

Measurement of the Competitiveness of Turkey: EU Countries, 1980-2010 Period Comparison

Mehmet Mercan

Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Hakkari University

Hakkari, Turkey

mercan48@gmail.com

Abstract: *Nowadays, in the new world order caused by economic globalization, technological and political changes in world economy result in changes in the competitiveness of the countries. Everyday, countries intensify their effort to gain, develop and protect their power to compete with other countries. Today, even the most developed countries are trying to strengthen their competitiveness in order to enlarge their share in the world economy. Turkey desires to increase its competitiveness in all sectors in order to raise the welfare level of its people and to speed up its economic growth. Turkey endeavors to increase its competitiveness against EU, who is one of the most important economic partners of Turkey, in all sectors. In this study, the period of 1980-2010 is used to measure the competitiveness of Turkey towards the EU countries and aims to achieve predictions*

Keywords:

Globalization, Competitiveness, International Trade, Turkey, EU.

JEL Classification: *F12, F14, F15*

Article History

Submitted: 10 August 2012

Resubmitted: 19 July 2013

Resubmitted: 02 August 2013

Resubmitted: 11 August 2013

Accepted: 27 August 2013

Introduction

The common objective for all the countries in the changing world order is to provide competition conditions and increase the prosperity. However, competition is a multidimensional fact. Competitiveness of the countries and companies is depended on various factors. The importance of competitiveness has increased after the rapid change and development with the globalization in every sense. Studies about competition and competitiveness in countries also have increased.

Since competition and competitiveness are handled by various discipline in various aspects, there is no a common definition or measurement technique. However, if we want to classify in general, there are two points of view in the measurement of competitiveness. The first one is the studies carried out in micro (business and industry) level. The second one is the macro (country) point of view. While the competition among businesses inside the country and the effects of this competition on national and international market is emphasized in micro level approach, the status of the country in international competition is emphasized in macro approach. Competitiveness means that while countries try to increase the incomes of their citizens under the conditions of free and established market, at the same time they can present their products and services to the international markets and become successful. The definition mostly attributed in macro approach is this one (Çivi et al., 2008).

We can put in order the three basic characteristics of competitiveness according to the study results like this: The first one is that the main objective of having competitiveness is to provide an increase the living standards in the country and the prosperity of the citizens. This prosperity increases can be provided by paying attention to the activities like investment and production, increasing the cooperation between all institutions and paving the way for specialization. The second one is that the country should focus on its specific features, abilities and potentials in order to catch the opponent countries in producing the products and services and distributing them. The third one is that numerous indicators are used to analyze the competitiveness of the country. For instance, international market share, trade balance of the country, production, employment, openness i.e. (Çivi et al., 2008).

The competitiveness of Turkey with 15 basic countries of EU between 1980 and 2010 periods was tried to be measured by the globalization index measuring the competitiveness. It was aimed to make predictions for the future according to the upcoming results.

This study consists of four sections. In the first section literature scanning was carried out. In the second section data set and method was presented and explained. In the third section there are analysis results. In the fourth section a general evaluation will be carried out and recommendations will be made.

Literature Review

Theoretical foundations of international competitiveness date back to the period of classical economics. There are several numbers of approaches such as the Theory of Competitive Advantage Approach, Double Diamond Approach, and Nine Factors Model Approach for international competitiveness. The issues such as the definition of international competitiveness concept, assessment, explaining the determiners for this concept and stating the economic relations of it ranges according to the chosen approach. So there is no generally accepted approach for international competitiveness (Kibritçioğlu, 1996:112). In theoretical context, there is no certain consensus about international competitiveness and the factors affecting it and also it is not possible to say that the explanations are complementary each other (Yapraklı, 2011).

The concept of international competitiveness is one of the significant facts of the globalization process. The concept of international competitiveness in literature is handled and tried to be defined in three different ways as in firm, sector and international level (Kesbiç and Ürüt, 2004: 56-59).

Neither there is a generally accepted approach for the definition of the concept of international competitiveness, nor there is an approach for assessment and determining the factors affecting it. In international economy literature, macroeconomical, microeconomical and commercial approaches are generally used in order to assess the competitiveness in international trade. Among these approaches, the commercial approach is based on the theory of international foreign trade and it searches the foreign trade performance of sector/country. As a part of commercial approach, international competitiveness can be calculated via the Revealed Comparative Advantage Index which was built up by Balassa in 1965 (Wziątek-Kubiak, 2003: 2-4). In order to assess international competitiveness many indices are also used in literature such as The Relative Export Advantage Index, The Relative Import Influence Index, The Relative Trade Advantage Index, Intra-industry Trade Index, Specialization in Export Index, Similarity in Export Index, Relative Competition Advantage Index, i.e. (Altay and Gürpınar, 2008: 262-267).

When we deal with the factors affecting the international competitiveness, many factors are used such as micro and macro economical, price and out of price, within firm and non-firm, structural, qualitative, social and political, i.e. In economy literature, many qualitative and quantitative factor affecting the competitiveness are handled, but price- oriented factors are usually emphasized for the ease of finding data and assessment. In other words, in the factors affecting the international competitiveness and its assessment issues there are versatile studies in economy literature. However, depending on the time, as a result that developing countries began to compete more than with developed countries, studies on the efficiency of the factors affecting the international competitiveness began to increase. In this sense, many economic variables were handled and labor cost, foreign exchange rate, market volume (GDP) and openness were mostly used variables.

So we can classify the studies in four main titles (Yapraklı2011: 377-379): First group studies searched the relationship between the labor costs and competitiveness. As a determiner for competitiveness labor cost is the contraversial field. Studies about the effect of the cost of labour on the international competitiveness was performed by Fagerberg (1988), Jorgenson and Kuroda (1991), Guerrieri and Meliciani (2005). As a result of these studies, it was found out that the high price level in the labor costs meant high productivity and qualified labour employment. This result is the indicator of the efficient source usage and productivity-cost advantage and it affects the international competitiveness positively. On the other hand, Agrawal (1995), Wang (2002), Omel and Varnik (2009) and Du Toit (2010) found out in their studies that high labor costs had a negative effect on the competitiveness. As a conclusion, we can not say that there is a certain consensus about the effect of labor cost on the international competitiveness.

The other variable used to measure the factors affecting the international competitiveness was intended for assessing the relationship between market volume and international competitiveness. The common view about this issue is that: Expansion of market volume increases the competitiveness. Studies about this issue was carried out by Fagerberg (1988), Kim and Marion (1997), Esterhuizen (2006), Mu and Zhang (2010) and Feinberg and Weymouth (2011). As a conclusion of these studies it was identified that Gross Domestic Products of the countries was a significant factor for international competitiveness. Also the expansion of market volume increases the international competitiveness by benefiting from scale economies and providing efficient source usage. However, it was found out that GDP was not enough to explain the

international competitiveness in the studies on developed and developing countries by Cho, Moon and Kim (2008).

Another variable used to measure international competitiveness was foreign exchange rate. In the studies measuring the effect of foreign exchange rate on international competitiveness by Yoshitomi (1996), Zawalinska (2005) it was identified that the increase in the exchange rate affected the international competitiveness positively. However, in the studies by Safin and Rajtar (1997), Du Toit (2010) it was identified that the increase in the exchange rate affected the international competitiveness negatively. As a result, it is necessary to present the certain effect of the foreign exchange rates about increasing or decreasing the competitiveness. If the positive effect's is bigger than the negative effect, the increase in foreign exchange rates affects the competitiveness positively; if the negative effect's is bigger than the positive effect, it affects the international competitiveness negatively.

Also in some studies measuring the international competitiveness openness was used. Openness degree of a country is usually measured by the proportion of its GDP to its foreign trade volume (export + import) (Kazgan, 1988: 116). In the studies by Fagerberg (1988), Feinberg and Weymouth (2011) and Egbetokun (2011), it was found out that there was a positive effect between openness and international competitiveness. This result was obtained by the country's becoming more competitive due to the reasons such as efficient resource distribution, production increase and technology transfer while the openness degree increased.

Globalization Index in our study is based on Çoban and Çoban (2004: 167). The method used in the Çoban and Çoban's (2004) study, based on Human Development Index of United Nations Development Plan (UNDP). In the study by Çoban and Çoban (2004), competitiveness of Turkey and European Countries between 1970 and 2001 periods was analyzed by GI (Globalization Index) developed by A.T. Kearney Consulting Company. Even when country experiences took into consideration, it was found in the study that competitiveness of Turkey increased remarkably and accession to the EU would affect this process positively.

Data Set and Methodology

In this study a comparative competitiveness of Turkey with EU countries between 1980 and 2010 periods was to be expressed with the help of GI (export + import / GDP), globalization index in goods and services. The

data set in the analyses which was consisted of total export, total import, foreign direct investments, population, the number of incoming and outgoing tourists to the country, domestic loan volume, the number of internet users and GDP series in terms of countries was collected from the World Bank database (World Bank, 2012).

The issues such as economic integration, political links, technology and personal communication which are considered to be a factor for the globalization can be expressed parametrically with the help of globalization index called shortly as KFP and used to measure the international competitiveness of the countries (Çoban and Çoban, 2004). With the use of globalization index the issues such as international affairs and policies, commercial and financial movements, human mobility, thoughts and international data flow can also be embodied. So competitiveness can be explained more significantly (A.T. Kearney, 2001).

Globalization Index is originally based on the HDI (Human Development Index) developed by UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). At first step the variables to be used in the index are identified and then quantitative measurements of the variables involved are carried out. The obtained quantitative values after these two steps are normalized to clear the problems which can be seen in various variables identified with different modules. For example, before normalizing the two variables such as average life span (year) and GDP in human development index, the second one approaches nearly one hundred times of the first one. At last, the aggravated sum of normalized variables which gives a numerical result for each country is checked out.

In the globalization index consisting of 11 variablesⁱ the weights of variables used in index calculations are drown up in Table-1 (Lockwood, 2001: 5).

Table 1. The Variables in Globalization Index

| Category | Variable Name | Variable Definition | Weights |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Globalization in Goods and Services | Commerce | (Export + Import)/GDP | 1 |
| | Convergence | GDP according to Nominal GDP/PPP* | 1 |
| Financial Globalization | Income | (Loans + Depths)/GDP | 1 |
| | Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) | (Incoming FDI + Outgoing FDI)/GDP | 2 |
| | Portfolio Investments (PI) | (Incoming PI + Outgoing PI) / GDP | 2 |
| Globalization in Personal Communications | Tourism | (Incoming Tourists Number + Outgoing Tourist Number) / Total Population | 1 |
| | Telephone | International Phone Call to and for per Individuals (Minute) | 2 |
| | Transfer payments | (Loans + Depths)/GDP | 1 |
| Internet Connections (Personal Connections) | Internet Users | Internet Users/ Total Population | 2/3 |
| | Internet Sites | Number of Servers for Each One Million People | 2/3 |
| | Security Servers | Number of Security Servers for each one million people | 2/3 |

*PPP: Purchasing Power Parity

When Table 1 is observed, we can see that globalization index was calculated by considering four categories as globalization in goods and services, financial globalization, globalization in personal communication and internet connection. The degree of economic integration is calculated by combining the data about international trade, foreign direct investments and capital flows, wages for foreign workers and workers exchange rates in globalization index. Also the index embodies the international technological communication by regarding the number of internet users, internet sites and security servers.

Mehmet Mercan

Analysis Results

Competitiveness of Turkey with EU countries was comparatively analyzed by means of globalization index developed by A.T. Kearney Consulting Company in this study.

Index values calculated by us and given in Appendix-1 were also displayed in Table 2, Figure 1 and Figure 2 with a summary like approach reflecting the globalization trend in terms of competitiveness.

There are periodical averages of globalization values of the countries between 1980-2000 and 2001-2010 periods in Figure 1 indicating the development of globalization index in terms of periods.

Table 2. Development of Globalization Index and Change in Terms of Periods


| Rank | Countries 1980-2000 Term | | Countries 2001-2010 Term | | Change (%) | |
|------|--------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| | Country | Value | Country | Value | Country | Value |
| 1 | Denmark | 6.799 | Denmark | 16.59 | Denmark | 143.9 |
| 2 | Sweden | 6.218 | Sweden | 14.18 | Portugal | 139.1 |
| 3 | Luxembourg | 4.639 | Ireland | 7.566 | Turkey | 130.8 |
| 4 | EU | 3.929 | Austria | 7.132 | Sweden | 128.1 |
| 5 | Belgium | 3.467 | Luxembourg | 7.033 | Ireland | 119.1 |
| 6 | Netherlands | 3.462 | EU | 6.885 | Austria | 106.2 |
| 7 | Austria | 3.458 | Netherlands | 6.096 | Greece | 101.3 |
| 8 | Ireland | 3.452 | Belgium | 5.381 | Spain | 98.54 |
| 9 | Germany | 2.870 | Portugal | 4.982 | United Kingdom | 97.79 |
| 10 | France | 2.772 | Finland | 4.972 | Finland | 86.17 |
| 11 | Finland | 2.670 | United Kingdom | 4.844 | Netherlands | 76.09 |
| 12 | United | 2.449 | Germany | 4.678 | EU | 75.21 |

| | Kingdom | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|-------|
| 13 | Spain | 2.34 4 | Spain | 4.655 | Italy | 72.17 |
| 14 | Italy | 2.28 6 | France | 4.558 | France | 64.37 |
| 15 | Portugal | 2.08 3 | Italy | 3.935 | Germany | 62.96 |
| 16 | Greece | 1.92 2 | Greece | 3.872 | Belgium | 55.21 |
| 17 | Turkey | 1.014 | Turkey | 2.342 | Luxembourg | 51.59 |

As we can see Table 2 and Figure 1, Denmark is in the first in both periods in EU countries. Sweden is the second in both periods, too. Considering the periods of 1980 and 2000 Luxemburg, Belgium and Holland follow Denmark and Sweden in turn. When considering the periods of 2001 and 2010 Ireland, Austria, Luxemburg and Holland follow Denmark and Sweden in turn. Another remarkable point in Table 2, 12 countries in 1980-2000 terms and 10 countries in 2001-2010 term remained below the EU average. In the studies by Çoban and Çoban (2004); Austria holds its fourth place in both of the periods between 1970-1985 and 1986-2001. According to the periods of 1970 and 1985 Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Germany, England, Greece and Italy receded for a row in the period of 1986 and 2001. The ninth country of the period between 1970 and 1986 and the full member of EU in 1986 Portugal showed a significant development and it climbed up to the fifth place. The twelfth country of the period of 1970 and 1985 France climbed up to tenth place in the periods of 1986 and 2001.

Figure 1. Development of Globalization Index in Terms of Periods


Measurement of the Competitiveness of Turkey: EU Countries, 1980-2010 Period Comparison



In the studies by Çoban and Çoban (2004) again, we can see that Denmark is again the first in the periods of 1970 and 2001. Ireland, Holland, Austria and Denmark followed this country in turn. In the periods involved the countries having important roles in EU such as Germany, England, France and Italy were quite in back rows. Also when the averages are taken into consideration, EU countries averages are 3.55 in the periods of 1970 and 1985; 4.23 in the periods of 1986 and 2001 and 3.89 in the periods of 1970 and 2001. Turkey, which is in the developing countries category and the arguments about EU membership has increased recently, was in the last place in all three periods. However, when the figure in Appendix-2 is observed, we can see an increase trend in globalization index of Turkey since 1996 when Customs Union happened. This means that accession of Customs Union affected the competitiveness of Turkey positively.

The changing of index values indicated on Figure 1 in terms of periods are as in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Change of Index Values In Terms of Periods (%)



According to Figure 2 the changing rate averages of the periods of 1980-2000 and 2001-2010 is 0.75 in EU countries and this means that globalization index of EU countries increased in the rate of 75 % in the periods involved.

When the change in terms of periods in globalization index for Turkey is observed, it was found remarkable increases. The involved change rate was 1.31 between 1980-2000 and 2001-2010 periods. This means that globalization index of Turkey has increased in the rate of 131% from 1980 to 2010. These increase rates are above the averages of both EU and EU countries (exclude Denmark and Portugal) and they indicate that competitiveness of Turkey has remarkable increased in time.

Results and Policy Implications

Competitiveness of Turkey with EU countries was comparatively analyzed by means of globalization index developed by A.T. Kearney Consulting Company in this study as the periods of 1980 and 2010 are considered.

Periodical averages of index values in the period of 1980-2000 and 2001-2010 are taken by the globalization index. As a result, it is observed that Denmark is the first country in both periods. Sweden is the second in both periods, too. Considering the periods of 1980 and 2000 Luxemburg, Holland and Belgium follow Denmark and Sweden in turn.

Turkey, which is in the developing countries category and the arguments about EU membership has increased recently, was in the last place in all

three periods. However, when the figure in Appendix-2 is observed, we can see an increase trend in globalization index of Turkey since 1996 when Customs Union happened. This means that accession of Customs Union affected the competitiveness of Turkey positively.

When we observe the changing rate averages of the periods of 1980-2000 and 2001-2010 is 0.99 in EU countries and this means that globalization index of EU countries increased in the rate of 99 % in the periods involved.

When the change in terms of periods in globalization index for Turkey is observed, it was found remarkable increases. The involved change rate was 1.72 between 1980-2000 and 2001-2010 periods. This means that globalization index of Turkey has increased in the rate of 172 % from 1980 to 2010. These increase rates are above the averages of both EU and EU countries and they indicate that competitiveness of Turkey has remarkable increased in time.

Çoban and Çoban's (2004) studies contains the periods of 1970 and 2001 and our study contains the periods of 1980 and 2010. When Çoban and Çoban's (2004) study and ours are evaluated together, it can be said that competitiveness of Turkey has remarkably increased in the periods used in the analysis and the accession in EU would affect this process positively as the experiences of the countries considered.

According to the results of both studies, we can say that Turkey which has a young and active population is in a good position in terms of international competitiveness and follow right policies in its foreign trade and it increases its competitiveness every year. The only recommendation can be focusing on the production and export of the capital-intensive products and products with high foreign trade incomes in the increasing competitiveness.

References

Agrawal, N. (1995). Indonesia: Labor Market Policies and International Competitiveness, *Policy Research Working Paper*, W. P. No: 1515, 1-39.

Altay, B. & Gürpınar, K. (2008). Revealed Comparative Advantages and Some Competitiveness Indices: A Practice on Turkish Furniture Industry, Afyon Kocatepe University, *İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, X(5), 257-274.

Cho, D. S., Moon, H. C. & Kim, M. Y. (2008). Characterizing International Competitiveness in International Business Research: A MASI Approach to National Competitiveness, *Research in International Business and Finance*, 22, 175-192.

Çivi, E., Erol, İ., İnanlı, T. & Erol, E. D. (2008). Uluslararası Rekabet Gücüne Farklı Bakışlar, *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(1), 1-22.

Çoban, O. & Çoban, S. (2004). The Measurement of Competitiveness of Turkey by Globalization Index: A Comparison with EU Countries, 1970-2001, *Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas University Social Sciences Journal*, 10, 163-174.

Du Toit, J. P. (2010). Factors Influencing The Long-Term Competitiveness of Selected Commercial Milk Producers in East Griqualand, South Africa, *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

Egbetokun, A. A. (2011). The Outcomes and the Drivers: Exploring how Openness Influences Innovation in Developing Countries. Retrieved July 20, 2012, from http://final.dimeeu.org/files/Egbetokun_E6.pdf.

Esterhuizen, D. (2006). An Inquiry into the Competitiveness of the South African Agribusiness Sector, *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

Fagerberg, J. (1988). International Competitiveness, *The Economic Journal*, 98(391), 355-374.

Feinberg, R. & Weymouth, S. (2011). National Competitiveness in Comparative Perspective: Evidence from Latin America. Retrieved July 20, 2012, from http://faculty.msb.edu/sw439/documents/Competitiveness_RFSW.pdf.

Guerrieri, P. & Meliciani, V. (2005). Technology and International Competitiveness: The Interdependence between Manufacturing and Producer Services, *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 16(4), 489-502

Jorgenson, D. W. & Kuroda, M. (1991), Productivity and International Competitiveness in Japan and the United States, 1960-1985, *NBER Discussion Papers*, W.P.No: 8442, 29-57.

Kazgan, G (1988). *Openness Growth in Economy*, 2. Press, Altın Kitaplar, İstanbul.

Kearney A. T. / Foreign Policy Globalization Index (2001). Foreign Policy, Washington, D.C., *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. Retrieved Sept. 3, 2003, from <http://www.atkearney.com>.

Kesbiç C. Y. & Ürüt S. (2004). Rekabet Gücü ve Global Rekabette Türkiye'nin Yeri, *Finans-Politik&Ekonomik Yorumlar Dergisi*, 483.

Kibritçiöğlü A. (1996). A Conceptual Approach to International Competitiveness, *MPM, Productivity Journal*, 96(3), 109-122.

Kim, D. & Marion, B. (1997). Domestic Market Structure and Performance in Global Markets: Theory and Empirical Evidence from US Food Manufacturing Industry, *Review of International Organization*, 12, 335-354.

Lockwood, B. (2001). How Robust is The Foreign Policy/Kearney Index of Globalization?, Center for the Study of Globalization and Regionalisation (CSGR) *Working Papers* University of Warwick, WP No: 79/01.

Mu, Q. & Zhang, S. (2010). Factor Analysis of International Competitiveness of the Iron and Steel Industry in China, *The Sixteenth Annual International Sustainable Development Research Conference*, 30 May-1 June 2010, Hong Kong. Retrieved Sept. 16, 2012, from http://www.kadinst.hku.hk/sdconf10/Papers_PDF/p163.pdf.

Omel, R. & Varnik, R. (2009). International Competitiveness of Estonian Cereal Production, *Economic Science for Rural Development*, 20, 140-146.

Safin, M. & Rajtar, J. (1997). Recent Comparative Advantages of Polish Agri-food Products: Results of the DRC Computer Spreadsheet Analysis, In: Tangermann S. et al. (der.), *Analysis of Polish Agriculture and Food Economy's Competitiveness and Complementarity in Regard to*

Mehmet Mercan

EEC/EU over the TimeSpan 1990-1995 and the Forecast until 2002, GFA, Kompak, Fapa: Warsaw, 1-20.

Yapraklı, S. (2011). Makroeconomic Factors Affecting International Competitiveness: A Practice on Turkish Production Industry, *Selçuk University İİBF Social ve Economic Researces Journal*, 16(2), 373-403.

Yoshitomi, M. (1996). On The Changing International Competitiveness of Japanese Manufacturing Since 1985, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 12(3), 61-73.

Wang, R. Z. (2002). Determinants of International Competitiveness-An Empirical Study of The Progress, Difficulties, Models, *Statistical Research*, No.4, 20-24.

WorldBank (2013). Retrieved Jan. 1, 2012, from www.worldbank.org

Wziatek-Kubiak, A. (2003). Critical Synthesis, Review of the Main Findings, Methodologies and Current Thought on Competitiveness of Accession Countries. Mapping of Competence, *Center for Socail and Economic Research*. Retrieved Aug. 30, 2012, from <http://www.case.com.pl>.

Zawalińska, K. (2005). Changes in Competitiveness of Farm Sector in Candidate Countries Prior to The EU Accession: The Case of Poland. Retrieved July 15, 2012, from <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/24520/1/cp05za01.pdf>

¹Vide infra for the involved variables: [http://www.atkearney.com\(03.09.2003\)](http://www.atkearney.com(03.09.2003)).