



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

# Do Agricultural Commodity Firm Stock Price and Agricultural Commodity Price Move Together?

Francis Declerck

*ESSEC Business School Paris-Singapore  
declerck@essec.fr*

*Received February 2014, accepted June 2014, available online November 2014*

---

## ABSTRACT

The research aims at explaining stock performance of processing companies as a function of commodity performance on commodity markets. The results show that stock prices of food companies do not significantly depend on agricultural market prices. So, risks of agricultural market price volatility cannot be hedged using food firm stocks, whose markets are more liquid.

*Keywords: Commodity, Pricing, Agricultural Commodity, Stock Price, Hedging*

---

## 1 Introduction

Agricultural commodity markets are less liquid than stock markets. So, it would be great to find a stable link between a given agricultural commodity price and the stock price of companies processing that commodity in order to improve commodity hedging. The paper aims at explaining stock performance of processing companies as a function of commodity performance on commodity markets.

The paper is organized as follows First, it roots the the research in theoretical foundations. Second, the methodology is presented. Third, the results of the tests are shown. Fourth, the results are analyzed in light of observations found in the literature related to the specificity of the food business. Fifth, conclusion is drawn to assess major consequences of the results.

## 2 Theoretical foundations

### 2.1 Output producers and input users

According to economic theory, for users of commodities such as manufacturing companies an increase in input costs relates to a decrease in profits. For commodity sellers an increase in sales prices relates to an increase in profit. Furthermore, commodities may be divided into durable commodities that are renewable and exhaustible commodities. The research focuses on renewable commodities, like agriculturals.

Several studies have focused on the price transmission of agricultural prices from farmers to consumers via food processors and retailers. However, no one focused on processors' stock price.

## **2.2 Efficiency of commodity futures markets and stock markets**

In 1980, Tschoegl analyzed the efficiency in the gold market with respect to the information incorporated in sequences of successive price changes over the 1974-1997 period. He could not demonstrate that the market was inefficient.

But Geman (2005) scrutinized commodity futures markets in order to price commodity derivatives. She noticed that commodity futures markets often faced liquidity problems, not only options but also many futures contracts. So hedging against risks of commodity price fluctuations could be more efficient in using firm stocks producing/using the commodity.

## **2.3 Stock price explained by commodity produced or used**

Kia (2003) studied US and Canadian companies and found that the commodity price index and the domestic-foreign price differential were significant components of the stock price determination.

Focused on gold, Brimelow (1996) indicated that historical stocks of gold mining firms outperform twice or three times bullion price: if gold moves up 10%, mining stock prices go up 20% or 30%.

Blose and Shieh (1995) showed that the value of gold mine was a function of the return of gold, production costs, and the level of gold reserves. The research work was done with a sample of 23 publicly traded gold mining companies using monthly data over the period 1981 – 1990. The gold price elasticity of the companies' stocks was greater than one.

Tufano (1998) studied the exposure of 48 North American gold mining firms to fluctuations in gold prices. He showed that the average mining stock increased by 2 percent for each 1 percent increase in gold prices. Further, larger firm stocks experienced gold price shocks more strongly than did small firm stocks. Tufano explained it by the high speed at which stock markets incorporated gold price fluctuations for larger companies.

Wang et al. (2002) studied whether food recalls (i.e. food products that have been recalled from the market due to bad quality or infection, in this case meat infection), had an impact on the value of the corresponding companies. They found that recalls had significant negative effects around the event dates. The recalls also increased the volatility of the companies' stocks as well as the stocks of other companies in the same industry.

With only a few studies, there is room to improve knowledge about links between commodity prices and stock prices. The objective of the research is to explain stock performance of agricultural processing companies as a function of commodity performance on commodity markets. If results are robust, one could be able to hedge commodity price fluctuations in using stocks whose markets are a lot more liquid.

# **3 Hypotheses, methodology and means**

## **3.1 Hypotheses**

The hypothesis is that it is possible to explain stock performance of processing companies as a function of commodity performance on commodity markets.

### *3.1.2 Methodology*

The methodology is based on the foundation of modern portfolio theory laid out by Markowitz (1959). Observing that most investors invest in multiple securities, he hypothesized that there would be some benefit in purchasing a portfolio. He showed that investing in a portfolio of securities may reduce the variability of returns, a measure of riskiness. So, part of risk is diversified away. He also found efficient portfolios which maximize returns for a given level of risk. But the Markowitz micro-model of portfolio choice requires restrictive assumptions on characteristics of assets and investors:

- one period model;
- markets are highly efficient: information is freely available, no transactions cost, no tax, perfect divisible assets;
- the market portfolio is efficient;
- investors are risk-averse and well diversified;
- investors have the same expectations and can choose between assets on the basis of expected return and variance; then, probability distributions for asset returns are all normally distributed or the investor's utility function is quadratic.

Further, the Markowitz model is very demanding in available data for generating an efficient portfolio. It requires  $N(N+3)/2$  estimates,  $N$  expected returns,  $N$  variances and  $N(N-1)/2$  unique covariance returns.

This limitation led to the emergence of the single-index model by Sharpe (1964) and Lintner (1965) to forecast asset pricing. Rooted in the Markowitz market model approach, it is used to eliminate the elements of each firm's price change that depend on the market. In a market equilibrium, the model expresses a linear ex-ante function between the return on each stock of firm  $i$  and the return of the market portfolio:

$$R_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i R_{mt} + \epsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where

- $i = 1 \dots N$ , is a firm index,
- $t = 1 \dots T$ , is a day index,
- $R_{it}$  is the rate of return on firm  $i$  for day  $t$ ,
- $R_{mt}$  is the rate of return on the market portfolio for day  $t$ ,
- $\alpha_i$  measures the mean return over the period not explained by the market,
- $\beta_i$  measures the systematic risk on firm  $i$ , that is the sensitivity of firm  $i$  to changes in the market portfolio's rate of return,
- and  $\epsilon_{it}$  is a statistical error term, with  $\sum \epsilon_{it} = 0$ .

The model only requires  $3N+2$  estimates: estimates of alpha, beta and variances for each stock, estimate of expected return on the market index and estimate of the variance of returns on the market index. Researchers have criticized the model, because they have found that other factors beyond market index may explain the stock returns of a firm (Stock and Watson, 1989, p. 352-353). Further, the model requires stringent assumptions:

- investors' utility functions are unknown and may change over time,
- very often, returns on assets (stocks, commodity) are not normally distributed,
- markets are not perfect: there exist frictions, transaction costs, taxes, indivisibilities.

investors are assumed to behave similarly over the period tested. Despite its shortcomings, the model provides a simple and straightforward measurement and plausible results to lead to meaningful benchmarks by taking market risk and firm stock return relationships into account.

Such a one-factor model is adapted to the present situation in order to explain stock performance of processing companies as a function of commodity performance on commodity futures market. So the model is as follows:

$$R_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i R_{mt} + \gamma_i R_{ct} + \delta_i R_{ct-1} + \epsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

where,

- $R_{it}$  is the weekly log-return on stock of firm  $i$  for day  $t$ , firm  $i$  using mainly commodity  $c$  in its operating process,
- $R_{mt}$  is the weekly log-return of stock market for day  $t$ .
- $R_{ct}$  is the weekly log-return of commodity futures market corresponding to the commodity business of the firm for day  $t$ .
- $R_{ct-1}$  is the one-week lagged weekly log-return of commodity futures market corresponding to the commodity business of the firm for day  $t$ .
- $\alpha_i$  measures the mean return over the period not explained by the market,
- $\beta_i$  measures the systematic risk on firm  $i$ , that is the sensitivity of firm  $i$  to changes in the market portfolio's rate of return,
- $\gamma_i$  measures the systematic risk on firm  $i$ , that is the sensitivity of firm  $i$  to changes in the commodity futures market portfolio's rate of return,
- $\delta_i$  measures the systematic risk on firm  $i$ , that is the sensitivity of firm  $i$  to changes in the commodity futures market portfolio's rate of return with one-week lag, and
- $\epsilon_{it}$  is a statistical error term, with  $\sum \epsilon_{it} = 0$ .

For each firm  $i$ , the estimates of  $a_i$ ,  $b_i$ ,  $c_i$ , and  $d_i$  of  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\beta_i$ ,  $\gamma_i$  and  $\delta_i$  respectively, are produced by running an ordinary least-squares regression according to equation 2. The  $R^2$  statistic of the regression indicates

the percent of variation in asset  $i$ 's log-returns that is explained by, or associates with the log-return of on stock market log-return and/or commodity market log-return.

So, the regression of the log-return of the company's stock is run on the log-return of the market index and the log-return of the wheat index. This kind of regression is the one that Tufano uses, and is justified in theory, as the log-returns should be normally distributed, therefore the assumptions of ordinary least squares hold.

All regressions were rerun on a year by year basis, in order to study the changes of the coefficients over time.

### **3.3 Data**

The model is applied to competitive industrial sectors with corporations quoted on stock exchange with commodity traded on futures markets. Focus is placed on the wheat futures contracts traded on the Chicago Board of Trade (CBOT, belonging to the CME group).

Stock performance is measured by weekly returns. It includes dividends. Stock price and commodity prices are available on « Datastream ». Data cover the period January 1996 to February 2007, before the financial and commodity crisis of 2007-2011. In total we have a sample of 49 companies from several markets.

## **4 Results**

Results show that the wheat index is not significant in any of the regressions. Only a handful of companies have a significant sensitivity on wheat return (9 companies out of 49).

- Most companies studied come from Japan (15) and US (12).
- Only 3 out of 15 companies in Japan had a significant coefficient on wheat, even on high significance levels (12%).
- Only 2 out of 12 US companies had a significant coefficient on wheat, even on high significance levels (12%). Surprisingly Du Pont turned out to be significant while Monsanto was not.
- Other companies studied from various countries are in agreement with the above conclusions, For instance, Syngenta was significant, i.e. their stocks do not seem to follow movements of wheat, because in the relevant regression the wheat coefficient is not significant.

Times series: All regressions were rerun on a year by year basis, in order to study the changes of the coefficients over time. It is interesting that the year of 2001, that includes the September 11 incident, has the maximum percentage of significant companies in wheat. The American economy was on a downhill path, which was further enhanced by the September 11 incident. The percentage of significant companies in the wheat industry is, apart from 2001, very low (10% or less) in all years.

Table 1.

Wheat processing firm stock price in function of wheat price: Results by company, January 1996 – February 2007

Name	Market	Start Date	End Date	market coeff	wheat coeff																		
CANADA BREAD CO.	Canada	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.3627 (6.11e-006)	-0.068 (0.0895)	DOVER INDUSTRIES	Canada	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.04101 (0.445)	-0.01754 (0.516)	SEPPS GOURMET FDS.	Canada	18-oct-99	12-févr-07	-0.1095 (0.772)	-0.04651 (0.8)						
1 / 3																							
BISCUITS GARDEIL	France	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.1184 (0.318)	-0.1075 (0.191)	HATZIKRANIOTIS MILL	Greece	27-déc-99	12-févr-07	1.265 (7.43e-021)	0.0004964 (0.996)	MLS C SARANTOPOUL	Greece	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.8796 (5.01e-020)	-0.0159 (0.859)	KATSELIS SONS CR	Greece	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.8439 (6.96e-046)	0.00492 (0.925)
SKANE MOLLAN	Sweden	06-juil-98	12-févr-07	0.02306 (0.726)	-0.03347 (0.542)	GRUPE MINOTERIES	Switzerland	12-oct-98	12-févr-07	0.1874 (0.0153)	-0.05226 (0.273)	HIESTAND R	Switzerland	27-oct-97	12-févr-07	0.5705 (2.63e-018)	0.1157 (0.00618)	SYNGENTA	Switzerland	13-nov-00	12-févr-07	0.7422 (9.59e-030)	0.09038 (0.0181)
LOTUS BAKERIES	Belgium	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.2387 (0.000244)	-0.02796 (0.432)	FINSBURY FOOD	UK	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.2832 (0.0222)	-0.01532 (0.815)	INTER LINK FOODS	UK	24-août-98	12-févr-07	0.4897 (3.44e-006)	0.03707 (0.509)	REAL GOOD FOOD CO.	UK	29-sept-03	12-févr-07	0.51 (0.106)	-0.1362 (0.17)
2 / 12																							
COMO	Japan	08-déc-97	12-févr-07	0.1803 (0.0164)	-0.04034 (0.449)	CYBELE	Japan	01-août-05	12-févr-07	0.492 (0.00186)	-0.1441 (0.079)	FIRST BAKING	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	1.012 (3.49e-020)	0.005006 (0.944)	VITTO FUJI FLOUR MILL	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.4567 (2.1e-020)	0.01339 (0.678)
MASUDA FLOUR MILL.	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.2223 (0.00159)	0.09022 (0.0583)	NICHIRYO BAKING	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.2061 (0.064)	-0.04147 (0.582)	NISSHIN SEIFUN	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.4546 (1.15e-020)	0.06458 (0.043)	NTON FOOD INDUST	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.1567 (0.000206)	-0.02184 (0.443)
TOFUFUKU FLOUR MILLS	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.5624 (3.77e-009)	0.01968 (0.758)	TORIGOE	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.5415 (2.67e-023)	-0.01543 (0.663)	YAMAZAKI BAKING	Japan	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.5125 (1.03e-024)	-0.03731 (0.249)						
2 / 11																							
DAEHAN FLOUR MILLS	Korea	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.5205 (3.35e-018)	0.112 (0.0894)	KIRIN	Korea	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.4218 (0.00416)	0.07692 (0.645)	ORION	Korea	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.7851 (5.41e-036)	0.06624 (0.32)	SEOUL FOOD IND	Korea	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.8899 (2.67e-013)	-0.1208 (0.372)
SILVER STAR	Korea	04-août-03	12-févr-07	1.159 (6.53e-005)	-0.219 (0.212)	KAWAN FOOD	Malaysia	08-août-05	12-févr-07	0.3805 (0.109)	-0.02726 (0.705)	UANTAN FLOUR MILL	Malaysia	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	1.35 (3.71e-049)	-0.004959 (0.946)	MALAYAN FLOUR MILL	Malaysia	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.8482 (1.45e-054)	0.05556 (0.197)
LONG GUAN FLOUR MI	Singapore	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.09772 (0.245)	0.03464 (0.556)	UNITED FLOUR MILL	Thailand	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.01279 (0.953)	0.1378 (0.252)												
1 / 10																							
MOLINO J SEMINO B	Argentina	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.1733 (0.00737)	0.0697 (0.337)	BIMBO A	Mexico	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.5712 (5.88e-014)	-0.009771 (0.811)												
0 / 2																							
LYN CHEESECAKE & DE	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.7569 (0.0315)	-0.1626 (0.4)	FLOWERS FOODS	US	26-mars-01	12-févr-07	0.6026 (9.5e-008)	0.06216 (0.281)	GENERAL MILLS	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.2675 (4.31e-009)	-0.003162 (0.898)	TERSTATE BAKERIES DI	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.3044 (0.0234)	-0.09106 (0.217)
KELLOGG	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.2882 (3.4e-007)	-0.00923 (0.764)	NEW DGN.ASIA	US	01-mai-00	12-févr-07	1.521 (0.000162)	0.1421 (0.501)	RALCORP HDG.	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.3101 (0.000615)	0.02961 (0.55)	TASTY BAKING	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.3239 (0.000105)	0.07609 (0.0959)
MONSANTO	US	23-oct-00	12-févr-07	0.7985 (8.82e-013)	-0.05144 (0.379)	PONT E I DE NEMOU	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.8503 (2.32e-043)	0.06885 (0.027)	DOW CHEMICALS	US	27-févr-96	12-févr-07	0.8316 (4.49e-034)	0.06308 (0.0733)						
3 / 11																							
TOTAL 9 / 49																							
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">In Bold window, the companies for which the coefficient for wheat is significant.</div>																							

**Table 2.**  
Commodity processing firm stock price in function of commodity price: summary of results on the period January 1996 – February 2007

WHEAT	Sample period									
	Janv-96 déc-96	Janv-97 déc-97	Janv-98 déc-98	Janv-99 déc-99	Janv-00 déc-00	Janv-01 déc-01	Janv-02 déc-02	Janv-03 déc-03	Janv-04 déc-04	Janv-05 déc-05
Number of companies with significant coefficient in wheat	7	2	7	6	2	6	4	5	4	7
Total number of companies for the sample	34	36	39	40	44	45	45	49	49	50
percentage	0.21	0.06	0.18	0.15	0.05	0.13	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.14

## 5 Discussion of results

According to economic theory an increase in productions costs results in a decrease of profits. It is the case for raw material costs such as commodity costs for manufacturing companies. Wheat companies do not have such a direct sensitivity to wheat price, as gold companies would have to gold . In the case of wheat, Kellogg for instance would have a lot of other processes entering their revenue flows (marketing, logistics management, etc.).

### 5.1 Hedging to reduce costs of bankruptcy

According to Modigliani-Miller (1958), costs of bankruptcy risks affect the pricing of corporations. Hedging on futures markets may reduce risks of commodity price fluctuations. Observing small numbers of deals on most futures agricultural commodity markets, companies using agricultural commodities do not hedge often. So their costs of bankruptcy risks are higher when prices of agricultural commodities increase.

Corporations act in their owners' interest, thus, they must maximize shareholders' share value. This is executed through a series of business and financial decisions. Business decisions are presented first and then financial decisions are described. Business decisions involve investment decisions. Investments are conducted to increase profits and then firm value. According to the Modigliani-Miller separation theorem (Modigliani and Miller, 1958), investment decisions are independent from financing decisions. The most important financial decision is to choose the level of financial leverage. Corporations will increase their financial debt as long as bankruptcy costs remain low. Hence, corporations will maximize their value while maintaining bankruptcy costs at low level.

### 5.2 Bargaining power: perfect competition versus imperfection competition

Results may be explained by imperfect competition in terms of bargaining with clients, in terms of pressure from retailers and in terms of power among competitors.

#### In terms of bargaining power with clients

Bargaining power may be quite strong for some commodity producers operating in cartels such as the OPEC for oil or the many cartels observed in the copper markets. However such a phenomenon is less common for agricultural commodities although food markets that are oligopolies are widespread.

Cartels were only found in very few food industries: the cartel of vitamins for example. But no cartel was found in agricultural commodities before the year 2010. However, many authors have studied retail food prices on the basis of cost-push theories. They analyzed food manufacturers reaction to increases in agricultural input costs. Such increases may be "passed through" to consumers in the form of higher product prices.

Holloway (1991) analyzed the farm-retail price spread for eight major food commodity groups: beef and veal, pork, poultry, eggs, dairy, processed fruits and vegetables, fresh fruit and fresh vegetables. He found no significant departure from perfect competition in the retail sector during the period 1955-83.

Schroeter and Azzam (1991) looked at pork prices and farm prices of market hogs. They found that farm/wholesale margins are more consistent with competitive performance in the period 1972-1988 than before. Further, they confirmed a positive relationship between marketing margin and price risk.

Butault (2008) showed that food companies transferred any decrease in agricultural commodity prices to their clients (which may be merchants or other processors or retailers) from 1979 to 2004 in France. He concluded that globally food companies seem to not hold any bargaining power on their output markets.

Furthermore, in terms of costs, farm inputs are lower for food products that are more and more processed. Following Goodwin and Brester (1995), Morrison and MacDonald (2003) observed that food prices in the US were less responsive to agricultural price shocks since the 1980s because food bought by consumers is more and more processed. So, agricultural materials represented a reduced share of food-processing costs. They found weaker linkages between farm and food prices.

Urbanichik (1997) compared changes in the US consumer price index (CPI) for food with the index of prices received by farmers for all farm products (PFR) which was a proxy for agricultural prices. He found a relative stability of food price inflation contrasting with the volatility of commodity prices over the period 1984-1996.



Food products have evolved and incorporated more and more processing and convenience services. Based on prices farmers receive for commodities, the farm value share of the retail price of food has almost continuously declined during the last 50 years in the USA, with a share of 41% in 1950 to an estimated share of 19% in 2006 (Christian and Rashad, 2008). Then, change in agricultural commodity prices affect food prices in a smaller and smaller proportion.

### **Food manufacturers may be pressed by food retailer's market power**

Bontemps *et al.* (2008) found that French retailers exert some market power vis a vis consumers and vis a vis fresh tomato suppliers. They demonstrated that in absence of retail market power, the consumer price of French round tomatoes would have decreased by about 1.2% to 4.5% depending on year, between 2000 and 2006. Such a market power concerned large volumes since tomato was the main vegetable consumed in France after potato.

Bontemps *et al.* (2008) also found that the producer price of round tomatoes would have been 6 to 24% higher than the actual observed on markets. The producer price of round tomatoes would have been 13 to 54% higher. Tomato producers were hurt: they had to produce less and at a small price. Further, price distortions were higher in winter when supply mainly came from imports.

Food retailers exert some power on food manufacturers. Most food processors cannot easily pass cost increases to food retailers. However, there exists some exceptions. Food giant firms like Nestlé, Danone, Kraft, Unilever can pass price increases through to retailers and consumers. It is due to their branding power. They enjoy some monopolistic power attached to their strong brand worldwide.

### **In terms of power among competitors: Food price stickiness**

Rottemberg (1982) and Cecchetti (1986) assessed that price rigidity to cost changes might be due to fear of uncertain responses from rival firms that put considerable risk on pricing decisions: any firm price increase not followed by competitors might lead to loss of market share, revenue, goodwill and profit. Any price decreases might lead to increased market share or to harmful price wars that may induce predatory pricing.

According to Shonkwiler and Taylor (1988), firm altered price only in response to changes in production cost caused by input price changes and/or technological progress. Transitory changes did not result in price changes. They found evidence of sticky prices at firm level in the frozen concentrated orange juice business. For major processors in Florida, changes in bulk price of inputs such as orange juice or labor or packing costs, "must pass significant threshold before listed retail prices are changed".

With French food prices observed in 27,000 shops, Guédès (2008) confirmed the findings with data of 2007-2008 where the strong increase in agricultural prices led to a moderate increase in food prices. For instance from June to November 2007, the price of wheat increased by 58% from 158 €/t to 250 €/t, while the consumer price of a "baguette" (very common French type of bread) increased by 4.7% on average, with variations from - 20% to 12.9%. Later, the baguette price remained quasi-stable during the three following months, while milling wheat price fluctuated around 250 €/t. Declerck and Weaver (2011) extended the work on price stickiness of bread price w.r.t. wheat price and noticed some ratchet effect in the US and French markets: when wheat price rose, bread price increased, but bread price did not decrease when wheat price went down. They suggested that wheat price increase was an argument provided by retailers to pass some increase in bread price even though wheat only accounted for 6 to 10% of bread making costs.

## **6 Conclusion and perspectives**

The paper focuses on stock performance of processing companies as a function of commodity performance on commodity markets. Applied to the case of wheat, food processors' stock prices do not significantly depend on agricultural market prices. Such a result differs from studies made on gold mining companies whose stock price depends on gold price (Tufano, 1998). In contrast, results show that stock prices of wheat users are not related to wheat price. Several hypotheses may be formed to explain the results:

- 1) Food processors do not hold any bargaining power on their output market and transfer any commodity price change to their clients as found by Butault (2008). Following Morrison and MacDonald (2003) purchases of farm inputs only represent a small fraction of costs of food explaining why in the present research wheat price movements do not significantly affect stock prices of wheat users.
- 2) As found by Rottemberg (1982) and Cecchetti (1986), food processors may be pressed by food retailers who hold some market power.
- 3) Food price stickyness may be observed for wheat as observed by Guedes (2008) and Declerck and Weaver (2011).

So, agricultural market prices cannot be hedged using food processors' stock prices.

Further studie may be made with other agricultural commodities and energy and mineral commodities.

## References

- Brimelow, John. (1996). Gold: The hazard of hedging. *Forbes*, February, 12, 1996: 180.
- Blose L. E., Shieh, J.C. (1995). The impact of oil price on the value of gold mining stock. *Review of Financial Economics*, **4**:126-139.
- Bontemps, Chr., Orozco, V., and Réquillart, V. A. (2008). Private Labels, National Brands and Food Prices, *Review of Industrial Organization*, vol.33, N1, p.1-22. [doi:10.1007/s11151-008-9176-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-008-9176-x).
- Butaut, J.P. (2008). La relation entre prix agricoles et prix alimentaires. *Revue française d'économie*, n2/vol. **23**: 215-241.
- Cecchetti, S.G. (1986). The frequency of price adjustment; a study of the newstand prices of magazines. *Journal of Econometrics*, **31**:255-274.
- Christian, T., Rashad, I. (2008). Trends in U.S. food prices, 1950-2007. *Economics and Human Biology*, in press: doi:10.1016/j.ehb.2008.10.002.
- Dasgupta, P., Heal, G. (1974). The optimal depletion of exhaustible resources. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **41**:3-28.
- Declerck, F., Weaver, R.D. (2011). "Sticky food prices? Evidence from recent price jumps." in *Proceedings in Food System Dynamics 2011, the 5<sup>th</sup> International European Forum on System Dynamics and Innovation Networks*, International Center for Food Chain Network Research of the University of Bonn-Germany, Innsbruck-Igls, Austria, 14-18 February 2011.
- Geman, H. (2005). *Commodities and commodity derivatives: modeling and pricing for agriculturals, minerals and energy*. Wiley Finance. John Wiley & Sons Ltd: London.
- Guédès, D. (2008). Les variations de prix alimentaires. *INSEE Première*, n 11991, 4 P.
- Herfindahl, O. (1959). *Copper costs and prices: 1870-1957*, The John Hopkins University Perss, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Holloway, G.H. (1991). The farm-retail price spread in imperfectly competitive food industry. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, **November**: 979-989.
- Hotelling, H., (1931). The economics of exhaustible resources. *Journal of Political Economy*, **39**: 137-175.
- Kia, A. (2003). Forward – Looking Agents and Macroeconomic Determinants of the Equity Price in a Small Open Economy, *Applied Financial Economics*.
- Koopmans, T.C. (1967). " Objectives, Constraints and Outcomes in Optimal Growth Models". *Econometrica*, **35**: 1-15.
- Koopmans, T.C. (1974). A proof for the case where discounting advances the dooms-day. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **41**.
- Koopmans, T. C. (1973). *Economic Growth and Exhaustible Resources*, in Bos, H. C., H. Linneman, and P. de Wolff, eds., *Economic Structure and Development*, Essays in Honour of Jan Tinbergen: 239-255. Amsterdam, North Holland Publ.

- Lintner, J. (1965). The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **47**: 13-37.
- Markowitz, H.M. (1959). *Portfolio selection: efficient diversification of investments*, Wiley, Yale University Press, 1990, Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- Modigliani, F., Miller, M.H. (1958). The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment. *American Economic Review*, **48**: 3.
- Raintree Nutrition, Inc. web site: <http://www.rain-tree.com>
- Rottemberg, J. (1982). Monopolistic price adjustment and aggregate output. *Review of Economic Studies*, **49**: 517-531.
- Sharpe, W.F. (1964). Capital Asset Prices: a theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk. *The Journal of Finance*, **September**: 425-442.
- Shonkwiler, J.S., Taylor, T.G. (1988). Food processor price behavior: firm-level evidence of sticky prices. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, **May**: 239-244.
- Schroeter, J., Azzam, A. (1991). Marketing margins, market power and price uncertainty. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, **November**: 990-999.
- Stock, J. H., Watson, M. W. (1989). *New Indexes of Coincident and Leading Economic Indicators*. In National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Macroeconomics Annual 1989, edited by Olivier J. Blanchard and Stanley Fischer, 351-394. Cambridge, Mass.
- Tufano, P. (1998). The Determinants of Stock Price Exposure: Financial Engineering and the Gold Mining Industry. *The Journal of Finance*, vol. **53**, 3: 1015-1052.
- Urbanichik, J.M. (1997). Commodity markets, farm-retail spreads, and macroeconomic condition assumptions in food price forecasting.
- Wang, Z., Salin, V., Hooker, N., and Leatham, D. (2002). Stock Market Reaction to Food Recalls: A GARCH Application. *Applied Economic Letters*.