

MACROECONOMIC PERFORMANCE, TRADE AND COMPETITIVENESS OF SOUTH-EAST EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Buturac, Goran; Lovrinčević, Željko; Mikulić, Davor

Source / Izvornik: **Ekonomski pregled, 2011, 62, 483 - 507**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:213:991477>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-01-23**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[The Institute of Economics, Zagreb](#)

Goran Buturac*
Željko Lovrinčević**
Davor Mikulić***

UDK 338.124.4:339.5.057.7
JEL Classification F41, F17, E32
Izvorni znanstveni članak

MACROECONOMIC PERFORMANCE, TRADE AND COMPETITIVENESS OF SOUTH-EAST EUROPEAN COUNTRIES¹

The purpose of this paper is to analyze macroeconomic performance of the selected South-east European (SEE) countries reflected by GDP growth, inflation, unemployment and overall economic competitiveness and especially to assess the impact of global crisis on domestic economies. As a key aspect of overall competitiveness, changes in the trade patterns of selected South-east European countries are also analyzed. The period from 2000 to 2008 can be characterized as successful for South-east European countries due to the narrowing development gap in comparison to EU countries, but the recent global economic crisis had a strong negative impact on this region. However, due to domestic absorption growth and export of services, Albanian economy was growing even in 2009, a period when most European countries recorded significant drops in economic activity. On the other hand, the highest negative growth rates were recorded in Croatia and Montenegro. In all countries the global economic crisis resulted in decreasing comparative advantages and export competitiveness in most export products. Most of

* G. Buturac, Ph. D., Research Associate (e-mail: gbuturac@eizg.hr).

** Ž. Lovrinčević, Ph. D., Senior Research Associate (e-mail: zlovrincevic@eizg.hr)

*** D. Mikulić, Ph. D., Senior Research Associate (e-mail: dmikulic@eizg.hr) all three from the Institute of Economics, Zagreb.

The first version of the paper was received on July 18th 2011 and the final one on Oct. 10th 2011.

¹ The first version of the paper was presented at the international conference “Western Balkan: An Opportunity or a Challenge for the Future of the EU” which was held in Prishtina, 26-27 June 2010 and published in the Proceedings from the Conference. In this second version some new issues as well as the review of recent empirical research are included.

the observed countries have complementary export structures. This kind of situation offers the possibilities of strengthening the mutual economic cooperation and joint efforts on the international markets especially in the circumstances of the global economic crisis.

Key words: macroeconomic performance, trade and export competitiveness, South-east European countries

1. Introduction

Countries of south-eastern Europe (SEE) in the last two decades have witnessed an abundance of significant political and economic events. Establishment of independent states, the collapse of central planning and transition towards market economic system were the most important factors influencing macroeconomic performance. Although significant macroeconomic improvements are recorded, there is still significant room for further reforms oriented to rising of overall competitiveness which will result in higher living standard of population.

All these countries face the challenge of more active inclusion in the European integration process, and one of the key factors in this path is the improvement in trade patterns and export competitiveness. The changes of export structure towards higher value added products are a precondition of growth in export competitiveness. The latest trends on the international markets are characterized by a significant fall in demand and a strengthening of competitive pressure. In this context the ability of the adjustment to new market circumstances is especially important for the achievement of continual growth in production and in exports. Present theoretical knowledge supports open policies of international trade. The liberalization and openness of the markets and global reduction of demand create new challenges for strengthening export competitiveness (Buturac, Grzinic, 2009.).

The purpose of this paper is to analyse macroeconomic performance of the selected countries reflected by GDP growth, inflation, unemployment and overall economic competitiveness and especially to assess the impact of global crisis on domestic economies. The analysis comprises the following countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.²

The paper is divided into three parts. After the introduction, the second part is related to the analysis of macroeconomic performance of SEE³ countries. The

² Republic of Kosovo is not included in the analysis because the lack of data

³ SEE is the abbreviation for South-east European

results of empirical research of the openness, dispersion and concentration, comparative advantages, export competitiveness and export similarities are shown in the third part. Brief conclusions are then drawn.

2. Macroeconomic Performance of SEE Countries

In the literature on macroeconomic performance of the European economy, the region comprising of the so-called SEE countries is usually neglected due to the low impact on the rest of the European economy or simply due to a lack of comparable data. However, the EU expansion process has a strong impact on the SEE region, not only in political, but also in economic terms. Although each analyzed country has specific features in terms of economic development stage, in the medium or long term, EU integration is expected for the entire region.

SEE region is usually treated as the European periphery in the economic literature, connected to negative economic developments. Bartlett (2009) argues that the conflicts of the 1990s pushed the countries into the European „super-periphery” characterized by deindustrialization and high unemployment, political turmoil and instability. As opposed to new EU member states, the SEE countries significantly lag behind in foreign capital inflows and are consequently recording slow progress in terms of technological catch-up and weak international competitiveness.

Relationship between research and development and competitiveness of South-east Europe is explored by Radošević (2007). He found that SEE countries are quite diverse in terms of competitiveness which should have strong effects on the role of R&D. Results showed that innovation policy is essential for knowledge based growth in SEE countries.

One of the important aspects of successful convergence to EU is international trade. Establishment of regional free trade agreements could be important in terms of attractiveness for FDI inflow and interregional trade. Grupe and Kusic (2005) estimated that gain from an increase of interregional trade will be moderate. In this paper we will try to show the relationship between macroeconomic performance measured primarily through speed of EU convergence process and trade competitiveness.

2.1. EU Convergence


The economic convergence process can be defined as the reduction of the development gap between the less developed countries in comparison to developed

economies. The process is broadly explored in the economic literature, especially in the context of EU expansion (Angeloni, Flad, Mongelli, 2005.). Based on economic theory and empirical research, factors determining the speed of convergence are: initial conditions, success of structural reforms, and macroeconomic stability (Fischer, Sahay, 2000.). In the later phases of transition, determinants of economic growth of less developed countries are more or less the same as in the most developed economies and are related to quality of human and fixed capital in the broadest sense.

Graph 1 presents comparison of current GDP per capita in transitional economies to the pre-transition period. As shown, although the SEE countries in recent years recorded relatively high growth, some are still below the development levels in the socialist era. The war and market disintegration had a very strong negative impact on ex-Yugoslav countries. Apart from the physical destruction, those countries have been isolated from the EU integration process which implied slower process of structural reforms and lower attractiveness for FDI inflow. Albania is the only country from the group of the SEE countries which significantly improved economic development in comparison to 1989.

Graph 1.

GDP PER CAPITA



Source: WIW (2010), EBRD transitional report.

In the period 2000-2010, the SEE countries have significantly reduced the development gap in terms of EU 27 average in terms of GDP measured by purchasing parity standard (Table 1). Although in less favorable conditions, macroeconomic convergence of SEE countries was comparable to new EU member states (NMS 12). Confirming economic theory, less developed countries in initial transition phase have a potential for higher growth, and that is the factor behind a rapid “catching-up” process in Albania and Montenegro. However, despite the low base, Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina have recorded lower levels of progress.

Table 1.

GDP PPP PER CAPITA, EU 27 =10

| | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Index 2010/2000 | Average annual reduction of development gap, in terms of EU 27 average GDP |
|------------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--|
| Albania | 18 | 22 | 29 | 161,1 | 1,1 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 21 | 23 | 28 | 133,3 | 0,7 |
| Croatia | 49 | 56 | 62 | 126,5 | 1,3 |
| Macedonia | 27 | 28 | 34 | 125,9 | 0,7 |
| Montenegro | 29 | 31 | 43 | 148,3 | 1,4 |
| Serbia | 32 | 32 | 43 | 134,4 | 1,1 |
| Average SEE countries | 29 | 32 | 40 | 138,3 | 1,1 |
| NMS-12 | 45 | 52 | 61 | 135,6 | 1,6 |

Source: WIIW (2010).

In 2010, Croatia recorded real per capita GDP on the same level as the NMS-12 average, despite slightly slower convergence process. EU accession in the near future could help Croatia to speed up the convergences process. Abolition of administrative trade burdens can promote Croatian exports and FDI inflows. In addition, as a full member state, Croatia will be the net beneficiary of EU structural funds which could give a new momentum to investment and growth.

2.2. Macroeconomic stability

Apart from the relative success in “catching up” with EU countries in the last period, the SEE countries recorded significant progress in assuring macroeco-

conomic stability in terms of price stability and improvement of public finances. On the other hand unemployment and trade competitiveness are areas with unsatisfactory results.

Table 2.

MAIN MACROECONOMIC INDICATORS FOR SEE COUNTRIES

| | Inflation | Public deficit | Public debt | | Current account deficit | Foreign debt | | Unemployment | |
|------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|------|-------------------------|--------------|------|---------------------------|------|
| | GDP deflator | in percentage of GDP | | | | | | in % of active population | |
| | | Av. 2005-08 | 2005 | 2008 | Av. 2005-08 | 2005 | 2008 | 2005 | 2008 |
| Albania | 3.4 | -4.0 | 58.1 | 52.6 | -9.7 | 20.7 | 29.5 | 14.1 | 12.7 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 4.8 | 1.2 | 25.6 | 27.6 | -11.9 | 25.6 | 17.2 | 44.1 | 40.6 |
| Croatia | 3.9 | -2.1 | 38.3 | 33.5 | -6.9 | 71.8 | 83.8 | 17.8 | 13.7 |
| Macedonia | 4.4 | -0.2 | 46.9 | 28.7 | -6.2 | 54 | 50.9 | 37.3 | 33.8 |
| Montenegro | 7.2 | 2.5 | 38.6 | 26.8 | -20.9 | 28.3 | 15.6 | 25.2 | 14.4 |
| Serbia | 11.5 | -1.3 | 50.5 | 25.8 | -11.7 | 66.2 | 69.2 | 27.2 | 24 |
| Average | 5.9 | -0.6 | 43.0 | 32.5 | -11.2 | 44.4 | 44.4 | 27.6 | 23.2 |

Source: WIIW (2010) and EBRD.

Although Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia managed to keep inflation under control for a longer period, some SEE countries in the last decade of the 20th century still recorded high inflation levels⁴. The main anchor used to lower inflation rates were more or less fixed exchange rates, with the euro used as the anchor currency. While Montenegro is euroized, Bosnia and Herzegovina has established a currency board system. In other SEE countries a managed floating system with narrow band around the euro is applied (Belke, Zenkić, 2007.). The credibility of the Central Banks plays an important role in terms of monetary stability in the transition countries (Coats et al., 2002.). In order to gain the necessary credibility, the five SEE countries institutionally strengthened central banks enabling them to act independently in order to conduct a policy ensuring monetary stability in this region.

⁴ For example in 1998 CPI inflation was 20,6% in Albania, 32,4% in Montenegro and 305 in Serbia.

High growth rates realized in the analyzed period with tax systems primarily oriented toward consumption taxation, helped a group of SEE countries to improve the stability of public finances. Public deficit was even lower when compared to NMS countries⁵ which, coupled with high growth of GDP and privatization receipts in some countries, made it possible to reduce public debt in terms of GDP share.

On the other hand, price convergence to EU levels and rising wages and salaries negatively affected trade competitiveness of the SEE countries, resulting in high current account deficits (11.2% of GDP on average). In Croatia and Serbia, a rising share of foreign debt connected with significant amount of interest payments to external economies could present a serious obstacle for further growth based on investment financed with foreign capital inflow. A high share of debt in foreign currency and the euro-indexation of loans mean that monetary authorities cannot resort to exchange rate depreciation as a tool for strengthening competitiveness without threatening debt servicing (WIIW, 2010.). Other SEE economies still have a significantly lower share of foreign debt in comparison to new member states but persistent current account deficits could deteriorate their position in the future, especially in an environment marked by slower global growth.

Low competitiveness of the SEE countries and rising unit labor costs, apart from high current account deficits, resulted in high unemployment which on average exceeded 20% of the labor force. High GDP growth in period prior up to 2008 was not accompanied with significant labor market improvements. Rising overall productivity through restructuring of privatized companies and the deindustrialization process are factors behind relatively low demand for labor and persistent unemployment.

Table 3 presents a comparison of unit labor costs in the SEE countries based on purchasing parity standards. Average worker in Austria is more than twice expensive as average worker in the SEE countries according to PPS⁶. Labor costs in the SEE countries increased almost 10 percentage points (in terms of Austrian wages) in only four years which significantly deteriorated competitiveness of domestic exporters. The highest growth of unit labor costs is recorded in Montenegro (21.7 percentage points), but it is interesting to note the increase of 16.1 percentage points growth of unit labor costs in Bosnia and Herzegovina while in the same period, unemployment rate is exceeding 40%. The slowest growth of unit labor costs at purchasing parity standards are recorded in Croatia and Serbia.

⁵ According to EBRD data, NMS countries in the analyzed period recorded a public deficit of slightly below 3% GDP on average.

⁶ According to market exchange rate the difference in wages is significantly higher.

Table 3.

UNIT LABOR COSTS, AUSTRIA=100, PPP ADJUSTED

| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | Growth 2009-2005 |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------------------|
| Albania | 22.7 | 23.1 | 33.8 | 30.2 | 28.0 | 5.3 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 31.3 | 39.2 | 41.7 | 47.0 | 47.4 | 16.1 |
| Croatia | 54.9 | 55.1 | 55.2 | 57.8 | 56.7 | 1.8 |
| Macedonia | 36.6 | 38.7 | 38.8 | 40.3 | 46.2 | 9.6 |
| Montenegro | 31.9 | 32.9 | 46.8 | 52.5 | 53.6 | 21.7 |
| Serbia | 30.5 | 33.3 | 39.5 | 44.8 | 33.6 | 3.1 |
| Average | 34.7 | 37.1 | 42.6 | 45.4 | 44.3 | 9.6 |

Source: WIIW (2010).

2.3. Impact of Global Crisis on SEE Economies

The period from 2000 to 2008 can be characterized as successful for the SEE countries due to the narrowing development gap in comparison to the EU countries, but the recent global economic crisis had a strong negative impact on this region. Due to persistent external imbalances and risk aversion of global investors, the SEE countries were not able to implement expansionary fiscal policies to compensate for the drop in external demand.

All macroeconomic indicators, apart from the current account deficit worsened in 2009 compared to previous periods. Albania is the only SEE country with positive economic growth during the global crisis. Drop of external demand has limited impact on Albanian manufacturing industry because of the low share of export of goods in GDP⁷. Due to domestic absorption growth (personal consumption and gross fixed capital formation) and export of services, Albanian economy was growing even in 2009, a period when most European countries recorded significant drops in economic activity.

The highest negative growth rates were recorded in Croatia and Montenegro. Economic performance in those two countries was worse than the EU 27 average which temporarily stopped economic convergence. Other SEE countries have recorded lower negative growth rates but unemployment rose in each of analyzed country.

⁷ The share of goods exports in Albanian GDP was 8.5% in 2009, which is very low compared to other SEE countries and NMS.

Table 4.

KEY MACROECONOMIC INDICATORS
 – THE IMPACT OF THE GLOBAL CRISIS

| | GDP growth | | Public deficit | | Current account deficit | | Foreign debt | | Unemployment | |
|------------------------|-----------------|------|-----------------|------|-------------------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | Average 2005-08 | 2009 | Average 2005-08 | 2009 | Average 2005-08 | 2009 | Average 2005-08 | 2009 | 2008 | 2009 |
| Albania | 6.3 | 4.2 | -4.0 | -7.0 | -9.7 | -3 | 22 | 35 | 12.7 | 12.8 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 5.6 | -3.0 | 1.2 | -3.0 | -11.9 | -7.8 | 21 | 20 | 40.6 | 43 |
| Croatia | 4.2 | -5.8 | -2.1 | -2.9 | -7.0 | -5.5 | 77 | 95 | 13.7 | 16.7 |
| Macedonia | 4.7 | -2.0 | -0.2 | -2.8 | -6.2 | -7 | 50 | 55 | 33.8 | 34 |
| Montenegro | 7.6 | -5.0 | 2.5 | -2.0 | -21.0 | -15 | 21 | 18 | 14.4 | 14.5 |
| Serbia | 5.8 | -2.9 | -1.3 | -5.0 | -11.7 | -7 | 64 | 74 | 24 | 25 |
| Average | 5.7 | -2.4 | -0.6 | -3.8 | -11.2 | -7.6 | 42 | 50 | 23.2 | 24.3 |

Source: WIIW (2010).

Due to lower tax base and non-elastic government expenditures, a group of the SEE countries recorded deteriorating stability in public finances. On the other hand, current account deficit was reduced because of adjustments of domestic absorption. Despite lower current account deficits, the share of foreign debt in GDP significantly rose in 2009. Therefore, improvements in trade competitiveness are crucial for future macroeconomic performance of the SEE countries. The features of international trade of the SEE countries are explored in detail in the next chapter.

According to EBRD (2009), significant cross-country differences regarding the speed and shape of recovery are likely. The fastest growth can be expected in internationally competitive economies with relatively sound pre-crisis banking systems, as well as in some commodity producing countries, whose financial systems are smaller and were less affected by the crisis. The continuing credit crunch is likely to act as the most significant brake on growth in countries with high non-performing loans and weaker institutional frameworks for debt restructuring.

3. Empirical Analysis of Trade and Competitiveness

Prior to the empirical analysis of trade and export competitiveness of SEE countries it is useful and interesting to make a brief insight into other related empirical research and results.

3.1. Recent Empirical Research

Recent empirical research on international trade of SEE countries, CEE⁸ countries, CIS⁹ countries and other emerging economies are primarily focused on the processes of the globalization, integration and liberalization of domestic markets and their impacts on trade flows. Trade integration between most of the largest CEE countries and the euro area is already relatively well advanced, while some Baltic and SEE countries still have significant scope for trade integration (Bussiere, Fidrmuc and Schnatz, 2005). Some results suggest that the low quality of institutions in many SEE and CIS countries represents the biggest obstacle to greater trade integration (Kucharčukova, Babecky, Raisre, 2010).

Trade liberalization is important in some CIS countries, which maintain restrictive policies to date, although the weight of trade liberalization depends on the specification used. Geographical disadvantages resulting from distance to major markets and from landlockedness for some of the CIS countries, particularly in Central Asia, are quantitatively less important than weaknesses related to the quality of institutions or the quality of infrastructure (Kucharčukova, Babecky, Raisre, 2010; Broadman, 2006). These findings also support the results of Berkowitz et al. (2006), who argue that a country's ability to benefit from globalization depends on the quality of its legal framework for contract enforcement (Aghion, 2005, Rodrik, 2002, Babetskaia-Kukharchuk, Maurel, 2004).

Damijan, Sousa, Lamotte (2006) try to evaluate the evolution of tariffs and nontariffs barriers, faced by SEE countries and estimate their effects on manufactured trade. They find that exports are increasing in all sectors during the period 1996-2000, while bilateral tariffs are decreasing. However, this liberalization process exhibits small effects on trade. On the other hand, Damijan, Sousa and Lamotte (2006) find that nontariff barriers are increasing during the period. Trade liberalization should not be treated as exogenous (Trefler, 1993). Domestic firms, competing with SEE exporters, may have increased their lobbying activity for greater protection. The result is that nontariff barriers increase and hurt exports of SEE economies. In this context, large estimates of nontariff barriers on export of manufactured goods have been found.

Apart from the effects of integration and liberalization on trade flows, the analysis of trade specialization and diversification still remains a significant subject to the economic research. Some recent empirical research compare trade specialization and trade diversification among different groups of transition econo-

⁸ CEE is the abbreviation for Central-east European.

⁹ CIS is the abbreviation for Commonwealth of Independent States. It is a regional organization whose participating countries are former Soviet Republics, formed during the breakup of the Soviet Union.

mies. In that respect, Landesmann (2008) shows that the CIS export structures are characterized by an exceptionally high degree of concentration and a very strong specialization in trade with the EU. They have remained heavily dependent upon fuel and raw material exports with little movement into either up-stream (i.e. processing) stages or diversifying away from their current structures or specialization. On the other hand, the NMS¹⁰ economies show a much more diversified export structure, there is more evidence for upgrading.

Concerning applied methodology it is useful to mention the results of the recent empirical research on foreign trade specialization and international competitiveness of Greece, Portugal, Spain and Turkey (Yilmaz, 2008). The empirical results show that Greek economy was not fully able to exploit the economic advantages of being a member of the “Single Market”. Since 1981, interestingly, the Greek economy was not able to diversify its export structure from research and labor-intensive manufactures to more sophisticated commodities. On the other hand Portugal and especially Spain have improved their trade performance. Spain's exports are still based on traditional sectors such as non-fuel primary commodities, resource and labor-intensive manufactures, but it is replacing these traditional sectors with scale-intensive and science-based manufactures. Also, results indicate that the Turkish economy is showing a remarkable performance in the export of commodities and it has already been challenging the economies of Greece and Portugal, and is trying to catch up to Spain in the coming decades.

3.2. Methodology

The empirical analysis of changes in the trade and competitiveness of selected south-eastern European countries was calculated using the following indicators:

- trade entropy index (TEI) for the analysis of the dispersion and concentration¹¹;
- revealed comparative advantages (RCA) for the analysis of comparative advantages¹²;

¹⁰ NMS is the abbreviation for New Member States (the 10 member states that joined the EU in May 2004)

¹¹ Other widely known indexes for the analysis of trade dispersion or concentration are called Index of trade concentration or Hirschman index and Herfindahl index of concentration (Havlik, Landesmann, Stehrer, 2001; Boromisa, Mikić, 2003; Landesmann, 2008)

¹² Apart from the Balassa index, the most commonly used indicators for the analysis of comparative advantages are: the Lafay index and the Bender index (Bender, 2001; Buturac, Teodorović, 2010; Lafay, 1992; Zaghini, 2005).

- Grubel-Loyd Index (GL) for the analysis of intra-industry trade¹³;
- the indicator of export competitiveness¹⁴;
- the indicator of export similarities (ES)¹⁵.

The dispersion and concentration of export and import structure are analyzed applying empirical calculations TEI indicator („Trade Entropy Index“) which is calcu-

lated according to the following expression: $I_{xi} = \sum_j b_{ij} \ln \left(\frac{1}{b_{ij}} \right)$; $0 < b_{ij} < 1$; $\sum_j b_{ij} = 1$

where b_{ij} is the share of the export of individual product i in total export of manufacturing j . The same is valid for imports. The higher value of the indicator reveals a higher level of export dispersion, i.e. a lower level of export concentration. Conversely, the lower value of entropy index means lower dispersion, i.e. higher concentration. A high concentration or low dispersion implies a high share of product or several products in total export structure. Otherwise, low concentration or high dispersion reveals the fact that none of the products has significantly higher share in export structure relative to other products.

The RCA indicator is used for the analyses of comparative advantages. The methodology for calculating the RCA indicator was originally developed by Bela Balassa (1965). Later, numerous derivations originated from this indicator. The RCA indicator is useful for the purpose of comparing comparative advantages for individual product groups¹⁶. The RCA indicator is calculated by the formula:

$$RCA = \ln \left[\frac{X_i}{M_i} \right] \times \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i} \right) \times 100$$

X is defined as the value of exports, while M is the value of imports. Index i is the product group classified according to SITC. A positive value indicates

¹³ There are various indicators for the analysis of intra-industry trade: Balassa index, Aquino index, Bergstrand index and Glejser index. The analysis of intra-industry trade in this paper is based on Grubel-Loyd index (GL). It is a very common index in other recent empirical research (Greenaway, Milner 1986; Brühlhart, 2000; Dixon, Menon 1997; Kaminski, Ng, 2001).

¹⁴ Export competitiveness can be analyzed by applying various indicators: export product dynamics index, export specialization index, export share index (Havlik, Landesmann, Stehrer, 2001; Landesmann, 2008; Yilmaz, 2008; Zaghini, 2005).

¹⁵ The most used indicators for the analysis of export similarities are Finger and Kreinin Index of Export Similarities and Complementary Index from Michaely (1994).

¹⁶ See more details about the use of RCA indicator in Balassa (1965), Lafay (1992), and for transition economies Kaminski and Ng (2001), Yilmaz (2005), Buturac (2005).

that the country has comparative advantages in the corresponding product group. Conversely, a negative sign for the RCA indicator implies that there are no comparative advantages. An alternative for RCA indicators is the Lafay's RCA index. Compared to Balassa's RCA indicator, Lafay's index takes in regard the flows of trade inside each sector of the economy, GDP as well as exports and imports for each group of products.¹⁷

The GL index shows the level of intra-industry trade specialization. The methodologies and calculations of the GL index were developed and applied by Grubel and Lloyd (1975).¹⁸ For individual product groups the GL index is calculated using the formula:

$$GL_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i + M_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n |X_i - M_i|}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i + M_i)} * 100$$

GL_i is the value of the Grubel-Lloyd index for product group i . is defined as the value of exports, and M_i is the value of imports. The coefficient can vary from 0 to 1. The closer it is to 1, the higher the degree of specialization in intra-industry trade. A lower value of the coefficient shows that the country has a higher level of specialization in inter-industry trade.

Export competitiveness is analyzed applying the indicator of competitiveness¹⁹. It is the ratio between exports of the product, i , to observed market c and total imports of this product from the market c :

$$Ic_i(a, c) = \frac{EX_i(a, c)}{\sum_{i=1}^n IM_i(c)} \times 100$$

$EX_i(a, c)$ is the export of the product, i , of country, a , to the market c . The total import product, i , from market, c , is $\sum_{i=1}^n IM_i(c)$.

Export Similarities - ES indicator shows the level of similarities in the structure of exports between two countries. It is calculated using the following formula:

¹⁷ See more details about the use of Lafay's index in Lafay (1992).

¹⁸ See more details about the use of index of intra-industry trade specialization in transition economies in Kaminski and Ng (2001).

¹⁹ See more details about indicators of competitiveness in Yilmaz (2008).

$$ES(ab, c) = \sqrt{\sum_i \left[EX_i(ac) - \frac{EX_i(ac) + EX_i(bc)}{2} \right]^2}$$


ES indicator is used for measuring the different structures of exports of country *a* and of country *b* in country *c*. $EX_i(ac)$ describes a part of export products *i* of country *a* in country *c* in total exports of country *a* in country *c*. In this way the indicator is calculated assuming values in the interval from 0 to 1. The closer the ES indicator is to 1, the more similar the structure of exports between two countries is.²⁰

3.3. Analysis of export and import trends

The periods of transition were characterized by a process of accelerated opening and integration of south-eastern European countries into the international market. Therefore, in this introductory part of the empirical analysis basic indicators and trends in international trade and rising trade openness are presented. In all analyzed countries, trade rose rapidly relative to the rate of growth in GDP, which has resulted in a considerable growth in the share of trade in GDP. It is evident that, besides Albania and Serbia, Croatia has a lower level of openness measured by the total share of trade in GDP (Graph 2). In all countries the share of import in GDP is considerable higher than the share of export in GDP.

Graph 2.

THE SHARE OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS IN GDP IN 2008



Source: wiiw Handbook of Statistics, 2009.

²⁰ For details about the concept of the ES indicator see in Finger and Kreinin (1979).

The growth of openness and liberalization of domestic markets had strong impacts on import growth. In all countries export growth was recorded, but it was less than import growth (apart from Albania and Serbia). Average annual export and import growth rates from 2002 to 2008 were the lowest in Croatia (Table 5).

Table 5.

BASIC INDICATORS OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

| Country | Annual average export growth rate ²¹ (2002-2008) | Annual average import growth rate (2002-2008) | Relative deficit ²² (2008) | Export concentration (TEI) (2008) | Import concentration (TEI) (2008) | Share of top 3 export markets (2008) |
|------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Albania | 21.85 | 19.55 | -0.59 | 3.08 | 3.60 | 79.0 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 5.60 | 7.05 | -0.41 | 3.26 | 3.33 | 45.9 |
| Croatia | 4.48 | 5.23 | -0.37 | 3.38 | 3.32 | 45.3 |
| Macedonia | 6.44 | 8.93 | -0.29 | 2.75 | 3.32 | 43.7 |
| Montenegro | 18.35 | 24.14 | -0.66 | 2.13 | 3.65 | 73.8 |
| Serbia | 26.85 | 22.32 | -0.35 | 3.60 | 3.32 | 34.3 |

Source: COMEXT, own calculations.

It is clear that the movements in exports and imports of goods determined corresponding movements in the balance of trade.

Croatia had a high level of export concentration in 2008. It is opposite from the results in 2007 (Nacionalno vijeće za konkurentnost, 2009). The main reason for these tendencies lies in fact that shipbuilding industry has significant part in total export structure. The export value of this industry is highly dependable on

²¹ Average annual export growth rate is calculated using the formula:

$$AAGR_{T,T-n} = \left[\left(\frac{X_T}{X_{T-n}} \right)^{1/n} - 1 \right] \times 100$$

where X = the value of export, T = final year, n = number of year

²² Relative deficit is defined as $\frac{x-m}{x+m}$, where x is the value of merchandize export, and m the value of merchandize import.

business cycle and it can have strong impacts on higher or lower export concentration in some year.

All economies face a trade deficit. It is interesting that the relative deficits of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia were in 2008 at approximately the same level. Montenegro had the highest relative deficit.

3.4. Comparative advantages and intra-industry trade²³

The results show that the period before the economic crisis, from 2002-2008, was characterized by an increase in the volume of international trade. Increasing market openness and liberalization favored dynamic import growth. At the same time there was no significant growth of exports. Openness of the economy increased primarily due to increasing imports as a share in GDP. In contrast, a comparison of the share of exports in GDP of the south-east European countries with those that joined the EU in 2004, shows that the countries of south-east Europe are still poorly competitive with regard to export orientation. The key question is: does an increase in trade volume and openness correspond to positive changes in trade structure? A positive change in the trade structure implies a change of comparative advantages towards higher value added sectors and products as well as a higher level of trade specialization. The comparison of comparative advantages for selected south-east European countries is analysed by the RCA indicator. The empirical results are displayed in table 6.

A common characteristic for all countries is the presence of comparative advantages in low value added sectors. Also, there is no correlation between the values of the RCA indicator and the share of individual products in the total export structure. In most countries leading export products do not have comparative advantages. The exception is Macedonia.

²³ Empirical research of intra-industry trade began in the mid-1960s. The first results were exposed by Balassa (1965). The most well known work on intra-industry trade was made by Grubel and Lloyd (1975). This research was then followed by what we know today as the theory of intra-industry trade (Krugman, 1980., 1981.; Lancaster, 1980.; Helpman 1981.). The role and significance of intra-industry trade in the process of globalization and integration of transition economies on international markets is becoming more important than previously. Research in the field of international trade shows that intra-industry trade is the fastest growing segment in the international trade of transition economies (Aturupane, Djankov, Hoekman, 1997.; Kaminski and Ng, 2001.). Also, an increase of intra-industry trade specialization had an extremely positive impact on economic growth in the most developed transition economies.

Table 6.

COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES AND INTRA-INDUSTRY TRADE
 FOR THE FIRST FIVE PRODUCTS CONCERNING THE SHARE
 OF EXPORTS IN TOTAL EXPORT STRUCTURE IN 2008

| | | | |
|---|---------|-------|------|
| <i>Albania</i> | %EXPORT | RCA | GL |
| 64 Footwear | 16.8 | 0.31 | 0.46 |
| 62 Clothing, accessories, not knit | 14.6 | 0.14 | 0.74 |
| 61 Clothing, accessories, knit | 11.1 | 0.05 | 0.91 |
| 72 Iron and steel | 10.0 | -0.15 | 0.72 |
| 27 Mineral fuels, oils | 8.9 | -0.50 | 0.25 |
| | | | |
| <i>Bosnia and Herzegovina</i> | %EXPORT | RCA | GL |
| 27 Mineral fuels, oils | 9.84 | -0.57 | 0.40 |
| 76 Aluminum | 9.77 | 0.44 | 0.51 |
| 84 Boilers, machinery | 9.11 | -0.41 | 0.54 |
| 73 Articles of iron and steel | 8.13 | -0.04 | 0.95 |
| 94 Furniture | 7.69 | 0.29 | 0.66 |
| | | | |
| <i>Croatia</i> | %EXPORT | RCA | GL |
| 27 Mineral fuels, oils | 12.86 | -0.50 | 0.50 |
| 89 Ships, boats | 12.38 | 0.14 | 0.85 |
| 85 Electrical, electronic equipment | 9.44 | -0.25 | 0.73 |
| 84 Boilers, machinery | 9.02 | -0.45 | 0.54 |
| 44 Wood and articles of wood | 4.16 | 0.19 | 0.79 |
| | | | |
| <i>Macedonia</i> | %EXPORT | RCA | GL |
| 72 Iron and steel | 32.33 | 0.20 | 0.82 |
| 62 Clothing, accessories | 16.90 | 1.35 | 0.15 |
| 73 Articles of iron and steel | 5.98 | 0.43 | 0.62 |
| 26 Ores, slag and ash | 4.92 | 0.06 | 0.95 |
| 62 Articles of apparel, knit or crochet | 4.10 | 0.89 | 0.32 |
| | | | |
| <i>Montenegro</i> | %EXPORT | RCA | GL |
| 76 Aluminum | 43.15 | 0.16 | 0.62 |
| 72 Iron and steel | 19.22 | 0.03 | 0.92 |
| 27 Mineral fuels, oils | 9.59 | -0.27 | 0.42 |
| 22 Beverages | 4.92 | -0.22 | 0.51 |
| 73 Articles of iron and steel | 3.13 | -0.41 | 0.23 |
| | | | |
| <i>Serbia</i> | %EXPORT | RCA | GL |
| 72 Iron and steel | 13.87 | 0.21 | 0.78 |
| 85 Electrical, electronic equipment | 6.83 | -0.32 | 0.67 |
| 84 Boilers, machinery | 6.34 | -0.65 | 0.41 |
| 39 Plastics and articles thereof | 5.40 | -0.26 | 0.73 |
| 74 Copper and articles thereof | 4.20 | 0.23 | 0.76 |

Source: own calculations.

Observing intra-industry trade specialization (GL), the results show that all countries have a higher level of intra-industry trade specialization in labour-intensive sectors: textiles, base metal, wood, footwear, skins and leather (Table 6). At the same time, inter-industry trade prevails for capital intensive sectors and high technology sectors: vehicles, chemicals, precision instruments.

The global economic crisis resulted in decreasing comparative advantages and export competitiveness in most export products. During the crisis Croatia shows a strong drop in exports of oil derivatives, chemical products and machinery and Bosnia and Herzegovina in aluminum²⁴. The most important Macedonian export products with comparative advantages (iron, steel, and articles thereof) are hardest hit by the crisis. Other Macedonian export goods, such as textiles, are also having a hard time on the European and regional markets. Total export competitiveness for Montenegro is strongly dependent on the aluminum sector which is recording a decrease of comparative advantages and export competitiveness during the crisis.

The analysis of comparative advantages, intra-industry trade and trade specialization does not reveal an unambiguous conclusion for overall trade patterns. On the one hand, there are sectors with comparative advantage, while on the other hand there are sectors which do not have comparative advantage. At first sight the unfavourable ratio on behalf of the sectors without comparative advantage does not necessarily lead to a conclusion about unfavourable trade structures. The reason is a characteristic of small countries where it is expected that comparative advantages and trade specialization will be found in a smaller number of sectors and products. However, the results of the correlation analysis for all products at the three digit level of SITC show that products with a higher level of comparative advantage do not have a higher ratio between the unit value of exports and imports. It points to unfavourable trade patterns.

3.5. Export Competitiveness to EU markets

The European Union is the most important export destination for all observed countries. That is why in this part of the paper the emphasis is on the analysis of export competitiveness to EU markets. As an indicator of export competitiveness we use the ratio between the export share of individual product i to observed markets and total import of that product from observed market.

²⁴ For example, exports of the aluminum producer *Aluminij* dropped by 60% year on year (Q 1 2009) (wiiw Country reports)

Table 7.

THE INDICATOR OF EXPORT COMPETITIVENESS IN 2008

| SITC | SITC Sections | Albania | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Croatia | Macedonia | Montenegro | Serbia |
|------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|-----------|------------|--------|
| 0 | Food and live animals | 0.037 | 0.048 | 0.459 | 0.110 | 0.000 | 0.587 |
| 1 | Beverages and tobacco | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.429 | 1.016 | 0.016 | 0.159 |
| 2 | Crude materials | 0.121 | 0.377 | 0.680 | 0.303 | 0.025 | 0.256 |
| 3 | Mineral fuels | 0.016 | 0.008 | 0.058 | 0.001 | - | 0.009 |
| 4 | Animal and vegetable oils | - | 0.063 | 0.088 | - | - | 0.705 |
| 5 | Chemicals | 0.002 | 0.061 | 0.393 | 0.024 | 0.006 | 0.346 |
| 6 | Manufactured goods | 0.069 | 0.279 | 0.518 | 0.401 | 0.121 | 0.903 |
| 7 | Machinery and transport | 0.009 | 0.097 | 0.356 | 0.022 | 0.003 | 0.164 |
| 8 | Miscellaneous articles | 0.170 | 0.310 | 0.491 | 0.287 | 0.002 | 0.279 |
| 9 | Commodities and transactions | 0.008 | 0.025 | 0.075 | 0.014 | 0.003 | 0.097 |

Source: COMEXT, own calculations.

According to the indicator of competitiveness Croatia has the best position to the EU 25 markets relative to the other observed countries. The obtained results lead to the conclusion that Croatia has a significantly better position compared to other countries in the following products: crude materials, mineral fuels, chemicals, machinery and transport equipment and miscellaneous products (Table 7). Serbia has the highest indicator of competitiveness for food and live animals, animal and vegetable oils and manufactured goods. Macedonia shows the highest level of export competitiveness in beverages and tobacco.

3.6. Export Similarities

The paper so far has analyzed changes in basic trends, comparative advantages, intra-industry trade and trade specialization. However, now we discuss the question of export similarities, analyzing whether the observed countries have complementary or competitive export structures.

Table 8.

MATRIX OF THE ES INDICATOR IN 2008

| | Albania | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Croatia | Macedonia | Montenegro | Serbia |
|------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|-----------|------------|--------|
| Albania | - | 0.46 | 0.25 | 0.64 | 0.15 | 0.45 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 0.46 | - | 0.36 | 0.57 | 0.55 | 0.56 |
| Croatia | 0.25 | 0.36 | - | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.41 |
| Macedonia | 0.64 | 0.57 | 0.24 | - | 0.23 | 0.80 |
| Montenegro | 0.15 | 0.55 | 0.06 | 0.23 | - | 0.24 |
| Serbia | 0.45 | 0.56 | 0.41 | 0.80 | 0.24 | - |

Source: own calculations.

The empirical results displayed in table 8 show that the most similar export structures are found in Serbia and Macedonia. The values of the ES indicator for most countries are closer to 0 than to 1, which reveals a conclusion that most of the observed countries have complementary export structures. This kind of situation offers a strengthening of mutual economic cooperation and joint efforts on the international markets especially in the circumstances of the global economic crisis. Even though there is a constant growth in international trade between the SEE countries, the efforts towards enhancing all levels of economic cooperation are still on the agenda.

4. Conclusion

SEE countries have significantly reduced the development gap in terms of EU 27 average in terms of GDP measured by purchasing power parity standard in the period 2000-2010. Confirming economic theory, less developed countries in initial transition phase have a potential for higher growth, and that is the factor behind a rapid “catching-up” process in Albania and Montenegro. In spite of these positive processes, the recent global economic crisis had a strong negative impact on this region. An exception is Albanian economy which was growing even in 2009, a period when most European countries recorded significant drops in economic activity. On the other hand, the highest negative growth rates were recorded in Croatia and Montenegro.

Apart from the relative success in “catching up” with EU countries in last period, SEE countries recorded significant progress in assuring macroeconomic stability in terms of price stability and improvement of public finances. On the other hand unemployment and trade competitiveness are areas with unsatisfactory results. Common characteristic for all analyzed countries is the existence of comparative advantages and trade specialization in low value added products: iron and steel, footwear, clothing, wood.

In all countries the global economic crisis resulted in decreasing comparative advantages and export competitiveness in most export products. Most of the observed countries have complementary export structures. It reveals the conclusion about great possibilities of a strengthening of mutual economic cooperation and joint efforts on the international markets especially in the circumstances of the global economic crisis.

Although there are certain macroeconomic differences leading to a difference in the depth of the crisis among the countries in the region, there are a number of common features for them, both internal and external in character. For the countries in south-east Europe a revision of the current development model should be on the agenda. The priority should be given to the endogenous facts of development with the objectives of better utilization of resources at hand. For most of these countries due to their double deficits (budget deficits and current account deficits) there is a need to introduce harsh austerity programs parallel with focusing on structural adjustments, and increasing the role of the real sectors of economy, with the objective of increasing the levels of competitiveness of those economies. External factors revealed by the crisis should be aimed at a better functioning and strengthening of institutional mechanisms of the coordination of economic policies as well as from the European integration process.

The circumstances of the global economic crisis imply a need to bring down government expenditure and also a reduction of the budget deficit. A reduction in personal consumption and the need to stop the growth of government spending indicate that in the forthcoming period the only and major sources of economic growth are an increase of investments and exports. Tax reduction is one of the preconditions for competitive repositioning and for the increase of investment activities, which could result in higher rates of economic growth. Without them it is impossible to solve serious structural issues and the high rate of unemployment.

REFERENCES

1. Aghion, P., Burgess, R. Redding, S., Zilibotti, F. (2005). “The Unequal Effects of Liberalization: Evidence from Dismantling the License Raj in

- India”, *London School of Economics and Political Science*, NBER Working Paper, No. 12031, London.
2. Angeloni I., Flad M., F. Mongelli, F (2005). “Economic and Monetary Integration of the New Member States: Helping to Chart the Route”, *ECB Occasional Paper No. 36*.
 3. Aturupane, C., Djankov, S., Hoekman, B. (1997). “Determinants of Intra-Industry Trade between East and West Europe”, *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, No. 1850, World Bank, Washington.
 4. Balassa, B. (1965). “Trade Liberalization and Revealed Comparative Advantage”, *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies*, (33), 2: 99-123.
 5. Babetskaia-Kukharchuk, O., Maurel, M. (2004). “Russia’s Accession to the WTO: The Potential for Trade Increase”, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, (32), 4: 680–699.
 6. Bartlett, W. (2009). “Economic development in the European super-periphery: evidence from the Western Balkans”, *Economic Annals*, (54), 181: 21-44.
 7. Belke, A., Zenkić A. (2007). “Exchange-rate Regimes and the Transition Process in the Western Balkans”, *Intereconomics: Review of European Economic Policy*, (42), 5: 267-280.
 8. Bender, S. (2001). “Suggestion for Two New Trade Performance Indices: Trade Specialization Index and Beneficial Structural Change Index”, *Economic Growth Center*, Working Paper, Yale University.
 9. Berkowitz, D., J. Moenius, J., Pistor, K. (2006). “Trade, Law and Product Complexity”, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, (88), 2: 363–373.
 10. Boromisa, A.-M. i Mikić M. (2003). “Europska unija kao determinanta Hrvatske trgovinske politike”, u: Ott, K. (urednik), *Pridruživanje Hrvatske Europskoj uniji- Izazovi ekonomske i pravne prilagodbe*, Institut za javne financije, Zagreb, str.133-151.
 11. Broadman, H. (2006). *From Disintegration to Reintegration. Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union in International Trade*. Washington, The World Bank.
 12. Brühlhart, M. (2000). “Dynamics of Intraindustry Trade and Labor Adjustment”, *Review of International Economics*, (8), 1: 420-435.
 13. Bussiere, M., Fidrmuc, J., Schnatz, B. (2005). „Trade Integration of Central and Eastern European Countries: Lessons From a Gravity Model“, *European Central Bank*, Working Paper Series, No. 545., Frankfurt.
 14. Buturac, G., Teodorović, I., ”The Impacts of The Global Recession on South-east European Countries”, u: *Economic Development Perspectives of SEE Region in the Global Recession Context / Trivun, V. (ur.)*. Sarajevo,

- Bosnia and Herzegovina: University of Sarajevo, School of Economics and Business, 2010.
15. Buturac, G. (2005). "Comparative Advantages and Intra-industry Trade: Transition Economies and Russian Federation", U: Teodorović, I., Grinberg, R., Glinkina, S., Lovrinčević, Ž., (ur.), *Proceedings of the International Round Table Conference: Comparative Analysis of Economic Transition - Russian Federation, Croatia and the CEE Countries*, Zagreb: Ekonomski institut, Zagreb, str. 59-79.
 16. Buturac, G., Grzinić, J. (2009). "The Competitiveness of Croatian Export to EU Markets", *Zagreb International Review of Economics & Business*, (XII), 1: 39-51.
 17. Damijan, J., Sousa J., Lamotte O. (2006). „The effect of trade liberalization in South-Eastern European Countries“, *Global Development Network Southeast Europe*, Vienna: The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, Vienna.
 18. Dixon, P. i Menon, J., "Measures of Intra-Industry Trade as Indicators of Factor Market Disruption", *Economic Record*, Sep 1997, 73, 222, ABI/INFORM Global, str. 233-237.
 19. EBRD (2009) Transition Report 2009: Transition in crisis?, 2009.
 20. Finger, J. M., Kreinin, E. M. (1979). "A Measure of Export Similarity and its possible Use", *Economic Journal*, (89), 1: 905-912.
 21. Fischer S., Sahay R., (2000). "The Transition Economies After Ten Years", *IMF Working paper* 2000/30.
 22. Greenaway, D., Milner, C. (1986). *The Economics of Intra-Industry Trade*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 23. Grupe, C., Kušić, S. (2005). "Intra-regional cooperation in the Western Balkans: Under which conditions does it foster economic progress?", *Centre for the Study of Global Governance London School of Economics and Political Science Houghton Street*, London.
 24. Grubel, H., Lloyd, P. (1975). *Intra-industry Trade: The Theory and Measurement of International Trade in Differentiated Products*. London: Macmillan.
 25. Havlik, P., Landesmann, M., Stehrer, R. (2001). "Competitiveness of CEE Industries: Evidence From Foreign Trade Specialization and Quality Indicators", *Research Reports*, No. 278, Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, Vienna.
 26. Helpman, E. (1981). "International trade in the presence of product differentiation, economies of scale, and monopolistic competition: a Chamberlain-Heckscher-Ohlin approach", *Journal of International Economics*, (11), 1: 305-340.

27. Kaminski, B. and Ng, F. (2001). "Trade and Production Fragmentation: Central European Economies in EU Networks of Production and Marketing", *Policy Research Working Paper Series*, No: 2611, World Bank, Washington.
28. Krugman, P. R. (1980). "Scale Economies, Product Differentiation, and the Pattern of Trade", *American Economic Review*, (70), 5: 950-959.
29. Krugman, P.R. (1981). "Intra-industry specialization and gains from trade", *Journal of Political Economy*, (89), 5: 959-973.
30. Kucharcukova, O.B., Babecky, J., Raiser, M. (2010). "A Gravity Approach to Modelling International Trade in South-Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States: The Role of Geography, Policy and Institutions," *Czech National Bank, Research Department, Working Papers* 2010/04, Prague.
31. Lafay, G. (1992). "The Measurement of Revealed Comparative Advantages", U: Dagenais, M.G., Muet, P.A. (ur), *International Trade Modelling*, London: Chapman & Hall, London, str. 209-234.
32. Lancaster, K. (1980). "Intra-industry trade under perfect monopolistic competition", *Journal of International Economics*, (10), 2: 151-175.
33. Landesmann, M. (2008). "International Trade and Economic Diversification: Patterns and Policies in the Transition Economies", *Research reports*, No. 350, The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, Vienna.
34. Michaely, M. (1994). *Trade Preferential Agreements in Latin America: Ex-ante Assessment*. Washington: The World Bank Latin America and Caribbean Region.
35. Nacionalno vijeće za konkurentnost (2009). *Godišnje izvješće o konkurentnosti Hrvatske 2008.*, Nacionalno vijeće za konkurentnost, Zagreb.
36. Radošević, S. (2007). "Research and Development and Competitiveness of South Eastern Europe: Asset of liability for EU integration?", *Economics Working Paper No. 75*, Centre for the Study of Economic and Social Change in Europe, UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies Gower Street, London.
37. Rodrik, D. (2002). "Trade Policy Reform as Institutional Reform," in: *Hoekman, Bernard M., Mattoo, Aaditya, English, Philip (eds.), Development, Trade, and the WTO: A Handbook*, The World Bank, Washington.
38. WIIW (2010). "Current Analyses and Forecasts", *Economic Prospects for Central, East and Southeast Europe*, No. 5, February 2010 'Crisis Is Over, but Problems Loom Ahead', WIIW.
39. WIIW Handbook of Statistics (2009). *Central, East and Southeast Europe (2009.)*, Vienna: The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies.

40. Yilmaz, B. (2005). "The Foreign Trade Pattern and Foreign Trade Specialization in the European Union", *Eastern European Economics*, (43), 1: 77-103.
41. Yilmaz, B. (2008). "Foreign Trade Specialization and International Competitiveness of Greece, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the EU 12", *Center for European Studies at Harvard University, Working Paper Series #166*, Harvard.
42. Zaghini, A. (2005). "Evolution of trade patterns in the new EU member states," *Economics of Transition*, (13), 4: 629-658.

MAKROEKONOMSKA OBILJEŽJA, TRGOVINA I KONKURENTNOST ZEMALJA JUGOISTOČNE EUROPE

Sažetak

Svrha je ovoga rada analizirati makroekonomska obilježja odabranih zemalja jugoistočne Europe promatrajući rast BDP-a, inflaciju, nezaposlenost i ukupnu gospodarsku konkurentnost s posebnim naglaskom na učinak globalne gospodarske krize. Kao ključni aspekt ukupne konkurentnosti, analizirane su promjene u strukturama međunarodne trgovine odabranih zemalja jugoistočne Europe. Razdoblje od 2000. do 2008. je bilo uspješno za zemlje jugoistočne Europe zbog smanjenja jaza u razini gospodarskog razvoja u odnosu na zemlje EU, ali globalna je gospodarska kriza imala negativne učinke na zemlje regije. Unatoč tome, u 2009. kada je većina europskih zemalja zabilježila značajan pad gospodarske aktivnosti, gospodarstvo Albanije je zabilježilo rast i to zbog povećane domaće potražnje i izvoza usluga. S druge strane najveće su negativne stope promjene BDP-a zabilježile Hrvatska i Crna Gora. U svim je zemljama globalna gospodarska kriza rezultirala smanjenjem komparativnih prednosti i izvozne konkurentnosti u većini izvoznih proizvoda. Većina promatranih zemalja ima komplementarne izvozne strukture. Takva situacija, posebno u uvjetima globalne gospodarske krize, nudi mogućnosti jačanja uzajamne gospodarske suradnje i zajedničkih nastupa na međunarodnim tržištima.

Ključne riječi: makroekonomska obilježja, trgovina i izvozna konkurentnost, zemlje jugoistočne Europe