7th International Scientific Conference
"Business and Management 2012"
May 10-11, 2012, Vilnius, LITHUANIA

ISSN 2029-4441 print / ISSN 2029-929X online
ISBN 978-609-457-116-9 CD
doi:10.3846/bm.2012.070
http://www.bm.vgtu.lt

THE COMPETITIVENESS OF THE EXPORT FROM POLAND TO THE BALTIC COUNTRIES

Ewa Szymanik

Cracow University of Economics, Rakowicka 21, 31-510 Kraków, Poland
Email: szymanie@uek.krakow.pl

Abstract. The article shows the competitiveness of the Polish export of industrial goods to the Baltic countries after the access to the European Union. The main problem is the small and diffused trade between Poland and Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Changes after the last crisis are especially emphasized. Even if the exchange between Poland and their countries is rather small, it plays an important role especially for Lithuania as the closest partner. That is why the article looks for new opportunities of the trade intensification between these countries and shows results of researches of the competitiveness and new possible ways of improving exchange.

Keywords: competitiveness, export, forteign trade, European Union, Baltic countries.

Jel classification: F15, P45

1. Introduction

Economic and political interests of Poland have been drifting more and more considerably towards West European countries since as early as the late 1980s. Among them the most significant ones were member countries of the then European Communities.

The year 2004 brought a long awaited accession to the structures of the Union and some far-reaching changes. First and foremost it meant a full accessibility of our most important partners' absorptive markets as well as an establishment of exchange on preferential terms with other countries which, like Poland, were accepted to the European Union, with Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia among them.

Trade cooperation with those countries was nothing new since contacts had also existed by the year 1990; however after the dissolution of the Soviet Union they were not significantly intensive. Poland and the Baltic states alike were undergoing political transformations and were particularly interested in establishing trade connections with some 'older', more economically developed countries of the European Union. A certain rapprochement and an opportunity of exchange on preferential terms without any room for discrimination took place only after the accession to the European Communities. What cannot be ignored is the fact that the Union economy had been developing dynamically and had been quite absorptive.

The main goal of the paper is to show the competitiveness of the Polish export to the Baltic countries and opportunities of improving it by the wider cooperation what is not so difficult because these countries are close neibourghs.

2. Definitions and measures

Economic and political changes and ensuing necessity of adaptation to the rules of the world trade posed a new challenge to our country, namely an essential improvement of the international competitiveness of our economy. The discussed competitiveness is defined in literature in many different ways as no single, universal definition exists. The difficulty results from the fact that the term may mean either ability to participate in competition or ex post evaluation of its results, so it encompasses both a dynamic component, which is connected with the analysis of the factors forming the long-term ability to compete, and a static one, which is expressed in the evaluation of such ability at a particular moment in time. What is more, some economists define competitiveness in terms of a scope of research (Wierzbołowski 1995), who distinguishes between competitiveness *sensu stricto* (micro-competitiveness) and *sensu largo* (macro-competitiveness), or Flejterski (1984) distinguishing also meso-competitiveness, that is export of goods of a particular trade or branch). One can also examine economy from a wider angle taking into account numerous factors, for example by means of the Integrated Economy Competitiveness Model (Jagiełło 2008) or by other authors (Puślecki *et al.* 2010; Radło 2008; Bernat *et al.* 2006; Daszkiewicz *et al.* 2008), but probably the full range of these factors is impossible to find and easure even if many authors try to do it (Dołęgowski 2000; Misala 2001; Bossak *et al.* 2004). One of the most important is also the definition given by Hämäläinen (1999).

For the sake of this publication a detailed definition has been adopted; the one paying attention to foreign trade in the first place. According to the definition international competitiveness of economy is its price and non-price competitiveness understood as a drawing power of goods and services exported by a particular country as well as products substituting imported goods (Hübner 1994). The necessity for improvement of economic condition was also a result of integration pursuit – the enhancement of economic status supports the development of exchange, also with the Baltic States, and further economic growth.

Only the export of industrial goods has been examined as they are of importance in Polish foreign trade and because of slightly different regulations governing the export of farm products.

The analysis uses RCA indicators counted with the logarithmic method, IIT and percentage shares in an export and import turnover. The choice of the form of indicators was imposed by their application in literature (Pluciński 1997; Misala, Pluciński 2000; Szymanik 2004, Szymanik 2009; Szymanik 2011; Misala 2011).

The intensity degree of inter-branch and branch trade allows for an indirect statement whether countries trading with each other have similar economic structures and whether a particular group of goods is competitive. This indirect method does not present in detail reasons for various economic processes but only their outcomes, which seems enough for the following paper. The analysis is supplemented with particular countries' shares (and what follows their significance) in Polish intra-union trade.

Revealed Comparative Advantage (RCA) Indicators:

$$RCAi = \ln [Xi/Mi : \Sigma Xi/\Sigma Mi] = \ln Xi - \ln Mi \quad (1),$$

where:

Xi – export value of an *i* group of goods,
Mi – import value of an *i* group of goods.

A negative RCAi value shows the lack, while a positive RCAi value shows the existence of an exposed comparative predominance and of intensity of inter-branch trade and international distribution of work.

Intra-Industry Trade (IIT) Indicator:

$$IIT = \frac{(X_i + M_i) - |X_i - M_i|}{X_i + M_i} \cdot 100 \quad ,(2)$$

Values close to 100% show a high intensity of exchange.

Export share:

$$U = (\frac{X_i}{X}) \times 100 , \qquad (3)$$

where:

Xi – export value of an *i* good.

Import shares are counted according to a similar pattern.

3. Trade exchange between Poland and the Baltic countries in comparison with the other European countries

Economic relations with the Baltic States are settled by the Treaty of Accession to the European Union and any contracts not interfering with it. Unfortunately, although the countries are our close neighbours, the mutual exchange is not extensive and their share in Polish intra-union trade is poor. The situation is depicted in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Shares of EU–25 countries in Polish import in 2004–2009 (percentage shares; EU–27 since 2007) (Source: author's own calculations and *Rocznik statystyczny handlu zagranicznego*, GUS, different years)

Country	Import shares					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Austria	2.62	2.79	2.71	2.6	2.8	2.8
Belgium	3.72	4.12	3.98	3.9	3.8	3.8
Dennmark	2.22	1.65	2.06	2	2	2.2
Finland	2.05	2.04	2.04	2	2.4	2.1
France	9.85	4.43	8.69	8	7.6	7.4
Greece	0.33	0.18	0.32	0.3	0.3	0.3
Spain	3.91	2.81	3.12	3.3	3.5	3.6
Holland	5.11	4.48	4.98	5.3	5.6	5.9
Ireland	0.76	0.84	0.89	0.9	1.1	1.1
Luxembourg	0.23	0.27	0.28	0.2	0.3	0.2
Germany	35.8	38.7	37.99	37.5	37.1	36.2
Portugal	0.47	0.42	0.47	0.4	0.4	0.4
Sweden	3.96	3.55	3.49	3.4	3.3	3
Great Britain	4.87	4.83	4.54	4.8	4.6	4.8
Italy	11.55	11.1	10.75	10.7	10.5	11
Cyprus	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Czech Republic	5.31	5.37	5.52	5.4	5.8	5.8
Estonia	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.1	0.1	0.1

End of table 1

Country	Import shares					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Lithuania	0.79	0.9	0.92	0.9	0.9	0.9
Latvia	0.3	0.41	0.19	0.2	0.2	0.2
Malta	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Slovakia	2.42	5.86	2.8	2.8	3.1	3.3
Slovenia	0.76	0.76	0.71	0.7	0.7	0.7
Hungary	2.77	2.75	3.4	3.3	2.9	3
Bulgaria	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	0.3
Romania	-	-	-	0.8	0.8	0.9

Table 2. Shares of EU–25 countries in Polish export in 2004–2009 (percentage shares; EU–27 since 2007) (Source: author's own calculations and *Rocznik statystyczny handlu zagranicznego*, GUS, different years)

Country	Export shares					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Austria	2.5	2.7	2.37	2.4	2.5	2.4
Belgium	4.04	4.01	3.57	3.4	3.3	3
Dennmark	2.83	2.54	2.54	2.4	2.5	2.3
Finland	1	1.02	0.87	0.9	1.1	1
France	7.63	8.58	8.06	7.7	8	8.7
Greece	0.37	0.39	0.45	0.5	0.7	0.8
Spain	3.1	3.29	3.21	3.7	3.2	3.3
Holland	5.43	5.19	4.97	4.9	5.2	5.3
Ireland	0.37	0.44	0.42	0.5	0.6	0.5
Luxem-bourg	0.13	0.13	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1
Germany	37.94	36.8	35.06	32.8	32.2	32.8
Portugal	0.8	0.67	0.62	0.4	0.4	0.5
Sweden	4.42	4.24	4.15	4.1	4.1	3.4
Great Britain	6.84	7.36	7.38	7.5	7.4	8
Italy	7.73	8.11	8.45	8.4	7.7	8.6
Cyprus	0.12	0.04	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.2
Czech Republic	5.47	5.79	7.16	5.4	7.3	7.3
Estonia	0.44	0.58	0.66	0.7	0.7	0.5
Lithuania	2.14	1.71	1.92	2.1	2.1	1.5
Latvia	0.76	0.77	0.92	1	0.9	0.7
Malta	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Slovakia	2.26	2.41	2.7	2.8	3.2	2.9
Slovenia	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.4	0.5	0.5
Hungary	3.25	3.58	3.93	3.7	3.6	3.4
Bulgaria	-	-	-	0.5	0.6	0.4
Romania	-	-	-	2	2	1.7

The tables present that the crisis did not cause any changes in the streams of Polish intra-union trade of industrial goods.

The reason for such a state of affairs may be major disproportions in sizes of economies and the fact that in the post-war period trade relations among our countries were not too vivid. For Poland its biggest neighbours were its natural partners; the Baltic States held a similar position but with the interest in Scandinavian countries as the Baltic Sea played an important role in their economies. The accession to the European Union structures did not change the situation to any greater extent; however one can speak about a sort of rapprochement in terms of natural cooperation within the community.

What follows is the description of cooperation with the Baltic States.

3.1. Lithuania

In the period of transformation and after the accession to the European Communities Lithuania was developing quickly. The process was hampered, similarly to other countries, at the end of 2007, when due to the crisis the number of bankruptcy declarations increased and the dynamics of GDP growth dropped. The situation lasted till 2009. At the beginning of 2010 some signs of a slow economic stabilisation appeared; this stabilisation lasts up to the present and manifests itself in a slow but permanent growth of GDP, a drop in inflation rate and a slight increase in export and import as well as in a fall in a trade gap (data available for the second quarter) (Lietuvos bankas 2011).

Poland is one of the most important trade partners for Lithuania – for years it has ranked 4th or 5th with a share of about 6 % in Lithuanian export and about 11 % in import (Ministerstwo Gospodarki 2011b). According to some preliminary data for the year 2010 Lithuania is the 15th partner for our country in the European Union with a share of 1.16 % in total export and 0.6 % in total import. It is also one of the countries which Poland has the highest surplus with. The advantage of export over import reaches 60 %.

What is also worth noticing is an increase in trade exchange since 2006. At the end of 2008, however, mutual trading suddenly declined due to the crises which strongly afflicted Lithuania. Together with the improvement of economic situation one could notice a slight increase in trade and the beginning of 2011 brought an evident growth in the dynamics of trading.

The highest share in Polish export to Lithuania have, apart from agri-food goods, chemical products (about 23 %), plastics (about 10%) products of electromechanical and metallurgical industry while in import – fuels and oils (about 37.5 %), chemical products (about 27.5 %) and different products. It is also significant that Poland is one of the biggest foreign investors in Lithuania. The main areas of activity are petroleum processing (PKN Orlen is is an owner of the sole Lithuanian oil refinery in Mazeikiu), production of glass, rubber and plastic articles, insurances, financial mediation, trade, transport, food industry (Ministerstwo Gospodarki 2011b).

3.2. Latvia

Economic development of Latvia proceeded in a similar manner to its western neighbour. The first signals of a looming slump occurred at the end of 2007 – rising inflation, a high deficit on the current account of balance of payment, an increase of negative balance of foreign trade. The situation worsened in consecutive years, yet in 2011 a slight increase of GDP was recorded, although its pace is much slower than in the previous year (5.3 %, the previous year 5.6 %, data available for the second quarter). Also a clear rise in export and import, which deepened the deficit in foreign trade, occurred (Latvijas Banka 2011).

Poland belongs to the main trade partners for Latvia, which may be a result of a relatively close geographical position and a big, in comparison to Latvia, size of the country. Since 2008 we hold the third position in terms of the scale of import and the sixth in terms of export. Paradoxically, the situation improved during the period of crisis. In our exchange with the EU countries Latvia comes 18th in export and 23rd in import (Ministerstwo Gospodarki 2011c).

The structure of Polish export to Latvia has changed in recent years. Some new goods which have never been a subject of export from our country appeared. What is currently being exported to Latvia are mainly machines and mechanical devices and cars (more than 20 %), chemical products (about 15 %), base metals and plastics. Import is dominated by metals and raw materials (about 28 %; in recent years the share increased almost four times), wood and wooden articles (about 20 %) and mineral products. Poland's positive balance has decreased in recent years due to a substantial reduction of turnover in the period of crisis; however a reconstruction, and even an increase, of exchange seems possible during the upcoming years due to a high position of Poland among foreign investors in Latvia (the 5th position), although their significance for our country is slight since the capital employed there is low. They concentrate on trade, real estate and food industry so they can create new streams of exchange (Ministerstwo Gospodarki 2011c).

3.3. Estonia

Similarly to the above-mentioned countries, Estonia developed dynamically until 2007. The crisis revealed, however, that this development had weak foundations. Estonia was the first of the EU countries where one year later the economic recession emerged, which was especially visible in 2009 when in the third quarter the Estonian GDP decreased by 15.6 %. The most important reason for that was an abrupt drop of added value in manufacturing industry caused by a substantial decrease in commissions (Ministerstwo Gospodarki 2011c). However, this situation changed radically and in the following year due to an increase in external demand, GDP increased by 3.1 % in comparison to 2009. Export of goods rose by nearly 35 % and of services by about 7 %, which according to the Bank of Estonia resulted from an improvement of competitiveness of products (Eesti pank 2010). Despite the introduction of the euro a similar trend is likely to persist in the upcoming years, which is to allow for acquiring the level of GDP from before the crisis already in 2013 (Eesti Pank 2011). This may also have changed because of problems the euro zone has now (Kuśpit *et al.* 2011).

The biggest trade partner for Estonia is Finland, which results from geographical and cultural proximity, and apart from Finland Estonia's neighbouring countries and Germany. For Poland it is the 23rd partner in the European Union (2010) in terms of turnover while our country occupies the 7th position as an import partner and the 15th as an export one. Poland sells Estonia mainly electromechanical products (24.8 %), chemicals (23.3 %) and products from base metals. What prevails in the very scarce import are metallurgical products (about 29.5 %; their import increased four times in comparison to 2009), chemical products, products of electromechanical and of wood and paper industry (Ministerstwo Gospodarki 2011a).

4. Competitiveness of Polish export of industrial goods to the Baltic States

As it has already been mentioned, despite the fact that all the discussed countries have belonged to the structures of the European Union since 2004, the exchange between Poland and the Baltic states is not extensive although our country holds a high position as their trade partner. This probably results from the fact that Poland is much bigger than they are and traditionally it established the biggest trade contacts with its big neighbours. However, on no account can it be equalled to the lack of possibility for increase of exchange. The situation has not even been particularly affected by the crisis, which was a combination of many factors such as the lack of responsibility of financial markets, a pursuit of excess profits, a lack of state control or improper monetary policy of the FED (Altman 2009). Till the end of 2007 export in the European Union countries had grown. According to the evaluations of the European Commission in the first three quarters of 2008 the volume of trade flow of the Union grew by 3.8 % in comparison to the previous year yet the exacerbation of the financial crisis in September that year caused its strong drop (by 6.3 %) (Eurostat 2011). What came as a consequence of the escalation of the recession was a decrease in the pace of exchange with an unprecedented rapidity and also a high level of synchronization of cycle phases in particular countries and economic areas. Within a few months at the beginning of 2009 the volume of trade decreased to the level of 2005 (Mroczek 2010), however, the situation started to improve in the following year.

Table 3 displays RCA indicators allowing for determining the comparative advantage of Polish export.

Table 3. Cumulative RCA indicators for 3, 5-9 SITC groups for 2004-2009 (Source: author's own calculations and *Rocznik statystyczny handlu zagranicznego*, GUS, different years)

Country	Year					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Estonia	1,08	1,62	1,74	1,75	1,59	1,5
Lithuania	0,89	0,63	0,71	0,85	0,85	0,59
Latvia	0,76	0,62	1,54	1,41	2,5	1,37
EU-15	-0,11	-0,03	-0,02	-0,07	-0,07	0,1
EU-10		0,14	0,29	0,26	0,28	0,18
EU-25		-0,008	0,03	-0,01	0,03	0,11
EU-27				-0,01	-0,0001	0,12

As the data reveal, for years Poland has been displaying dominance over the Baltic States, which remains on a similar level. The highest changeability in this respect is characteristic for the exchange with Latvia, where the domination grew visibly in recent years. What is puzzling is a systematic decrease in the domination over Estonia, although the structure of exchange is similar here. It could be a result of a decreasing share of the country's export in Polish sales and an ensuing lesser focus on accommodation to the needs of local clients. In the case of Lithuania the indicator has been remaining on a similar level for years, similarly to the share in exchange.

Attention should also be paid to a relatively minor decrease in Polish domination in the period of the crisis, which struck the Baltic States so strongly. It could be a result of a low value of exchange.

Average indicators for the whole Union were presented for one to compare. They show that despite the fact that Poland's domination over the whole grouping remains quite the same, it decreases for "the newcomer 10", which may indicate that exchange structures are drawing nearer.

Table 4. Cumulative IIT indicators for 3,5-9 SITC groups for 2004-2009 (percentage rates) (Source: author's own calculations and *Rocznik statystyczny handlu zagranicznego*, GUS, different years)

Country	Year					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Estonia	50,8	33	29,96	29,58	34,01	36,54
Lithuania	58,22	69,34	66,04	59,98	69,22	71,26
Latvia	63,89	70,18	35,27	39,24	15,21	40,53
EU-15	94,6	98,33	99,23	96,71	96,73	94,9
EU-10		92,79	85,73	86,89	86,09	90,82
EU-25		99,6	98,48	99,26	99,27	94,3
EU-27				99,88	99,99	93,89

The data in Table 4 confirm the previous conclusions. The table shows that the similarity of trade structures between Poland and the Baltic states is small. This state is completely different from the Union's average as well as from the structure of exchange with "the ten". The longest distance separates Poland and Estonia, which may be due to a big share of unprocessed and farm products in Polish export as well as a weak exchange. The exchange with Lithuania has the most congenial structure. It is probably an effect of more extensive trade and the fact that neighbouring countries become similar and long-lasting historic relations between the two countries shaped similar cultural and consumer models. The highest share of this country in Polish exchange confirms this thesis.

5. Conclusions

The foregoing analysis allows for drawing a few conclusions:

1. Competitiveness of export of Polish industrial products to the Baltic States is not very high and it has been remaining on a similar level for years.
2. A difference in the structure of exchange with particular countries does not allow for formulating a single, universal strategy for the improvement of competitiveness. In each case it needs to be adjusted to the specificity of a country. What may be of help is a great significance of Polish direct foreign investments for those economies.
3. In the case of Lithuania, strengthening of the cooperation may be started from increasing Polish import of oil and wider exploitation of the oil refinery in Mazeikiai.
4. A short distance, and what follows – lower costs of transport, may help to increase the turnover with Latvia, especially in the face of growing export of Polish mechanical products, which, as a result of the crisis, may be cheaper than those from western countries while maintaining an equally high quality. Polish investments, employed mainly

in retail trade, may also prove helpful. This conclusion may be drawn for the other countries.

5. In the case of Estonia, a similar structure favours an increase in turnover and in the future it may also favour a rapprochement of economical structures; for now it may allow for a rise in Polish competitiveness considering the fact that as a bigger country it has strong possibilities of development. What still remains unknown is also the situation of Estonia after the adoption of the new currency as there are some difficulties in the eurozone; as a small country struck by the crisis and obliged to help others, Estonia may reduce the pace of the reconstruction of economy.

6. Improvement of competitiveness of Polish trade of industrial products is possible on the condition that it takes advantage of the economic crisis; geographical proximity makes the costs of transport of goods and prices lower, similarly to the problems in the eurozone and lower costs of Polish products while maintaining quality standards of the Union.

7. An increase in cooperation and further in exchange is possible due to, for example, common involvement in maritime economy and its widely understood development connected with proctection of the Baltic Sea.

It is to be hoped that so geographically and culturally close countries are able to make good use of both their closeness and membership in the European Union.

References

Altman, A. 2009. The Great Crash 2008, *Foreign Affairs* 88(1): 2–14.

Bernat, T.; Poteralski, J. 2006. Competitiveness of nations – a comparative analysis, in *Theoretical and practical aspects of competitiveness.* University of Szczecin, Microeconomics Department, Szczecin, Poland.

Bossak, J.; Bieńkowski, W. 2004. *Międzynarodowa zdolność konkurencyjna kraju i przedsiębiorstw. Wyzwania dla Polski na progu XXI wieku*. SGH, Warsaw, Poland

Daszkiewicz, N.; Olczyk, M. 2008. Konkurencyjność podmiotów – ujęcie teoretyczne, in: *Konkurencyjność. Poziom makro, mezo i mikro*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw, Poland.

Dołęgowski, T. 2000. *Konkurencyjność a procesy integracyjne w Europie*. Biblioteka Wiedzy Europejskiej, zeszyt 13, SGH, Warsaw, Poland.

Eesti Pank 2010. Estonian economy in 2010 [online] [accessed 17 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://www.eestipank.info/pub/en/dokumendid/publikatsioonid/seeriad/aastaaruanne/_2010/_17.pdf

Eesti Pank 2011. Bank of Estonia [online] [accessed 17 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://www.eestipank.info/pub/en/dokumendid/publikatsioonid/seeriad/ylevaade/_2011_01/_3_111.pdf?ok=1

Eurostat 2011. European Statistics [online] [accessed 17 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu

Flejterski, S. 1984. Istota i mierzenie konkurencyjności międzynarodowej, *Gospodarka Planowa* 9. 390–394.

Hämäläinen, T. 1999. *A Systemic Framework of Economic Competitiveness and Growth*. Newark, United Kingdom.

Hübner, D. 1994. Międzynarodowa konkurencyjność gospodarki a strategia rozwoju, *Ekonomista* 3.

Jagiełło, E. M. 2008. *Strategiczne budowanie konkurencyjności gospodarki*. Wydawnictwo Poltext, Warsaw, Poland.

Kuśpit, J.; Pasierbiak, P. 2011. Wpływ kryzysu na popyt wewnętrzny i handel zagraniczny, in *Gospodarka i polityka makroekonomiczna strefy euro w latach 2008–2010. Skutki kryzysu i słabości zarządzania.* Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin, Poland.

Latvijas Banka 2011. Key macroeconomic indicators. [online] [accessed 15 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://www.bank.lv/en/statistics/data-room/main-indicators/key-macroeconomic-indicators

Lietuvos Bankas 2011. Statistics of Bank of Lithuania [online] [accessed 17 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://www.lb.lt/eng/statistics/nsdplt.htm

Ministerstvo Gospodarki 2011a. Trade with Estonia [online] [accessed 14 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://www.mg.gov.pl/Wspolpraca+z+zagranica/Wspolpraca+gospodarcza+Polski+z+krajami+UE+i+EFTA/estonia.htm

Ministerstvo Gospodarki 2011b. Trade with Lithuania [online] [accessed 14 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://www.mg.gov.pl/Wspolpraca+z+zagranica/Wspolpraca+gospodarcza+Polski+z+krajami+UE+i+EFTA/litwa.htm

Ministerstvo Gospodarki 2011c. Trade with Latvia [online] [accessed 14 October 2011]. Available in Internet: http://www.mg.gov.pl/Wspolpraca+z+zagranica/Wspolpraca+gospodarcza+Polski+z+krajami+UE+i+EFTA/lotwa.htm

Misala, J. *et al.* 2001. *Proces integracji gospodarczej Polski z krajami członkowskimi Unii Europejskiej w świetle teorii*. Politechnika Radomska, Radom, Poland.

Misala, J. 2011. *Międzynarodowa konkurencyjność gospodarki narodowej*. PWE, Warsaw, Poland.

Misala, J.; Pluciński, E. M. 2000. *Handel wewnątrzgałęziowy między Polską a Unią Europejską. Teoria i praktyka*. SGH, Warsaw, Poland.

Mroczek, W. 2010. Handel Unii Europejskiej w 2009 r., *Wspólnoty Europejskie* 3(208).

Pluciński, E. M. 1997. *Der Außenhandel der Visegrad – Staaten während des Transformationprozesses.* SGH, Warsaw, Poland

Puślecki, Z. W.; Walkowski, M. 2010. *Polityka wzrostu konkurencyjności Unii Europejskiej wobec USA i Japonii.* Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, Warsaw, Poland

Radło, M. J. 2008. Międzynarodowa konkurencyjność gospodarki. Uwagi na temat definicji, czynników i miar, in *Czynniki i miary międzynarodowej konkurencyjności gospodarek w kontekście globalizacji – wstępne wyniki badań*. Prace i Materiały Nr. 284, Instytut Gospodarki Światowej, SGH, Warsaw, Poland. Available from Internet: http://radlo.org/mkg.pdf

Rocznik statystyczny handlu zagraniczneg 2005 and later. GUS, Warsaw, Poland.

Szymanik, E. 2009. Competitiveness of Polish export of industrial goods within the European Union market, in *Contemporary business issues*. The State Vocational University in Gorzów Wielkopolski, Gorzów Wielkopolski, Poland.

Szymanik, E. 2004. *Konkurencyjność eksportu na przykładzie wymiany Polski z krajami Unii Europejskiej*. KSW im. A. F. Modrzewskiego, Cracow, Poland.

Szymanik, E. 2011. Poland's Export to the EU Market and its Competitiveness vs the Crisis, in*Selected Problems of Market Economy in the Crisis Era*. University of Szczecin, Microeconomics Department, Szczecin, Poland.

Wierzbołowski, J. 1995. Państwo jako aktywny uczestnik kształtowania międzynarodowej konkurencyjności, in *Międzynarodowa konkurencyjność gospodarki Polski – uwarunkowania i perspektywy*. Raporty. Studia nad konkurencyjnością Nr 35, IRiSS, Warsaw, Poland, 21– 22.