in where the competitors to Swedish firms are based. EMU will not necessarily lead to low profit fluctuations as a function of exchange rate fluctuations, even on intra-EMU sales. Competition from non-EMU countries is important within many industries, and profits in these industries will (most likely) fluctuate as long as the exchange rate between the Euro and the rest of the world's currencies fluctuates. This effect will become less important, the more countries that join the EMU, and the more widespread the use of the Euro becomes in international transactions.

The columns on exchange rate index weights in Table 2 give some indications of the role of different countries as competitors to Swedish exports of goods. While the EU countries' total shares in exports and imports are around 60%, the competitiveness (TCW) weights constructed by IMF suggest that the EU countries' total weight is around 70%. According to the MERM weights, however, the EU weights sum to just above 50%[13]. The total weight of the "core" countries within EU - Austria, Benelux, France, and Germany, the most likely members of a monetary union in 1999 - is clearly below 50%. This suggests that the exact definition of the EMU area will be very important. Whether the U.K., Denmark and Finland join the monetary union or not determines whether the majority of competition comes from EMU or non-EMU members. Even the former Swedish currency basket regime (1977 - 1991), which stabilized a weighted average of Krona exchange rates, perhaps involved less exchange rate uncertainty than a small EMU.

Another aspect of EMU is that it may make it harder for Swedish firms to price-to-market on EMU markets. Empirical evidence shows that there is larger price dispersion between identical goods sold in different countries than between differentiated goods which are sold in the same country (see e.g. Engel, 1993). This suggests that having a common currency might facilitate arbitrage between national markets that are in the EMU. This would tend to hurt firms but generally benefit consumers. To judge the welfare consequences of less exchange rate uncertainty and less price discrimination, one needs to know more about the explanations for nominal rigidites. If there are some imperfections that do not disappear when nominal exchange rates are fixed, it is hard to know whether reduced exchange rate volatility raises welfare or not.

One final argument that links competition and exchange rate uncertainty should be mentioned. It is frequently argued that a common currency is necessary to reap the full benefits of the internal European market, i.e. that the EMU is a necessary part of the "1992" programme. This is partly based on the argument discussed above, that there may be less price discrimination if exchange rate uncertainty is reduced. But it is also the case that protectionist movements often point at exchange rate changes as a form of "beggar-thy-neighbor" policy. While the economic logic behind this line of reasoning remains to be shown, it seems

[13] It should be noted that the IMF weights do not include all Swedish trading partners and competitors. To some extent the weights overestimate the role of EU countries.

reasonable that increased exchange rate stability could be welfare-improving if it reduces the protectionist pressures. However, it is also quite likely that these pressures will take other expressions once exchange rates have been stabilized within EMU. The EMU countries' stronger international position may lead to more protectionism vis-à-vis countries outside EMU.

2.4 Correlations between exchange rates and other variables which affect firm profits

In most of the literature on pricing-to-market, and in our discussion so far, the nominal exchange rate is assumed to be the only source of uncertainty for the firm when it solves its maximization problem. There are however good theoretical and empirical reasons to believe that unexpected changes in exchange rates are associated also with unexpected changes in the costs for labor, capital and intermediate inputs, as well as in income or wealth of consumers that demand the firm's products. Imported inputs make up a large fraction of the value of production in many industries. A few examples, based on input-output data from 1985, are given in Table 6. In the paper and board industry (SNI 34112), imported inputs account for 11.8% of the production value, while the corresponding figure for the electronics and telecommunications industry (SNI 3832) is 33.6%. The exchange rate exposure of a firm that uses imported inputs thus depends on the share of imported inputs, how much the prices of these inputs are affected by exchange rate changes and how much the firm in its turn passes through these cost changes. The overall economic exposure to exchange rate fluctuations thus depends on the share (and currency denomination) of imported inputs in addition to the factors discussed in sections 2.1 - 2.3 above.

Labor is an important factor of production in all industries. Since nominal wages are quite rigid, changes in product real wages will be strongly correlated with changes in exchange rates through prices of firms' products. In Sweden, the largest changes in competitiveness and real wages during the last decades have occurred in conjunction with the devaluations of the Krona in 1981 and 1982 and the depreciation following the move to a flexible exchange rate in November 1992. In Figure 2 we can see how Swedish industries' relative unit labor cost vis-à-vis foreign competitors (relative wages, in common currency, adjusted for changes in productivity) dropped by about 25% in 1981-83 and by even more in 1991-1993. The fact that real wages are correlated with nominal exchange rates of course affects exchange rate exposure.

Interest rates are also correlated with changes in exchange rates, because capital is internationally mobile. The difference between nominal interest rates on assets in domestic and foreign currency is equal to the expected rate of depreciation of the domestic currency plus a risk premium. Nominal interest rate differentials are however not very useful for predicting exchange rate changes. This suggests that exchange rate forecasts are systematically wrong and/or that risk premia are very volatile. Empirical research has not been able to provide any definite answer to the question about the relative importance of forecast errors and fluctuations in risk premia, since these variables are not directly observable. For our purposes it is sufficient to note that the stochastic processes for nominal exchange rates will affect both exchange rate expectations and risk premia, and hence interest rates (see Adler and Dumas, 1983, for a further discussion of this issue).

The strength of the correlation between exchange rates and other "fundamental" variables has been the subject of much empirical work; see Taylor (1995), Frankel and Rose (1995) and Obstfeld (1995) for surveys. The findings suggest, among other things, that a large part of exchange rate fluctuations seem unrelated to "fundamentals", and that estimated relations are

not stable out of sample. Nevertheless, exchange rates are related to ”fundamentals”. In the very short run (within a day, say) exchange rate changes are correlated with news about macroeconomic conditions. The relations are weak in monthly and quarterly data, where exchange rate fluctuations seem to be dominated by ”noise”, but become stronger again at longer horizons. It has been easier to establish links between exchange rate changes and ”fundamentals” for both very instable regimes (hyperinflations) and relatively stable regimes (target zones), than for regimes with more normal exchange rate flexibility[14].

All this information about correlations between exchange rates and other variables which affect firm profits implies that exchange rate fluctuations are not the only, probably not the most important, and certainly not an independent source of uncertainty for the firm. Yet, analyses of pricing-to-market and exchange rate pass-through are typically based on the assumption that exchange rates are the only source of uncertainty. This is not an unreasonable assumption within a static framework and if one is concerned with the volatility of profit, say, within a year. At such frequencies, nominal exchange rates are very volatile and weakly related to ”fundamentals”. But if one is concerned with exchange rate exposure over longer horizons, which the discussion in the next section suggests than one should be, the assumption of independent exchange rate uncertainty is not tenable.

2.5 Intertemporal aspects

Very often a firm’s behavior today affects its profits tomorrow. Intertemporal links may arise from the the demand side or the supply side. Demand side links have been studied by Froot and Klemperer (1989), who focus on consumers’ search costs. Intertemporal links on the supply side have been studied by Baldwin and Krugman (1989) and Dixit (1989), who look at the decision to be present on an export market as an irreversible investment (in e.g. marketing and distribution networks). The implications of such theories is that the pricing decision takes on an element of investment, since it affects future cash flows. This has further implications. In particular, responses to exchange rate changes may depend on if the changes are perceived as permanent or temporary. Furthermore, there may be ”hysteresis” effects on trade - large swings in real exchange rates will have persistent effects on industry structure through entry and exit of firms on different national markets[15].

Kasa’s (1992) model, where the firm has increasing adjustment costs for sales to the foreign market, has similar implications for pricing behavior. Using data on American and Canadian imports of seven commodities, he provides some empirical support for his theory of pricing-to-market. The fact that his model does not appear to explain the pricing-to-market behavior in Swedish exports - see Alexius and Vredin (1996) - does not imply that the correlations between exchange rates and Swedish export and import prices are unaffected by intertemporal relations. Gottfries (1991) suggests that the intertemporal pricing approach can explain the behavior of Swedish exporters after the 1981 and 1982 devaluations. Exporters mainly raised their profit margins in Swedish Kronor instead of investing in market shares. This would be the behavior predicted by the models of the Froot and Klemperer type if the real depreciation was perceived to be of short duration (i.e. if exporters expected a real appreciation; see also Gottfries, 1994).

---

[14] Nessén’s (1996) study on data from the Nordic countries suggest that fluctuations in risk premia are more important than expectational errors. Her analysis is inspired by Froot and Frankel (1989), who find the opposite result in U.S. data.

[15] The phenomenon of ”hysterisis in trade” was given particular attention after the strong fluctuations in the U.S. dollar in the 1980’s. See e.g. Baldwin and Krugman (1989).

An interesting topic for further research is if export and import prices have reacted differently to the changes in the flexible Krona after November 1992 than to the earlier devaluations. Changes in a floating exchange rate can be expected to be (even) less permanent than changes in a pegged rate. More generally, there is little reason to expect pricing behavior, and therefore exchange rate exposure, to be invariant to changes in the monetary policy regime. This makes it hard to determine how EMU will affect Swedish firms' exposure to exchange rate uncertainty.

2.6 Why do exchange rate fluctuations matter?

As noted above, most theoretical and empirical analyses of how firms respond to exchange rate fluctuations have focused on how profits are affected by exogenous (real or nominal) exchange rate changes. Exchange rate variability leads to profits that are sometimes higher and sometimes lower. This could be a problem if agents dislike fluctuations in wealth (and cannot hedge against it without costs) or if exchange rate fluctuations affect mean profits negatively. Exchange rate fluctuations decrease mean profits if profits increase at a decreasing rate as the exchange rate becomes more favorable for the firm. If profits increase at a increasing rate as the exchange rate becomes more favorable, exchange rate fluctuations lead to an increase in mean profits[16].

It is quite possible that exchange rate fluctuations increase mean profits. A flexible firm can change its exports to and imports from different foreign markets in response to exchange rate fluctuations. Total production, sales and profits may increase when the exchange rate is favorable, while the adverse effects of an unfavorable exchange rate can be limited through cut-backs. In this sense exchange rate variability can provide an opportunity to achieve higher mean profits than would be the case under stable exchange rates. This is also the intuition behind a well known result from microeconomics that states that mean profits of a price taker are higher the more the market price fluctuates (Oi, 1961). Although this is not directly applicable to our problem, because the representative firm is not a price taker, it is important to know whether profits are typically increasing or decreasing in exchange rate fluctuations.

We know of no direct studies of this, although empirical studies of pricing-to-market, exchange rate pass-through and invoicing could provide part of the answer. Figures 3a and 3b present the relation between operating profits, as a share of turnover, in the Swedish manufacturing industry and the real and the nominal effective exchange rates in the period 1975-1993. We note that for the Swedish manufacturing industry as a whole no clear pattern emerges. If anything, the relationship seems rather linear, i.e. profits increase with the exchange rate in a fairly constant way. But the figures only represent aggregate relations in which even very strong patterns for individual firms may cancel. Some firms may benefit more from a depreciation than others. We must also recognise that exchange rates are just one among many factors that influence profits. We can only say that there is no convincing theoretical or empirical evidence that risk neutral firms are harmed by exchange rate instability.

International evidence on how firms manage exchange rate exposure suggests that firms act as if they are risk averse; see Belk and Glaum (1990) for a study of 17 British companies and Torniainen (1992) for a survey[17]. Forward contracts seem to be the most common way of

[16] In technical terms the question is if profits are convex or concave in the exchange rate.
[17] We know of no comprehensive study of how Swedish firms deal with exchange rate uncertainty, although some studies of individual firms have been done, e.g. Hegbart and

hedging exchange rate risk. The focus is put on hedging of transaction exposure, i.e, hedging of known net flows in different currencies, while there is limited concern with hedging of economic exposure. However, different macroeconomic indicators are often ”given attention” when strategic decisions are discussed, according to Torniainen (1992). These findings raise the questions, first, why firms hedge at all, and, second, why hedging is limited to transaction exposure.

In a frictionless world with complete markets hedging cannot add value to the firm, since shareholders can equally well choose their own preferred risk profile given the exposure of different firms. In such a frictionless world the choice of exchange rate regime would hardly be interesting either. Dufey and Srinivasalu (1983) and Smith and Stulz (1985) point at some real world imperfections which may explain why firms do try to limit their exposure to exchange rate uncertainty. Reasons could be tax schedules (taxes are generally not negative when profits are negative) and/or credit constraints which imply that exchange rate fluctuations can lead to financial distress and bankruptcy. Another reason why hedging could add value to the firm is if the company has better information about its exposure to exchange rate risk than individual investors do, or can create hedges at lower transaction costs[18]. An argument presented in financial textbooks (e.g. Brealey and Myers, 1991, or Sercu and Uppal, 1995) is that hedging may make it easier to evaluate the performance of various exchange-rate exposed divisions within a firm and help managers focus on the production activities of their business.

The instruments on the financial markets that can help firms to hedge their positions are mostly relevant for hedging of known positions (see Torniainen, 1992, ch.2). If a firm knows that it has a certain revenue accruing in DM in 6 months there is little problem in hedging this on the financial markets. The cost of doing this can not be considered unreasonably large (i.e., the market appears to be efficient) and procedures are straightforward. This involves hedging of transaction exposure or what Dumas (1994) calls ”short-term hedging”. Since there are reasons to expect exchange rates to be affected by ”fundamentals” with a lag (see section 2.4), and since the firm has good reasons to look at its profit maximization problem in an intertemporal perspective (see section 2.5), a short term - let alone static - perspective on exchange rate exposure seems inappropriate. But as emphasized by Dumas (1994), it is only within a static framework that the argument that firms can easily hedge against exchange rate uncertainty is correct.

While ”long-term hedging” may be warranted, it may also be terribly complicated, both because the hedging plan must be continuously revised as the expectations about long term conditions are modified, and because one needs rather detailed information about such economic mechanisms behind exchange rate exposure that we have discussed above. Given transaction and information costs, it may thus be optimal for a firm only to consider ”short-term hedging”. Dumas (1994) notes that managers are reluctant to have forward contracts that will not be matched by any real flows: ”Managers - perhaps reacting to a no-regret condition - are loath to initiate a hedge which may later have to be reversed”.

Jutterström’s (1995) study of *Cloetta Choklad och Konfektyr*. Their results, and our own discussions with STORA, seem to be in line with the international evidence cited by Torniainen (1992).

[18] There do seem to be informational asymmetries between firms and investors. The Association of Swedish Financial Analysts (Sveriges Finansanalytikers Förening 1994) note in their recommendations that the information given by firms about exchange rate exposureis often incomplete and that methods of reporting vary greatly between firms.

It seems reasonable to assume that a larger firm will generally be able to handle exchange rate uncertainty in a better way than small firms. The existence of specialised finance departments at large firms should mean that they have a better capacity to handle adverse effects of exchange rate fluctuations. Large firms are also less likely to suffer from credit constraints and other real-world deviations from the frictionless (Modigliani-Miller) economy. It is therefore interesting to note the company composition of Swedish exports and imports presented in Table 7. A very large share of Swedish exports and imports seem to be accounted for by companies that can be expected to be able to handle complicated matters of international finance well. But the argument cuts both ways - the limited number of small firms trading internationally may reflect that there are significant barriers for smaller firms that want to engage in international trade. Variable exchange rates may be one of these.

In conclusion, unexpected changes in exchange rates affect firms in many different ways: through the prices of their products, in relation to competing products and costs of inputs, and through consumers' demand. The relations are however complicated functions of market structures, nominal rigidities and invoicing (and price setting) practices. Theoretically, if capital markets worked perfectly, firms should not have to care about their exchange rate exposure. A higher degree of exchange rate uncertainty may just as well be beneficial as damaging for a firm, and investors could diversify through their ownership of shares in firms with different exchange rate exposures. In practice, however, firms generally act as if they would want to lower their exposure to exchange rate uncertainty. Various imperfections (information and transaction costs) seem to give firms reasons to hedge their operations against exchange rate uncertainty.

According to European Economy (1990, p 73), "only a fraction of total trade is hedged through forward operations and the available data on international portfolio diversification suggests that exchange rate risk is not diversified by shareholders". The discussion in sections 2.1 - 2.5 above however shows that measuring and identifying the sources of economic exposure to exchange rate uncertainty is by no means a simple exercise. The exposure to be hedged depends in a complicated way on the competitive situation of the firm - its competitors' price setting behavior and exchange rate pass through on its outputs and inputs - and other sources of uncertainty are not independent of exchange rate uncertainty. Therefore, the actual degree of hedging and diversification is hard to measure for an outside observer. For the same reasons, exchange rate hedging is also difficult for the firm itself. This appears to be an argument to reduce exchange rate uncertainty through macroeconomic policy, if possible.

3. EXCHANGE RATE UNCERTAINTY AND MONETARY POLICY[19]

In section 2.4 above it was argued that exchange rate fluctuations are not an independent source of uncertainty for the firm. This argument, in itself, should hardly be surprising or controversial. Nominal exchange rates are relative prices of different national monies. As such, they should be affected by monetary policy and correlated with other variables that are affected by monetary policy. Monetary policy has immediate effects on exchange rates and short run nominal interest rates, partly through expectations about future policy. Monetary policy affects inflation with a lag. Nominal rigidities imply that these effects on nominal

[19] In this section our discussion has a macroeconomic perspective. The issues involved are essential for the question whether EMU leads to lower exchange rate uncertainty, but the discussion is brief since the topic is covered in other reports to the Swedish Government Commission on EMU.

variables, in turn, are transmitted to real interest rates and real wages, at least temporarily. That monetary policy can affect aggregate output and employment in the short run is not very controversial either.

Nevertheless, these observations have strong implications for the issue whether EMU will give rise to microeconomic benefits from lower exchange rate uncertainty. As noted by Adler and Dumas (1983, p. 962),

> ”the question of the relevance of exchange rate risk becomes ill-formulated since exchange rates and price levels are endogenous. The issue then becomes that of the welfare impact or non-neutrality of monetary policies in a multi-currency world. It is a very complex one, for which few statements remain valid outside a particular context or model formulation”.

The answer one gives to the ill-formulated question whether EMU will beneficially lower exchange rate uncertainty or not, appears to be determined by which of two extreme views on exchange rate fluctuations one most easily accepts. Friedman (1953) expressed the view that flexible exchange rates constitute no additional source of risk, and that increased exchange rate flexibility ”may not change the extent of uncertainty at all and, indeed, may even decrease uncertainty”. On the other hand, there is the idea that exchange rate fluctuations are governed by exogenous, possibly self-fulfilling and therefore destabilizing, expectations. This idea was dismissed by Friedman, but has recently become very popular, especially after the European currency crises in 1992 and 1993.

On a theoretical level, it is clear that a flexible exchange rate has a potential to act as an ”automatic stabilizer” when the economy is subject to real shocks. A fixed exchange rate may however be stabilizing when there are financial disturbances, e.g. to money demand. These arguments can be found in standard textbooks in international economics, e.g. Krugman and Obstfeld (1994). When nominal prices are sticky, the nominal exchange rate provides a link between the economy’s real and financial sectors. A flexible exchange rate may beneficially transmit real shocks to the financial sector and lead to movements in interest rates which dampen the effects on production. But when disturbances occur on the financial markets, it is beneficial if the link is cut by a fixed exchange rate.

Standard textbooks nowadays also emphasize that the exchange rate is an asset price which is influenced by expectations about future realizations of the exchange rate itself as well as other ”fundamentals”. Recent research has provided examples of how expectations may become self-fulfilling and destabilizing under certain conditions. These examples do not, however, show that destabilizing speculation is unavoidable, because the outcome depends on what is assumed about monetary policy (see e.g. Ljungqvist, 1994, and Obstfeld, 1996).

As noted in section 2.4 above, changes in nominal exchange rates are not generally unrelated to ”fundamentals”. Some empirical findings still support the speculations hypothesis. First, short run (monthly or quarterly) changes in nominal exchange rates appear to be driven mainly by ”noise”. Second, macroeconomic variables in general are not more or less stable under fixed than flexible exchange rate regimes. The exception is the real exchange rate, which is clearly more volatile when the nominal exchange rate is flexible, because price levels are rigid. Many, not mutually exclusive, interpretations of these observations are however possible. It is certainly conceivable that a monetary policy aimed at a pegged exchange rate can stabilize nominal and real exchange rates, both through stabilizing expectations (if the policy is credible), and through stabilizing ”fundamentals” (e.g. by making fiscal and monetary policy more stable). It is also possible that flexible exchange rates move around for no obvious reason. But the empirical record may also reflect the fact that changes in monetary

policy regimes are themselves endogenous. Fixed exchange rates may have been abandoned when real disturbances have become more severe, and macroeconomic stability may have been preserved through nominal - and real - exchange rate flexibility. The former interpretations seem to lie behind the argument for EMU, while the latter view is consistent with Friedman's.

Unfortunately, historical relations between macroeconomic fluctuations and exchange rate policies may be of limited use when it comes to predicting the effects of EMU. Most of our experience comes from regimes characterized by more or less exchange rate flexibility. A European monetary union is an experiment without precedent. What the discussion in this section makes clear is that the nature of exchange rate uncertainty is very much determined by monetary policy. This suggests that whether EMU leads to more or less uncertainty depends on specific details of the ECB's policy. Further discussion of this topic would however bring us outside the proper scope of the present paper.

4. OTHER MICROECONOMIC BENEFITS OF EMU

Of the sixteen mechanisms through which EMU is expected to have its strongest effects, according to European Economy (1990, section 1.3), three are related to exchange rate variability and uncertainty:

- A reduction in nominal exchange rate uncertainty between the EMU countries is expected to increase the efficiency and volume of investment;
- If EMU leads to more investment, this is expected to create higher growth, at least in the medium run;
- The substitution of a single Community currency for national currencies is expected to lead to an advantageous reduction in terms of trade variability.

This paper has primarily dealt with the sources of exchange rate uncertainty and the effects on firm profits. These mechanisms are important to understand before the effects on investments, growth, terms of trade and overall economic efficiency can be evaluated. In this section we will briefly review some of the arguments about such effects.

Theory tells us that the relationship between uncertainty and investment can be either positive or negative. The effects depend on investors' risk aversion, whether investments are irreversible, and on the specific form of the profit function; see for instance Caballero (1991)[20]. To determine the direction of the effects empirically has also proven hard and the issue is far from settled; see Leahy and Whited (1995) for a survey. Moving from the question of uncertainty in general to exchange rate uncertainty specifically, one does not find very much empirical work. Goldberg (1993) and Campa and Goldberg (1995a, b) have studied how exchange rate movements affect investment in different industries. Campa and Goldberg (1995a) find weak, generally not significant, evidence of a depressing effect from exchange rate uncertainty (variability) on investment.

Exchange rate uncertainty may influence investment if firms hedge against exchange rate fluctuations by diversifying internationally, investing abroad. The results of Goldberg and Kolstad (1994) point to the existence of such an effect on bilateral foreign direct investment patterns between the United States and Canada, Japan and the United Kingdom. Aizenmann (1994) offers a theoretical analysis. Adler and Dumas (1983, sec. VII), on the other hand, argue that other motives, such as purchases of control, probably are much more important explanations for foreign direct investments and multinational companies than hedging.

[20] Dixit and Pindyck (1994) provide a thorough treatment of investment under uncertainty.

How growth would be affected by EMU integrates very many issues, not the least the previously discussed effects on investment. We have noted that empirical evidence of positive effects from investment of limiting exchange rate variability are weak or inconclusive. Given the problem of establishing a clear theoretical link between investment and (long run) growth, it should come as no surprise that there is even less evidence of growth effects from lower exchange rate volatility. Regarding the advantageous effects of exchange rate stability on the variability of terms of trade, the situation is somewhat more clear. As noted above, real exchange rates are more volatile when nominal exchange rates are more flexible. There is also strong evidence that the export price of a traded good often differs between different importing markets, and that the differences are associated with changes in nominal exchange rates (see section 2.1). We suspect that these pieces of evidence support the conjecture that terms of trade are more stable when exchange rates are fixed. But it is not clear that this is advantageous. Since the exchange rate may function as an ”automatic stabilizer”, increased nominal exchange rate flexibility may be associated with increased stability in production even if - or rather, because - relative prices become more volatile.

Most empirical studies find no significant, or only weak, negative relations between trade levels and exchange rate variability. Edison and Melvin (1990) provide a comprehensive survey. A calibration exercise by Gagnon (1993) also suggests that there is little potential for exchange rate fluctuations, of realistic magnitudes, to depress trade significantly. It should however be noted that there are studies, e.g. by de Grauwe and de Bellefroid (1989) and Arize (1995), which point in the opposite direction, and that EMU is essentially a project without precedent. A monetary union may lead to more competition and more trade through mechanisms that we have not observed before (but see section 2.3 for related arguments).

While the evidence of positive effects from exchange rate stability on trade, investment and growth seems rather weak, a simple thought experiment suggests that some stability, at least within small enough currency areas, is desired. Suppose that every Swedish city had its own currency. It seems reasonable that creating a larger currency area with fixed exchange rates would stimulate trade, investment and growth, not only through through reduced uncertainty about trade conditions but also through lower conversion costs. Indeed, the most obvious gain from creating a common currency is sometimes argued to be the elimination of transaction costs. The direct costs of exchanging currencies would go down. Also, some resources that firms devote to the management of foreign exchange could be freed. Costs would of course remain for transactions in any currency that does not belong to the EMU. In European Economy (1990) it is estimated that the exchange transaction costs range from 0.1% to 0.9% of GDP (for the EU members at the time). The ”smaller” the currency and the less sophisticated the country’s financial markets are, the higher will the transaction costs be. Wihlborg (1995) makes a simple calculation suggesting that banks’ revenues from currency transactions represent about 0.1% of Swedish GDP. The gains do not seem to be large enough, on average, to play a critical role when evaluating the overall effects on the Swedish economy of joining EMU. The gains may however be very unequally distributed. Small firms are likely to gain much more than large firms.

An argument that we have not discussed explicitly, is that EMU would be beneficial if lower exchange rate uncertainty would create lower real interest rates, through lower risk premia. The microeconomic approach in this paper however deals with fundamental mechanisms behind such a potential link between monetary unification and interest rates. If risk premia go down, this must be because firms’ (and households’) perceived uncertainty goes down. We have noted that the effects of EMU in this regard are hard to predict.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this report has been to review the argument that EMU leads to benefits from lower exchange rate uncertainty. We believe that our difficulty with providing a clear conclusion has more to do with the complexity of the problem as such, rather than our incompetence. One testament to the difficulty of the task is given by Krugman (1993, p 22):

> ”Equally conceivably, the hidden microeconomic benefits of a common currency are so overwhelming in the United States that Europe should follow suit even though the macroeconomic costs would be much greater. We just don’t know. It is not that there are conflicts among the estimates. There are simply no estimates at all. At this point you may ask me how I propose to remedy this gap. The short answer is that I don’t know.”

Nevertheless, we have to make a judgement about whether the larger degree of exchange rate stability that EMU can offer is likely or not to be beneficial. Our review leads us to conclude that the following arguments speak against the idea that EMU will be beneficial:

- Firms can adjust to exchange rate changes through e.g. pricing and invoicing policies. Given that firms can price-to-market and change their price setting policies in response to exchange rate fluctuations, it is notclear that they benefit from lower exchange rate volatility.
- Exchange rate uncertainty is not independent of other sources of macroeconomic uncertainty. In response to shocks to the real economy, flexible exchange rate changes may work as ”automatic stabilizers”. Fixed exchange rates may lead to a higher degree of macroeconomic uncertainty.
- The empirical record does not suggest that there are any strong links between exchange rate uncertainty on the one hand and such phenomena as investments, trade and growth on the other.

The following arguments however seem to speak for EMU:

- Given the complicated nature of the relations between exchange rate fluctuations and firm profits, there are reasons to expect that it is hard for firms to hedge against exchange rate uncertainty (and macroeconomic uncertainty in general). Case studies and surveys also show that firms do not hedge perfectly. Market imperfections may constitute an argument for a government insurance policy through macroeconomic policy.
- EMU could lower uncertainty if it implies that macroeconomic policy becomes more predictable, e.g. because of more coordination between countries.
- Changes in ”fixed but adjustable” exchange rates, such as the sharp drops in the value of the Swedish Krona in 1981 - 1982 and 1992 - 1993, have been associated with large changes in relative prices of goods and production factors and hence with large swings in profit margins of exporters and importers. Monetary policies may have amplified the volatility in firms’ profits compared to what it would have been under either a completely fixed or a fully flexible exchange rate. If Sweden is faced with a choice between EMU and a unilaterally pegged exchange rate, then EMU may be preferable.
- EMU may lead to a higher degree of market integration, e.g. by loweringprotectionist pressures stimulated by exchange rate fluctuations.

In addition, resources are gained if EMU leads to lower transaction costs. But this is not directly related to exchange rate uncertainty and the argument has not been discussed in detail in this paper.

We do not think that it is possible to decide whether the arguments for EMU are stronger than the arguments against. Three circumstances are particularly noteworthy. First, whether EMU will lower exchange rate uncertainty or not very much depends on what countries that will participate. For Sweden, the dependence on the U.S. dollar is not necessarily smaller than the dependence on the DM. Whether the dependence on countries outside EMU is larger than on countries inside EMU, depends e.g. on whether the U.K., Denmark and Finland are outside or inside. Second, the exposure to exchange rate fluctuations (vis-à- vis different foreign currencies) differs between firms and industries. EMU may benefit some and harm others. Since we do not have a clear picture of firms' overall economic - as opposed to transaction - exposure to exchange rate fluctuations, an assessment of the total effect is impossible to make. Third, European monetary unification is a large structural change, the consequences of which are hard to predict from historical evidence on other monetary policy regimes. The estimated coefficients that describe e.g. the degrees of exchange rate exposure, pricing-to-market and exchange-rate pass-through are not ”deep” parameters which are invariant to monetary policy.

We conclude with a comment on the following quotation from One market, one money (European Economy, 1990, p. 63):

> ”The gains from the suppression of exchange rate variability in terms of increased trade and capital movements are difficult to measure because firms can in many cases insure against this risk using sophisticated foreign exchange market operations.”

Our review leads us to conclude, that, YES, the gains are hard to measure. But NOT because firms can insure themselves using sophisticated operations. Quite the contrary, because exchange rate uncertainty is such a complex phenomenon and so hard to measure, firms do not hedge most of their (long-term) exposure. That firms cannot hedge appears to be an - perhaps the - important argument for a monetary policy which stabilizes exchange rates.

References

Adler, M. and B. Dumas (1984), ”Exposure to Currency Risk: Definition and Measurement”, Financial Management, Summer 1984, 41 - 50.

Adler, M. and B. Dumas (1983), ”International Portfolio Choice and Corporation Finance: A Synthesis”, Journal of Finance XXXVIII, 925 - 984.

Adler, M. and P. Jorion (1992), ”Exchange rate exposure”, The New Palgrave Dictionary of Money and Finance 1, 817 - 819.

Adolfson, M. (1996), ”Exchange Rate Pass-Through to Swedish Import Prices”, Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance No. 123, Stockholm School of Economics.

Aizenmann, J. (1994), ”Monetary and Real Shocks, Productivity Capacity and Exchange Rate Regimes”, Economica 61, 407-434.

Alexius, A. and A. Vredin (1996), ”Pricing-to-market in Swedish exports”, manuscript, Stockholm School of Economics.

Arize, A. (1995), ”The Effects of Exchange-Rate Volatility on U.S. Exports: An Empirical Investigation”, Southern Economic Journal 62, 34-43.

Baldwin, R. and P. Krugman (1989), ”Persistent Trade Effects of Large Exchange Rate Shocks”, Quarterly Journal of Economics CIV, 635 - 654.

Belk, B. and Glaum, M. (1990), ”The Management of Foreign Exchange Risk in UK Multinationals: An
Empirical Investigation”, Accounting and Business Research 21, p. 3-13.

Betts, C. and M.B. Devereux (1996), ”The Exchange Rate in a Model of Pricing-to-market”, European Economic Review 40, 1007 - 1021.

Brealey, R. and S. Myers, (1991), Principles of Corporate Finance, fourth edition, McGraw-Hill.

Caballero, R. (1991), ”On the Sign of the Investment Uncertainty Relationship”, American Economic Review 81, 279-288.

Campa, J. and L. Goldberg (1995a), ”Investment in Manufacturing, Exchange Rates and External Exposure”, Journal of International Economics 38, 527-548.

Campa, J. and L. Goldberg (1995b), ”Investment, Pass-Through and Exchange Rates: A Cross-Country Comparison”, NBER Working Paper no. 5139.

De Grauwe, P. and B. de Bellefroid (1989), ”Long-Run Exchange Rate Variability and International Trade”, in S.

Arndt and J. Richardson (eds.), Real-Financial Linkages among Open Economies, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Ma.

Dixit, A. (1989), ”Hysteresis, Import Penetration, and Exchange Rate Pass-Through”, Quarterly Journal of Economics CIV, p. 205-227.

Dixit, A. and R. Pindyck (1994), Investment Under Uncertainty, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Donnenfeld, S. and I. Zilcha (1991), ”Pricing of Exports and Exchange Rate Uncertainty”, International Economic Review 32, 1009 - 1022.

Dornbusch, R. (1987), ”Exchange Rates and Prices”, American Economic Review 77, 93 - 106.

Dufey, G. and S. Srinivasalu (1983), ”The Case for Corporate Management of Foreign Exchange Risk”, Financial Management 12, p. 54-62.

Dumas, B. (1994), ”Short- and Long-Term Hedging for the Corporation”, CEPR Discussion Paper No. 1083.

Edin, P-A. and A. Vredin (1993), ”Devaluation Risk in Taget Zones: Evidence from the Nordic Countries”, Economic Journal 103, 161 - 175.

Edison, H. and M. Melvin (1990), ”The Determinants and Implications of the Choice of an Exchange Rate System” in W. Haraf and T. Willett (eds.), Monetary Policy for a Volatile Global Economy (American Enterprise Institute).

Engel, C. (1993), ”Real Exchange Rates and Relative Prices: An Empirical Investigation”, Journal of Monetary Economics 32, 35 - 50.

European Economy (1990), ”One market, one money”, No. 44, October.

Feenstra, R.C., J.E. Gagnon and M.M. Knetter (1996), ”Market Share and Exchange Rate Pass-Through in World Automobile Trade”, Journal of International Economics 40, 187 - 207.

Flood, R. and A. Rose (1995), ”Fixing Exchange Rates”, NBER Working Paper no. 4503.

Frankel, J.A. and A.K. Rose (1995), ”An Empirical Characterization of Nominal Exchange Rates”, in G. Grossman and K. Rogoff (eds.), Handbook of International Economics, North-Holland.

Friberg, R. (1996), ”On the Role of Pricing Exports in a Third Currency”, manuscript, Stockholm School of Economics.

Friedman, M. (1953), ”The Case for Flexible Exchange Rates”, in Essays in Positive Economics, Chicago University Press.

Froot, K.A. and J.A. Frankel (1989), ”Forward Discount Bias: Is it an Exchange Risk Premium?”, Quarterly Journal of Economics CIV, 139 - 161.

Froot, K.A. and P.D. Klemperer (1989), ”Exchange Rate Pass-Through When Market Share Matters”, American Economic Review 79, 637 - 654.

Gagnon, J. (1993), ”Exchange Rate Variability and the Level of International Trade”, Journal of International Economics 34, 269-287.

Giovannini, A. (1988), ”Exchange Rates and Traded Goods Prices”, Journal of International Economics 24, 45 - 68.

Gron, A. and D.L. Swenson (1996), ”Incomplete Exchange-Rate Pass-Through and Imperfect Competition: The Effect of Local Production”, American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings, May 1996, 71 - 76.

Goldberg, L. and C. Kolstad (1994), ”Foreign Direct Investment, Exchange Rate Variability and Demand Uncertainty”, NBER Working Paper no. 4815.

Gottfries, N. (1991), ”Devalveringarnas effekter påexportindustrins prissättning och marknadsandelar” (The devaluation’s effects on the export industry’s price setting and market shares), in L. Jonung (ed.), Devalveringen 1982 - rivstart eller snedtändning, SNS, Stockholm.

Gottfries, N. (1994), ”Market Shares, Financial Constraints, and Pricing Behavior in the Exports Industry”, Seminar Paper No. 586, Institute for International Economic Studies, University of Stockholm.

Hegbart, F. and N. Jutterstr”m (1995), ”Valutariskhantering - en fallstudie av Cloetta” (Management of exchange rate risk - a case study of Cloetta), B.A. thesis, Stockholm School of Economics.

Jorion, P. (1990), ”The Exchange Rate Exposure of U.S. Multinationals”, Journal of Business 63, 331 - 345.

Kasa, K. (1992), ”Adjustment Costs and Pricing-to-Market. Theory and Evidence”, Journal of International Economics 32, 1 - 30.

Kim, Y. (1992), ”Exchange Rate Pass-through”, The New Palgrave Dictionary of Money and Finance 1, 827 - 829.

Knetter, M.M. (1989), ”Price Discrimination by U.S. and German Exporters”, American Economic Review 79, 198 - 210.

Knetter, M.M. (1993), ”International Comparisons of Pricing-to-Market Behavior”, American Economic Review 83, 473 - 486.

Krugman, P. (1993), ”What do We Need to Know About the International Monetary System?”, Essays in International Finance, No. 190, Princeton University.

Krugman, P. and M. Obstfeld (1994), International Economics. Theory and Policy, third edition, Harper Collins.

Leahy, J. and T. Whited (1995), ”The Effect of Uncertainty on Investment: Some Stylized Facts”, NBER Working Paper no. 4986.

Lindberg, H., P. S”derlind, and L.E.O. Svensson (1993), ”Devaluation Expectations: The Swedish Krona 1985 - 1992”, Economic Journal 103, 1170 - 1179.

Ljungqvist, L. (1994), ”Destabilizing Exchange Rate Speculation: A Counterexample to Milton Friedman”, manuscript, SUNY, Buffalo.

Menon, J. (1995), ”Exchange Rate Pass-Through”, Journal of Economic Surveys 9, 197 - 231.

Ness,n, M. (1996), ”Exchange Rate Expectations, the Forward Exchange Rate Bias and Risk Premia in Target Zones”, forthcoming, Open Economies Review.

Obstfeld, M. (1995), ”International Currency Experience: New Lessons and Lessons Relearned”, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1/1995, 119 - 220.

Obstfeld, M. (1996), ”Models of Currency Crises with Self-fulfilling Features”, European Economic Review 40, 1037 - 1047.

Obstfeld, M. and K. Rogoff (1995), ”Exchange Rate Dynamics Redux”, Journal of Political Economy 103, 624-660.

Oi, W. (1961), ”The Desibarility of Price Instability under Perfect Competition”, Econometrica 29, p.58-64.

Page, S. (1977), ”Currency of Invoicing in Merchandise Trade”, National Institute Economic Review 81, 77 - 81.

Sercu, P. and R. Uppal (1995), International Financial Markets and the Firm, South-Western College Publishing, Chapman & Hall.

Siklos, P.L. and R. Tarajos (1996), ”Fundamentals and Devaluation Expectations in Target Zones”, Open Economies Review 7, 35 - 59.

Smith, C. and R. Stultz (1985), ”The Determinants of Firms’ Hedging Policies”, Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis 20, 391 - 405.

Sveriges Finansanalytikers F”rening, 1994, Finansanalytikernas Rekommedationer (Recommendations of Financial Analysts).

Söderström, U. and A. Stenfors (1995), ”Explaining Devaluation Expectations in the EMS”, Finnish Economic Papers 8, 63 - 81.

Taylor, M. P. (1995), ”The Economics of Exchange Rates”, Journal of Economic Literature XXXIII, 13 - 47.

Torniainen, A. (1992), Foreign Exchange Risk on Competitive Exposure and Strategic Hedging, PhD Thesis, The Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration.

Van Nieuwkerk, M. (1979), ”The Covering of Exchange Risk in the Netherlands’ Foreign Trade”, Journal of International Economics 9, 89 - 93.

Wihlborg, C. (1994), Mikroekonomiska aspekter p† en monet„r union (Microeconomic aspects on a monetary union), Annex No. 4 to SOU 1994:6, Fritzes, Stockholm.

Wihlborg, C. (1995), ”EMU - Economic Substance or Political Symbolism?”, The World Economy 17, 651 - 661.

Table 1, Estimated Exchange Rate Exposure

1a) Exposure using exchange rate index: $\ln(P_{t+1} / P_t) = \alpha + \beta \ln(S_{t+1} / S_t) + \varepsilon_{t+1}$

Dependent Variable	**Period**	**Coefficients**			
		β TCW	R**2	β MERM	R**2
Swedish Stock Market Index (AFGX)	80:02-96:02	0,41 [1.61]	0,01	**0.80*** [3.71]	0,07
	92:12-96:02	0,42 [1.53]	0,06	**0,61** [2.37]	0,13
STORA	80:02-96:02	0,65 [1.62]	0,01	**1.24*** [3.59]	0,07
	92:12-96:02	**1,24** [2.48]	0,14	**1,38** [2.95]	0,19

1b) Exposure to selected exchange rates: $\ln(P_{t+1} / P_t) = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i \ln(S_{i,t+1} / S_{i,t}) + \eta_{t+1}$

Dependent Variable	**Period**					
		β DEM	β FIM	β GBP	β USD	R**2
Swedish Stock Market Index (AFGX)	80:02-96:02	-0,45 [-1.93]	**0,65** [2.12]	-0,04 [-0.16]	**0,63** [4.19]	0,12
	92:12-96:02	-0,46 [-1.08]	0,07 [0.14]	0,26 [0.44]	0,67 [1.56]	0,19
STORA	80:02-96:02	**-1,09** [-3.00]	**1,58** [3.32]	0,07 [0.22]	**0,97** [4.12]	0,16
	92:12-96:02	-0,86 [-1.13]	1,32 [1.44]	0,20 [0.19]	1,18 [1.53]	0,26

*) These regressions were computed on the period 82:02-96:02

Coefficients on constants not reported, coefficients in fat print are significant at 5% level. t-values reported within parentheses. All exchange rates and exchange rate indexes are expressed as the price of foreign currency in terms of Swedish currency. The TCW index is the nominal effective exchange rate taken from IMFs' Financial Statistics. The MERM exchange rate was computed by weighing nominal exchange rates using IMFs' MERM weights. Australian dollars, Spanish Pesetas and Irish Punt were not included. Source: IMF, Findata.

Table 2, Swedish exports and imports of goods and exchange rate index weights.

Country	Imports	Exports	TCW	MERM
	% of total	% of total		
Germany	18,4	13,3	22,28	12,68
France	5,6	5,1	7,15	6,96
Netherlands	4,1	5,3	4,24	3,03
Austria	1,2	1,4	1,71	1,48
Belgium-Luxembourg	3,5	4,9	3,55	2,74
Sum of the above	32,8	30,0	38,93	26,89
United Kingdom	9,6	10,2	11,56	5,18
Denmark	6,8	6,9	5,60	4,19
Finland	6,3	4,8	6,69	5,75
Italy	3,8	3,8	6,05	7,27
Spain	1,4	1,9	2,48	1,90
Ireland	0,8	0,7	0,77	0,68
Portugal	1,0	0,5	0,93	0,00
Greece	0,2	0,6	0,27	0,00
Total, EU-countries	62,7	59,4	73,28	51,86
Norway	6,1	8,1	5,58	6,69
Switzerland	1,9	1,9	2,74	1,40
Canada	0,6	1,1	1,16	4,25
USA	8,6	8,0	11,63	25,56
Japan	4,7	2,7	5,20	8,46
Australia	0,2	1,3	0,27	1,78
New Zealand	0,0	0,2	0,14	0,00
Total	84,8	82,7	100	100

Source: Imports and exports 1994; Foreign Trade Statistics of Statistics Sweden. Exchange Rate weights; Swedish Riksbank.

0,000872
0,00349

Table 3, STORA, variables affecting exchange rate exposure .

Country	Currency denomination of sales and costs, %, 1995		Transaction exposure, Swedish entities, (june1995)	External sales to various markets 1994, % of total external sales
	Sales	Costs		
Germany	19	17	23,67	22
France	9	8	7,08	9
Netherlands	3	1	4,28	5
Austria	0	0	2,36	n.a
Belgium-Luxembourg	5	4	2,00	4
Sum of the above	36	30	39,39	40
United Kingdom	10	2	20,77	11
Denmark	5	5	4,36	5
Finland	0	0	-1,40	n.a.
Italy	3	0	5,03	4
Spain	2	0	3,10	n.a.
Ireland	0	0	1,62	na.
Portugal	0	2	0,08	n.a.
Greece	0	0	0,00	n.a.
Total, EU-countries	56	39	72,95	60
Norway	3	2	3,82	3
Switzerland	0	0	1,33	n.a.
Canada	0	3	0,00	n.a.
USA	15	7	22,82	5*
Japan	0	0	0,05	n.a.
Australia	0	0	0,35	n.a.
New Zealand	0	0	0,04	n.a.
Sweden	19	43	n.a	17
Ecu	7	6	-1,38	n.a
Total	100	100	100	80

*) includes Canada

Source: STORA. Transaction exposure defined as the percentage of total net currency flows to Swedish entities of STORA. A negative sign indicates larger outflows than inflows in that currency. External sales are defined as sales to a market of goods produced in another country.

0,000872
0,00349

Table 4a, Correlations between relative export prices and nominal exchange rate

Industry	Germany/UK	Germany/US	Germany/France	US/UK	US/France	UK/France
Manufacture of radio, television and communications equipment and apparatus. (SNI 3832)	-0,80	0,54	-0,13	-0,10	0,64	0,36
Motor vehicle and chassi manufacturing. (SNI 38431)	0,12	0,74	-0,28	0,81	0,90	0,26
Newspaper paper. (SITC 6411)	0,54	0,59	0,35	0,50	0,41	0,29
Craft liner board paper. (SITC 6414)	0,79	0,31	-0,02	0,00	0,03	0,67
Newspaper paper for a Stora subsidiary	0,92	n.a.	0,84	n.a.	n.a.	-0,37

The relative export price is defined as the ratio between the export prices (in SEK) to markets i and j (e.g. Pus/Puk), and the corresponding nominal exchange rate; currency j in terms of currency i (e.g. Suk,us).

All correlations exept those for STORA are computed on quarterly unit value data, 1980-1994. Source Alexius and Vredin (1996).

Correlations for STORA computed on quarterly price data, 92:1-95:2 for Germany/UK, 93:01-95:02 for other two. Source: STORA.

Table 4b, Correlations between relative export prices and real exchange rate

Industry	Germany/UK	Germany/US	Germany/France	US/UK	US/France	UK/Franc
Manufacture of radio, television and communications equipment and apparatus. (SNI 3832)	0,06	0,55	-0,32	0,09	0,61	-0,10
Motor vehicle and chassi manufacturing. (SNI 38431)	0,40	0,82	-0,34	0,89	0,88	0,59
Newspaper paper. (SITC 6411)	0,74	0,59	0,53	0,55	0,44	0,58
Craft liner board paper. (SITC 6414)	0,69	0,21	-0,24	0,04	0,23	0,58
Newspaper paper for a Stora subsidiary	0,92	n.a.	0,44	n.a.	n.a.	-0,40

The relative export price is defined as the ratio between the export prices (in SEK) to markets i and j (e.g. Pus/Puk), and the corresponding real exchange rate as the ratio between the consumer price indexes in countries j and i in common currency(e.g. Suk,usCPIus/CPIuk).
All correlations except those for STORA are computed on quarterly unit value data, 1980-1994. Source Alexius and Vredin (1996).
Correlations for STORA computed on quarterly price data, 92:1-95:2 for Germany/UK, 93:01-95:02 for other two. Source: STORA.

Table 5, Invoicing currency used in Swedish trade 1993 (in percent)

			Invoicing currency and share of national markets in Swedish exports, disaggregated												
Currency	Imports	Exports	Food (SNI 31)		Textiles (SNI 32)		Wood products (SNI 33)		Pulp and Paper (SNI 34)		Chemical (SNI 35)		Earth and Stone (SNI 36)		Iron
			Currency	Market	Currency	Market	Currency	Market	Currency	Market	Currency	Market	Currency	Market	Currency
USD	25,5	23,4	25,5	13,9	18,0	6,7	3,3	1,4	9,9	2,0	14,4	5,9	12,1	5,4	27,3
SEK	27,0	37,1	48,2	n.a.	28,5	n.a.	60,6	n.a.	40,0	n.a.	27,4	n.a.	39,2	n.a.	15,9
DEM	16,7	10,7	11,7	11,1	13,4	10,5	14,5	2,1	13,4	22,1	14,7	14,8	16,0	16,4	15,3
GBP	5,7	6,0	2,8	3,8	6,3	4,5	11,1	19,2	5,4	15,9	7,6	11,2	5,7	8,0	12,6
JPY	2,7	2,3	0,0	1,0	10,9	0,6	0,1	1,6	0,1	0,6	6,1	2,6	0,0	3,4	2,8
FRF	3,4	5,4	2,1	2,4	3,1	1,8	2,9	3,7	5,3	7,4	6,8	6,6	2,4	2,6	3,2
DKK	4,2	2,3	1,6	9,2	1,8	12,2	0,9	10,5	4,4	6,4	4,0	8,0	7,5	9,9	2,7
NLG	2,7	1,3	0,5	1,8	4,6	2,1	0,5	6,9	1,9	5,7	2,9	5,6	0,8	2,4	1,5
NKK	2,3	2,7	2,4	13,8	4,9	29,3	3,7	10,8	2,4	6,1	4,6	8,3	11,4	16,5	2,0
CHF	1,5	1,0	0,7	2,2	0,7	1,7	0,2	2,0	2,5	2,1	1,3	1,7	0,2	1,8	0,8
ITL	n.a.	n.a.	0,5	3,3	1,1	1,6	0,1	9,0	6,5	5,7	0,9	3,3	1,5	2,0	6,7
FIM	n.a.	n.a.	2,1	11,0	1,6	12,4	0,4	1,3	1,1	2,2	2,4	6,4	1,4	6,0	3,2
OTHER	8,3	7,8	1,9	26,6	5,1	16,6	1,7	31,7	7,1	23,8	6,9	25,6	1,8	25,5	6,0
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source:Invoicing currency, Swedish Riksbank, export shares, NUTEK. The names on the various industries have been shortened to save space.

7449927 3205818 26000000 54300000 15900000 4431741

Table 6, The share of inputs in the value of production , various se

	Industry, SNI classification			
	3832 Electronics& telecomm.	3843 motor vehicle and parts	34112 paper&board	3845 manufacturing repair of aircr
domestic inputs, goods	22,8	33,4	52,8	24,9
wages	32,1	22,3	14,7	35,5
gross operating profit	9,3	14,2	14,5	7
imports	33,6	28,6	11,8	30,1
production value	100	100	100	100

Source: Statistics Sweden, Input-output tables for Sweden 1985

Table 7, The largest corporations' share of Swedish expc and imports of manufactured goods, 1994

	Share of exports	**Share of imports**
5 largest	26,3	17,1
10 largest	37,5	23
20 largest	50,9	31,2
100 largest	71,3	49,9

Source: Statistics Sweden