



**No. 34-2017**

**Jolita Adamonis and Laura M. Werner**

**A New Measure to Quantify Hysteresis Losses: The case of  
Italian wine exports to the US**

This paper can be downloaded from  
<http://www.uni-marburg.de/fb02/makro/forschung/magkspapers>

Coordination: Bernd Hayo • Philipps-University Marburg  
School of Business and Economics • Universitätsstraße 24, D-35032 Marburg  
Tel: +49-6421-2823091, Fax: +49-6421-2823088, e-mail: [hayo@wiwi.uni-marburg.de](mailto:hayo@wiwi.uni-marburg.de)

# A New Measure to Quantify Hysteresis Losses: The case of Italian wine exports to the US

Jolita Adamonis and Laura M. Werner\*  
Justus Liebig University Giessen

February 2017

## Abstract

This paper introduces a new measure to capture dynamic losses for exporting firms on markets that exhibit hysteresis on the supply side. This new indicator quantifies dynamic losses caused by sunk adjustment costs in case of exchange rate fluctuations. While the standard procedure in welfare analysis is to compare two equilibria in order to determine certain consumer and producer surplus effects (comparative statics), we focus on special welfare effects that take place during dynamics – the process of adjustment towards an equilibrium. More precisely, we analyze negative dynamic effects on producers' income that are generated due to writing off sunk adjustment costs. As an example we investigate Italian wine exports to the US over 1995-2013. After testing the existence of hysteresis on the market, using the play-algorithm proposed by Belke and Göcke [2001], we present a new indicator of hysteresis losses. It captures a continuous increase of dynamic losses during the period from 2003 to 2008 and over proportionately large hysteresis losses if the pain threshold of the exchange rate is passed, which seems to be about 1.25 \$/€.

## 1 Introduction

The events of recent years have made the world economy extremely uncertain. In consequence of various crises (both political and economic), wars and terror, the world markets became more sensitive to shocks and the world trade stagnated. The higher global uncertainty directly influences decision making processes of worldwide operating (exporting) firms in form of e. g. exchange rate fluctuations.

---

\*We thank all participants and anonymous referees of the 23th Enometrics, the 18th Annual INFER Conference and the 56. Gewisola Jahrestagung for helpful discussions and valuable comments.

Corresponding author: Jolita.Adamonis@wirtschaft.uni-giessen.de

As an example, the \$/€-exchange rate has fluctuated between 0.89 and 1.66 since the introduction of the Euro, resulting in high losses of exporters or even in their market exits. This kind of uncertainty incentivizes exporting firms to be more cautious in their decision-making and to practice so-called “wait-and-see” strategies. These are associated with two different trigger values of the exchange rate: a favorable exchange rate change passing the so-called entry (or expansion) trigger results in firm’s entry into the export market (or increase in its sales volume), and an opposite scenario leads to passing the firm’s exit (or reduction) threshold and thus, to its exit from the export market (or reduction its exports). The interval between those exchange rate trigger values, that are individual for each firm due to individual cost structures, is called the “band of inaction”. The higher are the exchange rate fluctuations, the higher is the uncertainty leading to a wider band of inaction, associated with multiple equilibria. Modeling of economic activity of exporting firms, especially on markets with high barriers to entry and exit, might be more appropriate using a dynamic framework that takes the firm’s economic past into account in order to determine the appropriate equilibrium. In many cases, firms must incur sunk costs to enter new markets, e. g., for gathering information on the new market, for market research, for setting up distribution and service networks, for advertising or establishing a brand name, or for hiring new workers to start the production, etc. Since these entry investments are firm specific, the firms cannot recoup these costs if they exit. Analogously, a market exit results in exit costs, e. g. for severance payments for fired employees if the production is stopped. These sunk entry and exit costs together with uncertainty result in a path-dependent behavior of firms, which is called “hysteresis”, see Baldwin [1989], Baldwin and Krugman [1989], Dixit and Pindyck [1994].<sup>1</sup>

In addition to comparative statics, which is the standard procedure in welfare analysis, the income effects that take place during dynamics become more and more important in the context of an uncertain world. The main contribution of this study is the introduction of a new income effect measure, the hysteresis losses indicator, which quantifies dynamic losses of exporting firms on markets that exhibit hysteresis on the supply side. The indicator attempts to quantify dynamic losses caused by sunk adjustment costs in case of a positive exchange rate change, which is an appreciation of the home currency. More precisely, we analyze negative dynamic effects on producers’ income that are generated due to writing off sunk adjustment costs. In contrast to Göcke and Matulaityte [2015] which provide first theoretical insights to hysteresis losses in economics based on the Preisach model our hysteresis losses indicator is based on the play-algorithm which is a linearized form of the Preisach-hysteresis model and was proposed by

---

<sup>1</sup>Hysteresis originally stems from physics (ferromagnetism, plasticity, etc.) and also occurs in several phenomena in chemistry, biology, engineering, see Visintin [2006, p. 3]., In economics, hysteresis is known especially in international trade and labor markets, see Göcke [2001]. Amable et al. [1992], Cross [1993], Göcke [2002] and Cross et al. [2009, 2010] provide an overview of hysteresis in economics. The term hysteresis is derived from the Greek verb „hysteros“ meaning “lagging behind” or “that which comes later”, see Cross [1993, p. 53], and describes an effect that persists after the cause that brought it about has been removed.

Belke and Göcke [2001] to empirically identify hysteresis on particular markets. In addition, the hysteresis losses indicator enables us to investigate hysteresis losses empirically.

Since hysteresis effects are often found in empirical studies in economics, see e. g., Belke and Göcke [2001], Kannebley Junior [2008], Mota et al. [2012], Mota and Vasconcelos [2012], Piscitelli et al. [1999, 2000], Hallett and Piscitelli [2002], de Prince and Kannebley Junior [2013], Belke et al. [2013, 2014], the consequences in terms of economic hysteresis losses resulting from exchange rate fluctuations are a relevant question. As an example, we investigate Italian wine exports to the US. Italy is one of the largest wine producers worldwide. The shrinking home wine consumption, from 30.8 million hectolitres (m hl) in 2000 to 20.4 m hl in 2014, see OIV [2015], incentivizes Italian wine producers to search for consumers abroad and meanwhile they export ca. 40% of their whole production, see Anderson and Nelge [2011], whereas more than half of all wine exports (about 22%) went to the US in 2014, see Central [2016]. Moreover, Italy is confirmed to be the leading wine supplier in the United States in 2012, see d'Italia [2016]. Since wine production is associated with high sunk investments and exporting to the US with exchange rate uncertainty and much effort due to many legal restrictions (different for every state, see e. g. Beliveau and Rouse [2010]), hysteresis can be expected on the supply side of this market.

We replicate the results of Werner [2016]<sup>2</sup>, i. e. of chapters ?? and ??, analyzing the existence of hysteresis empirically for the sample 1995-2013. Next, we calculate the indicator for hysteresis losses that shows a continuous increase in hysteresis losses in the time span 2003-2008. Moreover, we observe disproportionately large hysteresis losses in comparison to the exchange rate changes, especially over the quarters 2004Q3-2005Q1. The paper is organized as follows: In section 2 the concept of hysteresis is explained. Section 3 deals with hysteresis losses and interprets them graphically. Section 4 introduces the hysteresis losses indicator based on the linearized hysteresis model and compares its values with those in a non-linear hysteresis model. In section 5 the empirical analysis is presented and in section 6 the results are discussed. Section 7 concludes.

## 2 Concept of hysteresis in foreign trade


### 2.1 Hysteresis on micro level

First, the simplest form of hysteresis called “non-ideal relay”, see Krasnosel’skii and Pokrovskii [1989, p. 263], is considered. In international trade this hysteresis phenomenon occurs due to sunk entry and exit costs, see Baldwin [1989, 1990], inducing a “band of inaction” (see figure 1).

---

<sup>2</sup>Werner [2016] found supply-hysteresis in Italian wine exports to the US using the method based on the original Preisach model. In contrast to this, we use the play algorithm proposed by Belke and Göcke [2001] like in chapter ??.

Figure 1: Non-ideal relay with one-period optimization



A firm observes the development of a forcing variable and does not change its economic behavior – i. e. its state of market (in)activity – until the forcing variable changes significantly and passes certain trigger values which are specific to each heterogeneous firm. In our special case of international trade, the forcing variable is represented by the exchange rate in direct quotation, e. g.,  $\text{€}/\text{\$}$  for an exporter which is an ECU member. A firm delays its entry and exit due to sunk entry and exit costs which is amplified by an uncertain future exchange rate development. Moreover, once the economic behavior of an exporting firm  $j$  has changed (due to large past exchange rate changes or many small changes of the same direction), it will not completely go back to the initial state, even if the exchange rate returns to its initial level, see Göcke [2002, p. 168].

Figure 1 illustrates the decision process of an exporting firm  $j$  which can be described as a “non-ideal relay”, see Belke and Göcke [1999, p. 266]. For reasons of simplicity we assume that one firm exports one unit of just one sort of products. However, it is entirely possible that economic behavior of one firm can be modelled using various non-ideal relays in order to capture all products that are relevant for the exporter. The ordinate in figure 1 captures the state of activity of firm  $j$  or its supply  $Y_{t,j}$  in the current period  $t$ . The abscissa reflects the real exchange rate in direct (price) quotation  $\epsilon_t$  which directly and proportionally affects consumer prices in the sales market in case of exchange rate pass-through, or firms profit margin in case of pricing-to-market, more precisely in the case of local currency price stabilization. A falling exchange rate means appreciation of the home currency and leads to a decreasing export activity of the firm. Depending on the size of sunk costs, the threshold value for an exit  $\epsilon_{j,\text{exit}}$  is lower and the threshold value for an entry  $\epsilon_{j,\text{entry}}$  is higher than the exchange rate value that covers the variable/unit costs  $\epsilon_{cj}$ , see point F in figure 1. If the value of the exchange rate varies between the entry/exit-thresholds, i. e.  $\epsilon_{j,\text{exit}} < \epsilon_t < \epsilon_{j,\text{entry}}$ , there are two potential equilibria (either active or passive). The currently valid equilibrium can only be determined if the state of activity in the previous period is known. There is a “band of inaction” between both triggers, since only a move outside this band, passing one of the triggers, will result in a switch in the state of activity. Thus, if the exchange rate varies

within the “band of inaction”, firm  $j$  remains in its state, which can either be active or passive. The “band of inaction” is the wider, the higher the sunk costs and the uncertainty are.<sup>3</sup>

For an illustration of the firm’s decision making process we use an example and consider the following exchange rate changes:  $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow \epsilon_{cj} \rightarrow \epsilon_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_{cj} \rightarrow \epsilon_0$ , see figure 1. In the initial situation the exchange rate equals  $\epsilon_0$ . This exchange rate value is unambiguously associated with the passive state of firm’s activity or, to put it differently, firm  $j$  is not exporting any goods due to the high value of the exchange rate leading to an expensive home production for the foreign consumers expressed in the foreign currency. In this situation firm  $j$  cannot compete with other suppliers on the foreign market and is inactive. A higher exchange rate (lower value of the home currency with respect to the foreign currency) that takes e. g. the value of  $\epsilon_{cj}$ , guarantees that the unit costs of firm  $j$  are covered. However, this value does not cover the sunk entry investments required for the market entry. Consequently, an initially inactive firm stays inactive as long as both - the unit variable and the sunk entry investments - are not covered. The firm enters the market only if the exchange rate exceeds the entry trigger value  $\epsilon_{j,\text{entry}}$ . Thus, a home currency depreciation up to  $\epsilon_1$  induces firm’s entry into the market, see figure 1. A subsequent appreciation of the home currency leading to a falling exchange rate back to the value  $\epsilon_{cj}$  does not induce any changes in the firm’s activity and the firm remains active. A further decrease in the forcing variable down to  $\epsilon_0$  passes the exit trigger, meaning that the loss from production is higher than the sunk exit costs. As a result, firm  $j$  shuts down, completing the entry-exit cycle and closing the micro hysteresis loop. As a consequence, sunk entry investments together with sunk exit costs have to be written off - hysteresis losses are generated. In contrast to Göcke and Matulaityte [2015], who analyzed the relationship between output and prices, we cannot argue that hysteresis losses are proportional to the area within the closed non-ideal-relay loop due to a different model specification. The two-dimensional graphical interpretation of hysteresis losses in an international trade framework requires a modification of the model and some additional assumptions, which is done in section 3.

## 2.2 Hysteresis on macro level

As stated above, every firm  $j$  has a specific cost structure which implicates heterogeneity in entry and exit thresholds (every firm has an individual non-ideal relay operator  $\mu_{j,\text{entry}/\text{exit}}$ . In the Preisach aggregation procedure, see Preisach [1935], Cross [1993], Mayergoyz [2003, 2006], the non-ideal relay is the elementary hysteresis operator, so called e. g. by Mayergoyz [1986, p. 604]. It illustrates a micro element of an aggregated macro system. Based on the

---

<sup>3</sup>Nevertheless, one could argue that rising uncertainty about the input variable (here: exchange rate) will not alter the trigger values immediately because trigger values may depend on other firms specific influences (like a full storehouse or sources of finance). Therefore, it could be possible that the determining of the trigger values is a subject to hysteresis, too.

Preisach procedure the export supply of heterogeneous firms can be aggregated using entry/exit-trigger diagrams, see e. g. Amable et al. [1991], and summing up firms entering or exiting the market due to a certain exchange rate change. The aggregated output corresponds to the number of active firms on the market.

Figure 2: Aggregated hysteresis loop (source: own representation according to Göcke and Matulaityte [2015])




Figure 2 illustrates the aggregated output depending on the following exchange rate changes: strong Euro depreciation  $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow M_1$  and a following continuous Euro appreciation  $M_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_2 \rightarrow \epsilon_3 \rightarrow \epsilon_0$ , leading to an initial situation in the origin of the coordinate system  $\epsilon_0$ . This special example generates a complete (closed) macro hysteresis loop. Every closed hysteresis loop has the form of a lens and consists of an upward  $B_1(\epsilon)$  and a downward leading  $B_2(\epsilon)$  branch, see figure 2. The upward leading branch captures the positive quantitative effects of a depreciating home currency  $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow M_1$  leading to more market entries of firms. The downward leading branch captures the negative impact of the subsequent home currency appreciation  $M_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_2 \rightarrow \epsilon_3 \rightarrow \epsilon_0$ .<sup>4</sup> The decreasing level of output means that more and more firms exit the export market.

However, if the initial situation is not located in the origin of the coordinate system but e. g. in point A which is located on the upward leading branch, an Euro depreciation up to  $M_1$  and a subsequent appreciation back to  $\epsilon_2$  would not generate a closed hysteresis loop. The output level would be situated in

<sup>4</sup>For more information to the aggregation procedure see Amable et al. [1991], Göcke and Matulaityte [2015].

point B, which is located on the downward leading branch. The latter example illustrates the remanence property of hysteresis, showing a positive permanent effect on output. In order to reach the initial output level in A, the system must attain the concrete branch  $B_1(\epsilon)$ . This is only possible if the Euro appreciates down to  $\epsilon_0$  and then depreciates up to  $\epsilon_2$ .

### 3 Hysteresis losses

#### 3.1 Microeconomic hysteresis losses

Hysteresis losses in economics are theoretically modelled by Göcke and Matulaityte [2015] for the general price-output model. In contrast to our international trade framework, illustrated in the figure 4, the dependent variable of the general model is the aggregated output and the forcing variable is the price. The authors state that hysteresis losses are proportional or even equal to the area inside the particular hysteresis loop/lens depending on the assumptions made in the model (e. g. optimization horizon and uncertainty level). Only in the model with one-period optimization and without uncertainty hysteresis losses can be interpreted as the area inside the hysteresis loop. The inclusion of uncertainty lowers hysteresis losses due to the option value of waiting. The extension of the optimization horizon increases the losses, which are positively related to the interest rate in this model. However, in both cases macro hysteresis losses remain proportional to the area inside the hysteresis loops, see Göcke and Matulaityte [2015].

The producer price that triggers the firm's entry into the market consists of the sum of its unit variable and its unit sunk costs. The exit trigger can be quantified as the difference between the firm's unit variable and the unit exit costs. Only in this constellation of the model the area inside the simplest non-ideal relay can be interpreted as hysteresis loss of the firm, see figure 3. We build on this and change the perspective of firm  $j$  considering it as an exporting firm. However, in order to consider the relevant measurements we stay close to the original price-output model. E. g. firm  $j$  is based in one of the euro-zone member countries (e. g., Italy) and exports its products (e. g., wine) to the United States. In order to convert the prices in both currency systems we use the exchange rate which is as previously quantified in direct quotation ( $\text{€}/\text{\$}$ ). The trigger values are denominated in Euro because this is the home currency of firm  $j$  and all its costs have to be paid in Euro.

Thus, the first step of firm's  $j$  decision making process can be illustrated in figure 4. For reasons of simplicity we assume that the prices in Euro depend only on prices in Dollar and the exchange rates. Consequently, a certain entry or exit price trigger, denominated in Euro  $P_{j,trigger}$ , represents different combinations of prices in Dollar  $P^*$  and exchange rate values  $\epsilon_j$  in ( $\text{€}/\text{\$}$ ):

$$P_{j,trigger} = P^* \cdot \epsilon_j. \quad (1)$$



Figure 3: The general price - output diagram





Figure 4: International trade: exchange rate - revenue diagram



In the next step we assume that firm  $j$  uses a pricing-to-market (PTM) strategy and practices local currency price stabilization (LCPS). I.e., it sets and maintains its export price in Dollar instead of adjusting the prices according to the exchange rate, see Krugman [1987]. This assumption allows us to keep Dollar-prices constant  $\bar{P}^*$  and to graphically analyze the hysteresis losses in international trade using only two dimensions. As a consequence, market entry and exit of an exporting firm  $j$  depend only on the exchange rate values:

$$P_{j,entry} = \bar{P}^* \cdot \epsilon_{j,entry} \quad (2)$$

$$P_{j,exit} = \bar{P}^* \cdot \epsilon_{j,exit}. \quad (3)$$

Göcke and Matulaityte [2015] showed that the hysteresis loss ( $H$ ) corresponds to the area inside the closed hysteresis loop in the non-ideal relay model with price on the abscissa and output on the ordinate, see figure 3. Therefore, we can calculate the hysteresis loss, denominated in Euro, as follows:

$$H_j = \Delta Y_{j,t} \cdot (P_{j,entry} - P_{j,exit}). \quad (4)$$

Combining equations 2, 3 and 4, the hysteresis loss can be formalized in the following way:

$$H_j = (\Delta Y_{j,t} \cdot \bar{P}^*) \cdot (\epsilon_{j,entry} - \epsilon_{j,exit}) \quad (5)$$


According to equation 5, the hysteresis loss is a product of firms revenue in Dollar and the difference between the exchange rate trigger values in ( $\text{€}/\text{\$}$ ). As a result, hysteresis losses can be illustrated in the exchange rate-revenue diagram as shown in figure 4 if we additionally normalize the constant Dollar-prices to unity. In contrast to the general case with price as forcing and physical output quantity as dependent variable, the model of international trade uses the exchange rate as forcing and the revenues as dependent variable. The aggregation procedure of this special case of international trade is analogous to the one in the general model presented in section 2.2.

The relationship between exports and exchange rates in the context of hysteresis losses can also be illustrated using the exchange rate in indirect quotation ( $\text{\$/€}$ ) and revenues in  $\text{€}$ . In this case hysteresis losses would be denominated in  $\text{\$}$ . We use this way of modeling in the empirical part in section 5.

### 3.2 Macroeconomic hysteresis losses

Hysteresis losses are only generated after a Euro depreciation which induces increasing export activity and a subsequent Euro appreciation which leads to a reduced or stopped export activity. In order to determine hysteresis losses graphically, a closed hysteresis loop has to be generated as illustrated in figure 5.

Figure 5: Hysteresis losses generated by different exchange rate changes (source: own representation according to Göcke and Matulaityte [2015])



As it was shown in section 2.2, the loop might not be closed naturally, even if after a shock the exchange rate comes back to its initial level, see figure 2.

Therefore, we have to close the loop artificially in such cases and this can be done by adding an upward leading fictitious loop that leads back to the local output maximum e. g., in point M, see figure 5. By doing so, fictitious inner loops (lenses) can be generated for every potential price decrease in Euro, which is proportional to the Euro appreciation. If the assumption that the Dollar price equals one still holds,  $H_1$  is the lens capturing the hysteresis loss in case of a Euro appreciation from  $M_1$  to  $\epsilon_1$ ,  $H_2$  represents the lens with a hysteresis loss after Euro appreciation to  $\epsilon_2$  and  $H_3$  closes the hysteresis loop resulting from the Euro appreciation to  $\epsilon_3$ . If the exchange rate would fall completely back to  $\epsilon_0$ , the whole area inside the outer maximum loop would describe the hysteresis loss of the complete exchange rate cycle:  $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_0$ .

As figure 2 suggests, the size of this loss, which is a cubic function of the exchange rate variation, is increasing by degree 3, if we assume a uniform distribution of firms in the entry/exit-diagram used for the aggregation. I. e., doubling [or tripling] the size of an exchange rate cycle  $\epsilon_n \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_n$  results in an increase of the generated hysteresis loss by factor 8 [or 27]. If we account for multi-period optimization, the hysteresis loss turns out to be larger than the area inside the hysteresis loop because of the interest costs on the sunk adjustment costs. In contrast to that, increased uncertainty leads to lower hysteresis losses because of the option value of waiting, see Göcke and Matulaityte [2015]. Since in both cases hysteresis losses remain proportional to the area inside the macro hysteresis loop, the latter remains an important measurement of dynamic adjustment effects on producer's income.

In order to simplify the macro hysteresis approach and to make it feasible for empirical analysis, Belke and Göcke [2001] developed a linear approximation of the macroeconomic hysteresis dynamics capturing strong and weak economic reactions, the so-called play-hysteresis. Figure 6 illustrates a geometric interpretation of play-hysteresis with a constant play width (area of weak reactions). The model contains two steep lines - spurt up and spurt down, as well as many flatter lines of the same slope, which are the constant play areas. Both spurt lines induce strong reactions of export supply to even small exchange rate changes, whereas just a moderate reaction can be observed in any play area. Based on play-hysteresis, an algorithm was developed, that describes the play and the corresponding switches between the areas due to changes in the forcing variable. This allows an empirical investigation of hysteretic systems by implementing it in a regression framework, see Belke and Göcke [2001].


The idea of the play-algorithm is to describe the behaviour of the system if there is hysteresis induced by the input variable. Therefore, a new variable, called *Spurt* is created by the algorithm. That is, if the initial point is e. g. in a maximum of the input variable, corresponding to point A in figure 6, and the input decreases, there will be just slight reactions of output to this decrease because only few exporters change their export activities. These are the exporters who have non-ideal relays with high exit triggers, see figure 4. If the input variable decreases further and passes the "bands of inaction" of several firms, which is represented by the aggregated band of inaction called play width

in figure 6, a strong reaction will follow because more and more exporters will react and exit the market. As long as the exchange rate declines, this strong reaction will continue until the exchange rate starts to increase once more. At this switching point, point C in figure 6, the system will change its direction and the output will start to rise. However, there will first be just a slight reaction of the exporters as long as the exchange rate is in the range “value at point C plus band of inaction”. No or just few reactions are expected. As soon as this range is passed, here at point D, the reaction is expressed by the upward leading spurt line indicating that even moderate Euro depreciations are able to induce strong export reactions.

The play-algorithm of Belke and Göcke [2001] starts with the assumption of a fixed play width. The procedure of building the *Spurt* variable begins in a maximum or minimum of the input variable, e.g. points A or C in figure 6, and investigates how the reaction would be if the input variable behaved as described above. That is, e.g. when starting in the maximum point A, there is no reaction expected as long as the exchange value is in the range “start value in point A minus play width”. As soon as the exchange rate value is less than this in point B, the *Spurt* variable follows exactly the decline of the exchange rate until a minimum is reached. The following increase of the exchange rate is depicted in the *Spurt* just as a flat line as long as the exchange rate is within the band of inaction. If the exchange rate value exceeds “minimum value plus play width” the *Spurt* reflects the input variable again.

After creating this *Spurt* variable it is tested if this variable is able to improve the regression framework which reflects the trade model, see subsection 5.2. This process is done for many possible play widths and the one with the best explaining power in the regression is reported.

Figure 6: Play hysteresis: linear spurt lines and constant play (source: own representation according to Belke and Göcke [2001])



## 4 The hysteresis losses indicator

In the following we address the problem of how to quantify hysteresis losses in the linear play-hysteresis model by expanding the play-algorithm of Belke and Göcke [2001].

The aggregation of hysteresis losses over heterogeneous firms has shown that these dynamic losses are proportional to the area inside the closed lens-formed hysteresis loop, see Göcke and Matulaityte [2015]. The area inside the trapezoid which linearizes the lens-formed hysteresis curve, see figure 6, represents an approximation of the area within the corresponding hysteresis loop, see figure 5. Consequently, using the same logic as Göcke and Matulaityte [2015] we argue that hysteresis losses are also proportional to the area inside a trapezoid, see figure 6. Since the play area reflects the aggregated bands of inaction, see figure 1, associated with no reactions of individual firms, no hysteresis losses are generated if exchange rate changes take place in the play area. The same result comes out if we observe favorable exchange rate changes (depreciation of the home currency) in the upward-leading spurt area, which captures firms entering the market. Only the appreciation of the home currency leading to market exit of individual firms, which on the macro level is captured by the downward-leading spurt, results in hysteresis losses. Consequently, two conditions must be fulfilled in order to generate hysteresis losses: exchange rate changes must be negative (meaning appreciation of the home currency) and they (or a part them) have to take place in the downward-leading spurt area, see figure 6.

Calculation of hysteresis losses  $\Delta H_t^5$  in the play-hysteresis model in period  $t$  is done according to the following equation:

$$\Delta H_t = \frac{d}{\cos(\arctan(\alpha))} \cdot \sqrt{\Delta y_t^2 - \Delta s_t^2} \cdot \sin(\arctan(\alpha + \beta) - \arctan(\alpha)). \quad (6)$$

Here  $d$  denotes the constant play width,  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha + \beta$  are the slopes of the play and spurt lines respectively,  $\Delta y_t$  is the output change in comparison to the last period and  $\Delta s_t$  denotes negative exchange rate changes in period  $t$  with movements in the spurt-down area, e. g. exchange rate changes  $\epsilon_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_2 \rightarrow \epsilon_3 \rightarrow \epsilon_4$  in figure 6. The function for cumulated hysteresis losses takes the following form:

$$H_t = \begin{cases} \Delta H_t, & \text{if } H_{t-1} = 0 \text{ and } \Delta s_t > 0 \\ H_{t-1} + \Delta H_t, & \text{if } H_{t-1} > 0, \Delta s_t, \Delta s_{t-1} > 0 \text{ and } \epsilon_t > \epsilon_{t-1} \\ 0, & \text{if else.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Thus, in case that the exchange rate was increasing in previous periods leading to more exports and zero dynamic losses, an exchange rate decrease in period

<sup>5</sup>The Operator  $\Delta$  is used as  $\Delta H_t = H_t - H_{t-1}$  for the hysteresis losses  $H$  and all other variables.

$t$  results in hysteresis losses generated only in the current period  $\Delta H_t$ . If, however, the exchange rate change was negative in the previous period, leading to some hysteresis losses  $H_{t-1}$ , and it keeps decreasing in period  $t$ , we cumulate the losses of both periods. In the end we can calculate hysteresis losses for the whole time span in which the exchange rate was decreasing or moving in the play area. If the exchange rate development changes its direction, crosses the play and penetrates the spurt-up area, no hysteresis losses are generated and the losses indicator takes the value of zero.

Figure 7: Areas of over- and under-estimation of Play-Hysteresis in comparison to a non-linear original Preisach model




Figure 7 illustrates over- and underestimation areas of the hysteresis losses indicator due to the approximation of the curved Preisach-loops by the angular-loops of the play-hysteresis model. It captures the relationship between hysteresis losses and the extent of the exchange rate decrease/appreciation. The dashed curve schematically captures the hysteresis losses as e.g., area ABCD in the play-hysteresis model, see figure 6, and the solid curve represents the losses as an area in the Preisach model as illustrated in figure 2. Since the lens-formed hysteresis curve is considered to illustrate the more appropriate dynamics of the system (with a certain distribution of firms in the entry/exit-diagram) and the play-hysteresis is the linear approximation of this hysteresis curve, we can capture some intervals of over- and underestimation of hysteresis losses. If the exchange rate is in a local maximum  $M_1$  and starts falling, see figures 5 and 6, there is no or just a little reaction of the system according to the play-hysteresis model, since exchange rate changes take place in the play area  $M_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_1$  in which no hysteresis losses are generated. In contrast to this, the lens-formed hysteresis curve shows some negative output reaction leading to hysteresis losses by the extent of area  $H_1$ . Thus, in this interval our indicator underestimates the dynamic losses. After penetrating the spurt down area  $\Delta\epsilon > d$  we slightly

overestimate the losses. If, however, negative exchange rate changes are of a very large extent, the area within the lens becomes larger than the area in the play-hysteresis trapezoid. This, again, leads to an underestimation of hysteresis losses. By interpreting the values of the indicator we are able to recognize the intervals illustrated in figure 7, since the width of the play area can be estimated using the play-algorithm. However, due to the fact that some determinants of hysteresis cannot be measured (e. g. level of uncertainty), the calculated hysteresis losses in both models can only be interpreted as indicators.

The main point of criticism regarding the hysteresis losses indicator is the fact that the hysteresis losses can only be interpreted as measuring negative welfare effects if we assume that the level of uncertainty as well as the risk-free interest rate do not vary over time, which is quite unrealistic. Changes in uncertainty and/or interest rates shift the entry and exit triggers of individual firms leading to changes in the width of their band of inaction. On the macro level these microeconomic changes induce modifications in the location and curvature of the hysteresis loops and result in quantitatively different areas inside the hysteresis loops.

## 5 Empirical analysis of hysteresis losses

### 5.1 Data and motivation


As an example for an empirical application of the hysteresis indicator, we investigate Italian wine exports to the US. Our market choice is based on many factors: first of all, we are interested in markets that exhibit hysteresis on the supply side. Agricultural and commodity markets are typically associated with relatively high sunk adjustment costs (in form of investments and disinvestments) that producers have to face after the shocks. Therefore, we expect the suppliers on these markets to behave hysteretically. Being an agricultural good, wine was qualified for our estimation. Secondly, we chose a market, which is important due to its high volume of sales. According to Eurostat, in 2008 Italy was the largest wine producer worldwide by volume (ca. 46 mhl per year).<sup>6</sup> Ca. 40% of the whole Italian wine production is exported, whereby more than half of all exports go to the US, see Central [2016]. On top of that, Italy is confirmed in 2012 to be the leading wine supplier in the United States, see d'Italia [2016]. In addition, Fertő and Balogh [2016] showed that Italy was able to price discriminate in the US market over the period 2000-2013, i. e. we can assume LCPS behaviour of Italian wine exports, as needed in 3.1.

For our estimation we use three time series: Italian wine export to the US denoted in current Euro and deflated by the export price deflator; real US GDP in millions of Euro, converted on basis of the exchange rates from the year 2000 and real \$/€-spot exchange rates as monthly averages. All data are aggregated on quarterly basis. The first two time series are seasonally and

<sup>6</sup>The data for total production of wine is available on Eurostat until 2008.

work day adjusted, and taken from the Eurostat database (Eurostat [2015]). Exchange rate time series stem from the US Department of Agriculture (USDA [2014]). All three time series are integrated of order one. The US GDP and the Italian wine export time series (representing US Italian wine imports) are cointegrated. For the regression analysis we do not transform the data and estimate them in levels. Our sample ranges from 1995Q1 to 2013Q3. Figure 8 gives an overview about the volume and the development in time of the following time series: Italian wine exports to the US and the US GDP during the time span 1991-2014.

Figure 8: Italian wine exports to the US vs. US GDP (1991-2014) (Note: US GDP is measured in million Euros, converted on basis of the exchange rates from the year 2000; the Italian wine exports are measured in Euros.)



## 5.2 Method to calculate hysteresis losses

The calculation of the hysteresis losses indicator underlies a two-step procedure: at first we test if the market that we are interested in exhibits hysteresis. If this is the case, hysteresis losses become relevant – we calculate the hysteresis losses indicator using certain estimated parameters from the first step (the estimated slopes of the play,  $\alpha$ , and of the spurt lines,  $\alpha + \beta$ ). For our purpose we prefer a method that describes the path-dependence of the system and is based on “strong”/macro hysteresis. There are just two of them so far – the Preisach model which was implemented by Piscitelli et al. [2000] – and the already mentioned play-algorithm developed by Belke and Göcke [2001].<sup>7</sup> In this paper we choose the second approach in order to be consistent with the logic of the indicator construction.

In order to test the hysteresis hypothesis we run the following OLS equations:

<sup>7</sup>For the overview about different methods describing economic path-dependence see Belke et al. [2014], i. e. chapter ??.



$$EX_t = Constant + \alpha \cdot RER_t + \gamma \cdot Z_t + \epsilon_t \quad (8)$$

$$EX_t = Constant + \alpha \cdot RER_t + \beta \cdot Spurt_t(d) + \gamma \cdot Z_t + \epsilon_t \quad (9)$$

The regression specification is kept simple and includes the following variables: Italian wine export values in Euro as the dependent variable  $EX_t$ , the real  $\$/\text{€}$ -exchange rate  $RER_t$  and other explanatory variables, summarized in vector  $Z_t$ . I. e. US GDP as a measure for the market demand is included into regression with one lag  $GDP_{t-1}$  in order to avoid reverse causality, a trend variable  $Trend_t$  and seasonal dummies for the first three quarters  $D_1, D_2, D_3$ . From the regression in equation 8 we expect the US GDP to have a positive and the exchange rate to have a negative impact on the export values. Equation 9 contains an additional  $Spurt$  variable, which is generated by the play-algorithm. It captures only large changes of the exchange rate leading to output reactions, thus, the small exchange rate changes (movements in the play area  $d$ ) are filtered out. Calculation of the most appropriate play width is made in the following way: based on the exchange rate time series, we define the interval which probably entails the appropriate play width  $d$ . The algorithm identifies the switching points (e. g. A, B, C or D in figure 6) and generates the  $Spurt$  variable for each play width from the defined interval. We assume that the most appropriate play width is associated with the maximum R-squared of the regression specified as described in equation 9 as in Belke et al. [2013].


In order to find out if the Italian wine export market in the US exhibits hysteresis, we test the null hypothesis  $H_0 : \beta = 0$  against the alternative  $H_1 : \beta \neq 0$ . Rejecting the null means that the  $Spurt$  variable significantly contributes to the explanation of the export variability. On top of that, we compare the estimation results of equations 8 and 9 to be sure that equation 9 produces the better fit than equation 8. From regression 9 we expect the US GDP to have a positive and exchange rate - a negative impact on the export values. The original exchange rate variable should become insignificant as the slope of the original exchange rate variables reflects the play (band of inaction) area. Moreover, the effects of the  $Spurt$  should be stronger than the ones of the exchange rate variable in regression 8. If hysteresis is identified, hysteresis losses become relevant and the hysteresis losses indicator is calculated as described in section 4.

On the micro level a modified non-ideal relay model is considered in order to illustrate hysteresis losses in international trade. The developing procedure and differences between the general output-price model are pointed out in section 3.1. Hysteresis losses are now proportional to the area inside the non-ideal relay loop defining the relationship between export values in  $\text{€}$  (or revenues) and exchange rate in contrast to the theoretical model, in indirect quotation ( $\$/\text{€}$ ). Positive exchange rate changes are associated with  $\text{€}$  appreciation against the  $\text{\$}$  and consequently, with higher export prices denominated in  $\text{\$}$ . Developing the microeconomic model of hysteresis losses in international trade, a pricing-to-market (PTM) strategy of firms (in this example - Italian wine producers) was

assumed, see section 3.1, in order to simplify the model to the two-dimensional hysteresis approach. As a result, a Euro appreciation can be interpreted as a decrease of the profit margins of the exporting firms. The use of this assumption is legit, since PTM of Italian exporting firms was empirically proved in several studies: e. g., Fedoseeva [2014] found PTM in agricultural exports of several European countries including Italy and Verheyen [2013] found exchange rate nonlinearities in EMU exports to the US.

To run a robustness check of our estimation, we excluded the trend variable in a first step and the seasonal dummies and the trend in a second step. As can be seen in tables 1, 2 and 3, as well as in figure 9, the results are quiet robust.

Figure 9: Hysteresis losses in Euro (robustness checks) (Note: the hysteresis losses indicator is not normalized to 1 but measured in Dollar.)



## 6 Results

The first table summarizes the results from the OLS regressions. The first column of the table shows the results from the linear regression without the *Spurt* variable. They meet our expectation: the exchange rate is highly significant and exerts a strongly negative influence on the exports. The influence of the US GDP is positive and significant. The second column summarizes the results of the regression with the *Spurt* variable and here we have a completely different, however, expected and theory conform picture: the coefficient of the *Spurt* variable (which is the filtered *RER*) is significant, negative and higher than the coefficient of the exchange rate variable in the first regression; the coefficient of US GDP is significant and positive again; the *RER* is no longer significant, since its coefficient represents only the slope of the play lines. Thus, the *Spurt* variable undertakes the explaining power and improves the value of the adjusted  $R^2$  making the second regression statistically better. Therefore, we conclude that the Italian wine export market exhibits hysteresis and the wine exporters

experience hysteresis losses in case of positive exchange rate changes. The same result was found by Werner [2016] or chapter ?? using a different method of describing the path-dependence of the Italian wine exports to the US.


Table 1: Linear regression of Italian wine export values to the US with and without the Spurt variable (source: own calculations with data from Eurostat [2015] and USDA [2014])

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Italian Wine Export Values	
	Without Spurt	With Spurt
RER	−66,031,297.00*** (12,943,883.00)	29,668,428.00 (18,954,038.00)
Spurt		−153,654,978.00*** (25,356,805.00)
GDP	118.11*** (18.92)	51.98*** (18.81)
Trend	145,930.40 (337,574.10)	1,382,115.00*** (341,067.70)
d1	−26,585,933.00*** (4,667,843.00)	−25,577,587.00*** (3,783,203.00)
d2	−2,557,228.00 (4,676,287.00)	−1,568,521.00 (3,789,893.00)
d3	−5,555,623.00 (4,672,343.00)	−5,199,324.00 (3,783,643.00)
Constant	−112,000,000.00** (44,255,942.00)	150,000,000.00*** (36,369,913.00)
Observations	75	75
R <sup>2</sup>	0.914	0.945
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.907	0.939
S.E. of regression (df = 68)	14,185,828.00	11,486,233.00
F statistic (df = 68)	120.76	163.13

*Note:* \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

According the Annual vineyard surveys of the International Organisation of Vine and Wine (OIV), see OIV [2005, 2013, 2014, 2015], the vineyards in Italy are shrinking from year to year. In 2003 there were 868 thousand hectares of vineyard whereas in 2009 for example there were just 812 thousand hectares and 705 thousand hectares in 2013. Figure 10 shows a continuous increase in losses in the time span from 2003Q1 to 2008Q1 captured by the dark grey curve. According to the OIV, the area under wine-grape vines in production has contracted by about 6.5 % during the years 2003-2009. The black line in figure

Figure 10: Hysteresis losses, exchange rate and the *Spurt* variable (source of data: USDA [2014] and own calculations)



10 represents the development of the  $\$/\text{€}$  exchange rate. The time series of the artificial *Spurt* variable is captured by the light grey and hysteresis losses indicator by the dark grey line. During the whole sample we cumulate the hysteresis losses as described in equation 7. The exchange rate fluctuates during the whole estimation period. However, if we filter out the small fluctuations and consider only strong exchange rate changes leading to some reactions of the export volume (see development of the *Spurt* variable), the picture becomes quite simple. Following the light grey line in figure 10 we can distinguish three periods: the period of predominantly negative exchange rate changes and non-negative export reactions going from 1995Q1 till 2001Q4; the period of predominantly positive exchange rate development with heavy hysteresis losses during the time span from 2003Q1 to 2008Q2 and finally, the period of fluctuating but slightly negative exchange rate changes (depreciation of home currency) from 2008Q3 till the end of the sample. Only the period of predominantly positive exchange rate development is interesting for us, since we focus on negative dynamic losses caused by sunk adjustment costs and taking place due to positive exchange rate changes.

The shady parts of figure 10 capture the three periods of increasing hysteresis losses: 2003Q1-2004Q1, 2004Q3-2005Q1 and 2007Q2-2008Q1. These periods are associated with the “pain (exit) thresholds” of exporting firms. As illustrated in figure 6, the “pain threshold” is not a constant trigger level, but is path-dependent, since the play lines are vertically shifted by movements along the spurt lines, see e.g. Belke et al. [2013]. Figure 10 shows that despite the increasing exchange rate during the last quarters of the year 2002 the export volume is not changing – the *Spurt* runs horizontally meaning that the system

moves in the play area, see figure 6. Consequently, the hysteresis losses indicator has the value of 0 and slightly underestimates the dynamic losses of exporters, see figure 7. The further on increasing exchange rate leaves the play area and penetrates the downward leading spurt in 2003Q1 passing the pain threshold of the least efficient exporters, corresponding to the exchange rate value of around 1.1 \$/€. These exporters have probably entered the market during the times of extremely low exchange rates (e.g. during the years 2000 and 2002) and made misleading forecasts concerning the exchange rate development, or even became very unproductive over the years. Until 2004Q1 the exchange rate increased by 0.2 \$/€ and accounted for increased hysteresis losses indicator by 0.15. The second period of hysteresis losses increase starts in 2004Q3 and ends in 2005Q1 leading to exit of high number of exporters and thus, to extremely heavy dynamic losses. A quite moderate exchange rate increase by 0.1 \$/€ (only half as large as the previous shock) this time induces over proportionally large increase in hysteresis losses indicator by 0.2 (which is by one third larger than previous increase). The subsequent negative exchange rate changes starting in 2005Q1 lead to a horizontal run of the *Spurt* associated with exchange rate movements within the play area which can only be crossed in 2007Q2. Since the pain threshold of efficient firms is passed (corresponds to the exchange rate value 1.33 \$/€) further exits take place and additional losses are generated. However, the effect of this exchange rate increase is far from the extent of effects caused by the two previous periods of exchange rate increase. Summing up, a rising exchange rate corresponds to heavy hysteresis losses if the exchange rate has not yet reached an extremely high level (e.g. 1.35 \$/€ in our example) at which only the most productive firms (that is, firms with high exit threshold values) can survive on the market. Since such a level is reached only moderate hysteresis losses are generated.

However, despite of the long period of increasing exchange rate, shrinking vineyards and extremely decreasing number of winegrowers, the Italian wine export value rises during the whole sample. This could mean e.g., higher wine prices due to lower consumption and/or higher quality, see e.g. Mariani et al. [2012].

## 7 Conclusion

The first and main contribution of this study is the introduction of a new welfare effect measure – the hysteresis losses indicator, which captures the dynamic losses of exporting firms on markets that exhibit hysteresis on the supply side. The new indicator describes dynamic losses caused by sunk adjustment costs in case of positive exchange rate changes. We analyzed negative dynamic effects on producers' welfare that are generated due to writing off the sunk adjustment costs. As an example we investigated Italian wine exports to the US.

As a first step, hysteretic dynamics of firm-level reactions based on one-period optimization was considered. Here the hysteretic behavior of one exporting firm was explained according to the existing literature on hysteresis in economics, see

Krasnosel'skii and Pokrovskii [1989], Baldwin [1989, 1990], Dixit [1989, 1992], Dixit and Pindyck [1994], Göcke [2002]. Since the unit/marginal costs as well as sunk entry and exit (dis)investments are firm specific, for heterogeneous firms individual entry and exit exchange rate trigger values result, leading to a “non-ideal-relay” reaction pattern to exchange rate changes. The distance between these triggers constitutes the so-called “band of inaction”, see figure 1. Considering that firms are heterogeneous, we presented the aggregated supply hysteresis loop of all heterogeneous firms related to exchange rate changes as an outcome of an adequate aggregation procedure, see Amable et al. [1991], Göcke [2002]. Göcke and Matulaityte [2015] showed theoretically that hysteresis losses in economics are proportional to the area inside a closed hysteresis loop, see figure 2, whose quantitative expression is a cubic function of price change in a certain period of time. Using the same logic we further on assumed that hysteresis losses are also proportional to the area inside the approximated linear hysteresis curve, see figure 6, calculated the indicator based on play-hysteresis, see equation 9, and integrated it into the play-algorithm, see Göcke [2001], in order to investigate hysteresis losses empirically, which is the main contribution of our paper.

As an example we calculated the hysteresis losses for Italian wine exports to the US, which is the second contribution of this paper. At first we proved the hysteresis hypothesis of the market empirically by running two OLS regressions – one with and the other without the path-dependent component (artificial *Spurt* variable). The existence of hysteresis on the market incentivized us to calculate the indicator for the hysteresis losses that captures a continuous increase in hysteresis losses in the time span from 2003Q1 to 2008Q2. According to the OIV the vineyards in Italy are shrinking every year. This fact supports our results captured by the indicator. Moreover, we observed disproportionately large hysteresis losses in comparison to exchange rate changes.

There can be various applications of the hysteresis losses indicator: on the one hand we can investigate how sensitive the exporters are to exchange rate changes, where the pain thresholds of firms are and how large the hysteresis losses are in comparison to exchange rate changes – all this is done in the paper; on the other hand it is conceivable to include this indicator into a certain utility function in order to account for hysteresis losses while making certain policy decisions.

Hysteresis losses should be taken into account because they increase welfare losses in a way which was not yet considered. Since hysteresis is an empirically proven phenomenon not only in foreign trade, but also in other economic fields like labor markets, see e. g. Mota et al. [2012], the new indicator has many applications. It can also be calculated for a very general case using price changes as a forcing variable.

## References

- Bruno Amable, Jerome Henry, Frederic Lordon, and Richard Topol. Strong hysteresis: An application to foreign trade. *OFCE Working Paper*, (9103), 1991.
- Bruno Amable, Jerome Henry, Frederic Lordon, and Richard Topol. Hysteresis: What is it and what it is not. *OFCE Working Paper*, (9216), 1992.
- Kym Anderson and Signe Nelge. *Global wine markets, 1961 to 2009: a statistical compendium*. University of Adelaide Press, 2011. URL <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/press/titles/global-wine/Global-Wine-2009-EB00K.pdf>. 13.02.2015.
- R. Baldwin. Hysteresis in trade. *Empirical Economics*, 15:127–142, 1990.
- Richard E. Baldwin. Sunk-cost hysteresis. *NBER Working Paper Series*, (2911), 1989.
- Richard E. Baldwin and Paul Krugman. Persistent trade effects of large exchange rate shocks. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 104:635–654, 1989.
- Barbara C. Beliveau and M. Elizabeth Rouse. Prohibition and repeal: A short history of the wine industry's regulation in the United States. *Journal of Wine Economics*, 5(1):53–68, 2010.
- A. Belke and M. Göcke. Exchange rate uncertainty and employment: an algorithm describing "play". *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 17:181–204, 2001.
- A. Belke, M. Göcke, and Martin Günther. Exchange rate bands of inaction and play-hysteresis in German exports - sectoral evidence for some OECD destinations. *Metroeconomica*, 64(1):152–179, February 2013.
- A. Belke, M. Göcke, and L. Werner. Hysteresis effects in economics - different methods for describing economic path-dependence. In José Carlos Dias, editor, *Hysteresis - Types, Applications, and Behavior Patterns in Complex Systems*, pages 19–42. Nova Publisher, New York, 2014.
- Ansgar Belke and Matthias Göcke. A simple model of hysteresis in employment under exchange rate uncertainty. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 46(3):260–286, 1999.
- Italian Wine Central. online, 2016. URL <http://italianwinecentral.com/italian-wine-exports-by-destination>. 01.09.2016.
- R. Cross, M. Grinfeld, and H. Lamba. Hysteresis and economics. *Control Systems Magazine IEEE*, 29:30–43, 2009.

- R. Cross, H. A. McNamara, A. V. Pokrovskii, and L. Kalachev. Hysteresis in the fundamentals of macroeconomics. University of Strathclyde Discussion Papers in Economics No. 10-08, 2010.
- Rod Cross. On the foundations of hysteresis in economic systems. *Economics and Philosophy*, 9:53–74, 1993.
- Diogo de Prince and Sergio Kannebley Junior. Strong hysteresis in Brazilian imports: a panel cointegration approach. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 40(4):528–548, 2013.
- Gusti d’Italia. online, 2016. URL <http://www.gustiditalia.com/1752/news/italian-wine-exports-to-the-united-states-first-in-the-world>. 01.09.2016.
- A. Dixit. Investment and hysteresis. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 6(1):107–132, 1992.
- Avinash Dixit. Hysteresis, import penetration, and exchange rate pass-through. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 104(2):205–228, May 1989.
- Avinash K. Dixit and Robert S. Pindyck. *Investment under uncertainty*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994.
- Eurostat. online, 2015. URL <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/de/data/database>. 03.12.2014 (last update 22.07.2016).
- Svetlana Fedoseeva. Are agricultural exports any special? Exchange rate nonlinearities in European exports to the US. *German Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 63(4):259–270, 2014.
- Imre Fertő and Jeremiás Máté Balogh. Are the major european wine exporters able to price discriminate across their EU extra wine export destinations? *Institute of Economics, Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences Discussion Paper*, (24):1–22, 2016.
- Matthias Göcke. A macroeconomic model with hysteresis in foreign trade. *Metroeconomica*, 52(4):449–473, 2001.
- Matthias Göcke. Various concepts of hysteresis applied in economics. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 16(2):167–188, 2002.
- Matthias Göcke and Jolita Matulaityte. Modelling economic hysteresis losses caused by sunk adjustment costs. MAGKS-Joint Discussion Paper Series in Economics by the Universities of Marburg, Aachen, Giessen, Kassel and Siegen, No. 36, 2015.
- A. J. Hughes Hallett and Laura Piscitelli. Testing for hysteresis against nonlinear alternatives. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 27:303–327, 2002.



- S. Kannebley Junior. Tests for the hysteresis in Brazilian industrialized exports: A threshold cointegration analysis. *Economic Modelling*, 25:171–190, 2008.
- Mark A. Krasnosel'skii and Aleksei V. Pokrovskii. *Systems with Hysteresis*. Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- P. Krugman. Pricing to market when the exchange rate changes. In S. W. Arndt and J. D. Richardson, editors, *Real-financial linkages among open economies*, pages 49–70. MIT Press, Cambridge, 1987.
- Angela Mariani, Eugenio Pomarici, and Vasco Boatto. The international wine trade: Recent trends and critical issues. *Wine Economics and Policy*, 1:24–40, 2012.
- I. D. Mayergoyz. *The Science of Hysteresis*, chapter Scalar Models of Hysteresis, pages 293–446. Elsevier, Burlington, USA, 2006.
- Isaak D. Mayergoyz. Mathematical models of hysteresis. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, 22:603–608, 1986.
- Isaak D. Mayergoyz. *Mathematical Models of Hysteresis and their Applications*. Elsevier Series in Electromagnetism. Elsevier, 2003.
- Paulo R. Mota and Paulo B. Vasconcelos. Nonconvex adjustment costs, hysteresis, and the macrodynamics of employment. *Journal of Post-Keynesian Economics*, 35(1):93–112, 2012.
- Paulo R. Mota, José Varejao, and Paulo B. Vasconcelos. Hysteresis in the dynamics of employment. *Metroeconomica*, pages 1–32, April 2012.
- OIV. Weltkonjunkturbericht. Report, March 2005. URL [www.oiv.int/oiv/info/deconjuncture?lang=de](http://www.oiv.int/oiv/info/deconjuncture?lang=de). (Organisation Internationale de la Vigne et du Vin) 30.06.2016.
- OIV. Weltkonjunkturbericht. Report, March 2013. URL <http://www.deutsche-winzergenossenschaften.de/inhalte/statistiken/OIV-Weltkonjunkturbericht%20Maerz%202013.pdf>. (Organisation Internationale de la Vigne et du Vin) 30.06.2016.
- OIV. Weltkonjunkturbericht. Report, Mai 2014. URL <http://www.infovin.org/content/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Konjunkturnote-OIV-M%C3%A4rz-2014.pdf>. (Organisation Internationale de la Vigne et du Vin) 30.06.2016.
- OIV. Weltkonjunkturbericht. Report, April 2015. URL <http://www.oiv.int/public/medias/2938/oiv-noteconjmars2015-de.pdf>. (Organisation Internationale de la Vigne et du Vin) 30.06.2016.
- Laura Piscitelli, Michael Grinfeld, Harbir Lambda, and Rod Cross. On entry and exit in response to aggregate shocks. *Applied Economic Letters*, 6:569–572, 1999.

- Laura Piscitelli, Rod Cross, Michael Grinfeld, and Harbir Lamba. A test for strong hysteresis. *Computational Economics*, 15:59–78, 2000.
- Ferenc Preisach. Über die magnetische Nachwirkung. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 94: 277–302, 1935.
- USDA. Real monthly country exchange rates, 12 2014. URL <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/agricultural-exchange-rate-data-set.aspx>. (United States Department of Agriculture) 16.01.2015.
- Florian Verheyen. Exchange rate nonlinear in EMU exports to the US. *Economic Modelling*, 32:66–76, 2013.
- A. Visintin. *The Science of Hysteresis*, chapter Mathematical Models of Hysteresis, pages 3–123. Elsevier, Burlington, USA, 2006.
- L. Werner. Hysterese im Agraraussenhandel: Analyse europäischer Weinexporte in die USA. *Schriften der Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaues e. V.*, 51:171–180, 2016.

Table 2: Linear regression of Italian wine export values to the US with and without the Spurt variable (robustness check 1: exclusion of the Trend variable)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Italian Wine Export Values	
	Without Spurt	With Spurt
RER	−63,949,290.00*** (11,943,498.00)	38,914,707.00 (25,258,054.00)
Spurt		−133,000,000.00*** (29,650,400.00)
GDP	125.99*** (5.05)	128.96*** (4.52)
d1	−26,548,160.00*** (4,639,444.00)	−25,133,758.00*** (4,117,800.00)
d2	−2,438,593.00 (4,640,639.00)	−428,342.00 (4,131,156.00)
d3	−5,469,813.00 (4,640,538.00)	−4,321,421.00 (4,114,647.00)
Constant	−130,000,000.00*** (15,377,365.00)	313,000,000.00*** (42,957,056.00)
Observations	75	75
R <sup>2</sup>	0.914	0.934
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.908	0.928
S.E. of regression (df = 68)	14,101,995.00	12,479,634.00
F statistic (df = 68)	146.60	159.35

*Note:*

\*p&lt;0.1; \*\*p&lt;0.05; \*\*\*p&lt;0.01

Table 3: Linear regression of Italian wine export values to the US with and without the Spurt variable (robustness check 2: exclusion of the Trend variable and the seasonal variables)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Italian Wine Export Values	
	Without Spurt	With Spurt
RER	-64,927,645.00*** (14,818,962.00)	41,958,122.00 (31,588,272.00)
Spurt		-138,000,000.00*** (38,260,121.00)
GDP	126.84*** (6.27)	129.92*** (5.86)
Constant	-140,000,000.00*** (18,670,909.00)	-329,000,000.00*** (54,979,461.00)
Observations	75	75
R <sup>2</sup>	0.862	0.883
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.858	0.878
S.E. of regression (df = 68)	17,509,637.00	16,203,767.00
F statistic (df = 68)	224.11	178.82

*Note:*

\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01