Productivity and Competiveness in Romanian and Bulgarian Industry: An Empirical Evidence of Firm'S Behavior to Separate Sectors

Dr. Stamatis Kontsas

Technological Education Institute of Western Macedonia (Adjunct)

38, Leof. K. Karamanli str., 54639, Thessalonica, Greece.

E-mail: kontsas@otenet.gr

Abstract

A. base line estimate of eligibility would be useful in assessing whether economic reforms can indeed achieve higher eligibility. In this paper estimated the technical eligibility of Bulgarian and Romanian firms for 15 separate sectors. A short comparative analysis of the two countries macroeconomic situations allows us to conclude that the two countries are fairly similar both in terms of their income categories and the degree of advancement of their economic reforms. According to the European Bank of Research and Development reports, both countries were most successful in liberalizing their trade and price system, but not advanced in terms of large-scale privatization and competition policy

Keywords: Trade, Income, Productivity, Efficiency, Enterprises, Competiveness, Economic reform, Liberalization, Industrial output, Private sector

1. Introduction

The economic reforms in Central and Eastern Europe of the last six years were aimed at creating a competitive market economy which should lead to increased enterprise efficiency and better economic performance. Price liberalization, privatizing state property and restructuring of enterprises were some of the key measures that accompanied the movement from communism to a capitalist society. An interesting theoretical and empirical literature emerged. The former focused on modeling the sequencing of reforms and optimal restructuring of enterprises (Aghion and Blanchard (1993), Boycko, Shleifer and Visny (1996), Dewatripont and Roland (1996), among others), while the latter focused on documenting firm restructuring and analyzing the effects of ownership on firm restructuring (Earle, Estrin and Leschenko (1996), Richter and Schaffer (1996), Konings (1997), among others).

Firm restructuring and institutional change that took place should have a considerable impact on the technical efficiency of firms given that under Central Planning substantial overuse was made of labor and other input factors. Little is known, however, about the technical efficiency of firms and its determinants in transition countries. A number of authors have investigated the issue for the pre transition year and the results vary between highly efficient firms and firms that can achieve considerable efficiency gains, this often depends on the sector and the period under consideration (Brada and King (1994), Kemme and Neufeld (1991), Danilin et al. (1985), Liu et at. (1995)). All in all, little is known about the technical efficiency of firms in the transition towards a market economy. Yet, a base line estimate of efficiency would be a useful starting point to be able to judge whether economic reforms can indeed achieve higher efficiency. Moreover, with market reforms being implemented it is expected that the efficiency of firms should increase. Brads et al. (1997) estimate for the Czechoslovak and Hungarian industry in the early 90's that the average efficiency varied between 40 and 80% and hence economic reforms could improve technical efficiency considerably. In addition, they test whether a number of firm specific factors affect technical efficiency and report evidence that firm size and profitability is positively related to efficiency, but ownership has no effect. (Note 1)

In this paper I estimate the technical eligibility of Bulgarian and Romanian firms for 15 separate sectors. To this end we use a unique firm level panel data set of 869 Bulgarian firms over the period 2003-2005 and 2912 Romanian enterprises for the years 2004-2005. Moreover, the panel nature of the data allows us to infer the evolution of the technical efficiency of firms as transition progresses. Furthermore, we test whether a number of firm specific characteristics are systematically correlated with its eligibility. To this end we use a stochastic production possibility frontier approach as introduced by Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1979), Meeuden and van den Broeck (1977) and further developed for panel data by Battese and Coelli (1995).

The paper is structured as follows. In section II I provide a macroeconomic and institutional background of Bulgaria and Romania. Section III discusses the model, estimation methodology and the data that we use, while section IV shows and discusses the results.

Section V is a concluding one.

2. Macroeconomic developments in Bulgaria and Romania, 1999-2004

Both Bulgarians and Romania started their economic reforms in 1999. Both belong to the low middle-income countries with GDP per capita equal to $1330 and $1130 respectively in 2002. Table 1 and Table 2 provide an overview of the macroeconomic developments in the two countries. Both countries experienced approximately the same GDP decline ın 2004 with respect to 1999 with Romanian GDP resuming its growth one year earlier than Bulgaria. Table 2 shows various transition indicators compiled by the EBRD (Note 2).

According to the EBRD transition indicators most indicators have the same values in both countries and both are most successful in their trade and foreign exchange system reform. Romania is, however, more advanced in terms of its bank reform and interest rate liberalization than Bulgaria is. The lowest index value pertains to the competition policy with Romania being less advanced iń this area than Bulgaria. As Table I and Table 2 demonstrate, these two countries lag behind Hungary and the Czech Republic in terms of the EBRD transition indices.

Table 1. Percentage change in GDP

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	1999-2004 Cumulative
Bulgaria	-9,1%	-11,7%	-7,3%	-2,4%	1,4%	-26,3%
Romania	-5,6%	-12,9%	-10,0%	1,3%	3,4%	-22,3%
Hungary	-5,6%	-12,9%	-8,8%	1,3%	3,9%	-20,9%
Chezch Republic	-0,4%	-14,2%	-6,4%	-0,9%	2,6%	-17,8%

Source : EBRD Transition Report, 2005

Table 2. Indicators of Economy 2005

	GDP share in private sector, mid=05	Large-scale privatization	Small-scale privatization	Enterprise restructuring	Price liberalization	Trade and foreign exchange system	Competition policy	Bank reform and interest rate liberalization
Bulgaria	45	2	3	2	3	4	2	2
Romania	40	2	3	2	3	4*	1	3
Hungary	70	4	4*	3	3	4*	3	3
Czech Republic	75	4	4*	3	3	4*	3	3

In Bulgaria, the economic situation has been deteriorating since 1999 up to 2004. Before the reform process started, the country's trade volume (measured by exports plus imports) constituted about 80% of the GDP which is unusually large. Thus, the CMEA collapse had a potentially destructive effect on the industry. Combined with increasing nominal wages, credit expansion and price controls, this led to pronounced shortages of goods and the monetary overhang. Investment spending dropped by 25% in 2000 while inflation reached 64% by the end of the year. In 2001 a more radical economic reform program was adopted which encompassed restrictive monetary and fiscal policy, including higher interest rates. One of the most important measures that year was price liberalization. As a result, prices tripled in the first two months in 2001 and GDP declined 11.7% accompanied by 10% unemployment rate and about 40% decline in real wages. This led to political uncertainty which forced the government to relax its macroeconomic policies in 2002. In April 1992, the Privatization Law was enacted, but only a handful of large privatizations had actually been realized with most enterprises remaining in state property. By the end of 1993, the country's economic conditions were roughly the same as they were in 1990. It's only in 1994 that the government committed itself to an extremely tight budget, introduced the VAT law (at 18%), and also a new privatization program has been formulated involving 70 large enterprises.

Thus, our results for Bulgaria in 2004 refer to the case of a transition country which succeeded in liberalizing its prices but was not consistent in its stabilization policy and where the privatization program was delayed and did not result in the change bf ownership from the state to the private sector.

Romania is characterized by similar developments, however, it was more efficient in privatization and had a higher level of commitment to the stabilization than Bulgaria. As a result of the Romanian reform program a new Constitution has been adopted which established the property rights and provided a legal framework for a market economy. One of the more radical measures the transition government has applied was the price reform, consumer subsidy reduction and the introduction of VAT. As Bulgaria, Romania was also affected by the CMEA collapse. Until 2002, the macroeconomic stabilization policies where characterized by inconsistency resulting from frequent changes in the government. By late 2002 the legal and administrative basis for privatization was laid down. About 30% of share ownership was distributed to the population, while 70% ended up in the state property fund (to be divested in 7 years, by law). In 2003, the government tightened its macroeconomic policies by partially removing subsidies and establishing ore tight control over expenditures. As a result, a balanced budget was achieved in that year. However, both inflation and unemployment rates remained high (256% and 10,2% resp.). In 2004, the government proceeded with its reform program. The most important measures were the liberalization of the price setting with removal of consumer subsidies, giving up control of the profit margins and elimination of almost all export restraints. In the first half of 2004, the inflation rate has subsided and industrial output showed a positive growth rate for the first tie since 1989.

3. Methodology and Data

3.1 Econometric Method

To obtain a measure for technical efficiency we use a method which has been applied in a variety of economic problems and estimate a stochastic production frontier as introduced by Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1979) and Meeusen and van den Broeck (1977). The method assumes the presence of technical inefficiencies in producing a particular output. While estimating the average efficiency relative to some "best practice" for a number of sectors is a valuable and interesting exercise, in recent years more effort has been made to explain firm level differences in efficiency as a function of a number of explanatory variables (Note 3) A two-step procedure was mostly applied, which existed in first estimating for each firm its technical inefficiency, under the assumption that these inefficiency effects are identically distributed. In a second stage, the predicted inefficiency effects are estimated as a function of a number of explanatory variables, which contradicts the assumption of identically distributed inefficiency effects in the stochastic frontier. In order to circumvent this problem, in this paper we use a method in which the parameters of the stochastic production frontier and the inefficiency model are estimated simultaneously, given appropriate distributional assumptions associated with the cross- sectional data on the sample of firms (Battese and Coelli (1995)).

To focus idea, assume the following stochastic frontier production function

$$Y_{it} = F(X_{it}\beta) \cdot e^{V_{it}-U_{it}} \tag{1}$$

where Y denotes production for observation i at time t, X is an input vector associated with the ith firm and β is a vector of unknown parameters to be estimated, F is a production function. It is assumed that the v_{it}'s are random variables that are ilid $N(0,\sigma^2,)$ and independent of the υ_{it}'s. The υ_{it}'s, are non-negative random variables, associated with technical inefficiency in production, independently distributed, such that u_{it} is obtained by truncation (at zero) of the normal distribution with mean $z_{it}\delta$ and variance σ^2_u. Finally, z is a vector of explanatory variables that are associated with technical inefficiency and δ is a vector of unknown parameters (for more details see also Battese and Coelli, 1995). The inefficiency model can also be expressed more explicitly as follows,

$$u_{it} = Z_{it}\delta + W_{it} \tag{2}$$

where W_{it} is defined by the truncation of the normal distribution with zero mean and variance σ^2 such that the point of truncation is $Z_{it}\delta$.

The above model is estimated by maximum likelihood and the technical efficiency of production for firm i is defined by (3a) in case of the technical efficiency effects model and by (3b) the estimation of stochastic production frontier alone (Battese and Coelli(1993)).

$$TE_{it} = e^{-U_{it}} = e^{Z_{it}-W_{it}}$$

$$TE_{it} = e^{-U_{it}}$$

3.2 Empirical Specification

We specify a log-quadratic production function as introduced by Chu, Aigner and Frankel (1970) to estimate the stochastic production frontier and the inefficiency model. In particular,

$$1nY_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 1nK_{it} + \alpha_2 1nL_{it} + \alpha_3 (1nK_{it})^2 + \alpha_4 (1nL_{it})^2 + V_{it} - U_{it}$$

and in the technical efficiency effects model,   (4)

$$U_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 MS_{it} + \beta_2 PROF_{it} + W_{it}$$

Where Y is value added, I{ is the capital stock, proxied by net tangible assets, L is the number of employees, MS is the market share of firm I and Profit stands for the profitability of firm i. Both value added and the capital stock are measured in terms of millions of current US dollars. We will explain the economic intuition of the variables associated with technical efficiency later in section 4.3.

The log-quadratic specification encompasses (the Cobb-Douglas specification and is a less restrictive one. In addition, the empirical implementation, which includes art iterative estimation procedure, obtained convergence with this specification, rather than the Cobb-Douglas or the Translog specification.

3.3 Data

The data at our disposal is a unique firm level company accounts database compiled by "bureau Van Dyck", Amadeus. The data include 869 Bulgarian firms for the years 2003-2005 end 2912 Romanian for the years 2004-2005. To be included in Amadeus, two of the following criteria must be satisfied: a turnover of at least 12min. USD, number of employees greater than 150 and total assets greater than 12min USD. Thus, it is only the largest firms which are represented in the sample. Recalling that the well-known problem of the socialist economies is excessively large size of their industrial enterprises, one can assert that the Amadeus sample is representative of a significant share of these countries' industries.

Table 3 shows some summary statistics for 2004. The average firm is larger in Romania than in Bulgaria.

Table 3. Data Summary Statistics Bulgaria: 681 firms Bulgaria 681 firms

	Mean	Mm n	Max	Coefficient of Variation
Y	2.14	-38.06	277.67	4.80
K	2.16	-77.69	314.39	6.11
L	670	115	62120	3.11

Romania: 4520 firms

	Mean	Min	Max	Coefficient of Variation
Y	2.66	-7.51	230.41	2.78
K	1.99	-46.13	303.10	4.87
L	979	150	37319	1.72

Note: Y end K x 1000 000 USD

4. Results

We estimated separate frontier production functions for 15 (NACE 2 digit) sectors in both countries. To account for time effects, we included the year dummies into the specification of the production functions. In tables 4 and 5 it can be seen that the average efficiency varies substantially between sectors for both countries. In Bulgaria, the lowest value for average efficiency is found in the Chemicals sector (22.84% average efficiency) while the maximum efficiency of 100% for Utilities. The latter should be viewed with some caution as there were only 7 firms in this sector, so the estimates are based on a very small sample. The next most efficient sector in Bulgaria is 'Extraction (99.73% in 2003 but falling down to 66.73% in 2005). In Romania, the variation of average efficiency levels is also quite high: the lowest level is 33.94% for Utilities in 2005 while the highest level is 80.48% (Extraction 2004). Interestingly, there is no clear correlation between the average efficiency of sectors in Bulgaria and the one in Romania.

Table 4. Bulgaria Industry Frontier Production Function Estimates, Years 2003-2005

firms	NACE	Const	LnK	LnL	LnK^2	LnL^2	Year 2003	Year 2004	Av.Eff. 2003	AvEff 2004	Av Eff 2005	W Av Eff 2003	Av Eff 2004	W Av Eff 2005
78	Food and Beverage	-0.433 -0.319	0.476 10.474	-0.011 -0.025	0.017 1.022	0.032 0.907	0.017 0.160	-0.046 -0.495	63.59 %	65.95 %	68.24 %	73.67%	74.27 %	76.37%
95	Textile and Apparel	-3.375 -1.156	0.384 6.898	0.630 0.660	0.009 0.490	-0.001 -0.011	0.129 1.380	0.048 0.814	54.54 %	60.10 %	65.32 %	63.27%	68.36 %	72.76%
31	Leather and Products	-30.975 -6.949	0.625 3.996	9.830 7.001	0.109 3.120	-0.747 -6.857	0.207 1.012	0.094 0.748	41.66 %	44.36 %	47.06 %	50.97%	54.82 %	57.71%
28	Wood and Products	1.204 0.163	0.424 2.966	-0.808 -0.314	0.014 0.459	0.117 0.529	-0.146 -1.071	-0.257 -2.157	70.07 %	65.07 %	59.72 %	74.41%	72.01 %	67.75%
26	Printing and Publishing	-3.521 -2.035	0.622 5.530	1.465 2.692	-0.030 -0.694	-0.094 -1.898	-0.057 -0.338	-0.042 -0.320	30.97 %	30.84 %	30.71 %	39.41%	43.45 %	40.98%
34	Chemicals, prod. and fibres	-0.343 -0.333	0.387 4.644	0.299 0.865	0.026 1.044	0.015 0.461	-0.182 -1.156	-0.291 -2.644	24.93 %	23.88 %	22.84 %	31.04%	31.24 %	28.80%
24	Rubber and Plastic	-2.852 -0.684	0.579 4.879	1.018 0.815	0.016 0.302	-0.059 -0.647	-0.320 -1.550	-0.111 0.761	54.19 %	51.51 %	48.81 %	64.94%	66.45 %	66.08%
36	Mineral mat. and Prod.	-2.260 -0.868	0.434 2.776	0.480 0.578	0.013 0.346	0.012 0.166	0.074 0.381	-0.055 -0.436	43.52 %	50.49 %	57.17 %	49.02%	53.37 %	59.85%
73	Basic met. and prod.	-3.189 -0.987	0.410 6.078	0.581 0.565	0.016 0.620	0.009 0.108	-0.189 -1.652	-0.150 -1.816	59.47 %	59.95 %	60.43 %	63.13%	63.38 %	63.85%
86	Machinery excl. Electr.	-2.486 -1.902	0.313 4.534	0.328 0.819	0.010 0.354	0.022 0.654	0.129 0.878	-0.086 -0.832	58.26 %	63.06 %	67.60 %	69.99%	70.84 %	75.00%
77	Electr. and Opt. Eq.	0.117 0.021	0.694 9.205	-0.021 -0.011	0.049 1.265	0.015 0.103	-0.040 -0.279	-0.055 -0.554	53.07 %	56.66 %	60.16 %	66.18%	65.80 %	69.88%
13	Transport Eq.	-1.429 -0.565	0.302 2.495	-0.107 -0.172	-0.033 -1.194	0.057 1.660	0.202 1.179	-0.065 -0.554	78.51 %	81.85 %	84.78 %	84.55%	87.13 %	89.48%
7	Utilities	-1.130 -0.748	0.826 6.966	0.256 0.578	-0.064 -2.839	0.014 0.532	-0.028 -0.192	-0.402 -2.802	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00%	100.00 %	100.00%
31	Extraction	1.208 0.767	0.503 7.102	-0.575 -1.256	-0.008 -0.497	0.087 2.653	-0.457 -3.980	-0.507 -3.463	99.73 %	96.41 %	66.73 %	99.57%	94.02 %	67.11%
42	Fumiture	-11.063 -7.492	0.267 1.573	3.188 6.627	0.009 0.239	-0.195 -3.781	-0.323 -1.894	-0.405 -3.044	46.29 %	40.69 %	35.12 %	51.66%	48.33 %	43.84%

Table 5. Romania Industry Frontier Production Function Estimates, Years 2004-2005

firms	NACE	Const	LnK	LnL	LnK^2	LnL^2	Year 2004	AvEff 2004	Av Eff 2005	Av Eff 2004	W Av Eff 2005
791	Food and Beverage	-4.946 -5.858	0.404 30.234	1.374 5.422	0.048 9.290	-0.061 -3.118	-0.198 -5.237	51.63%	42.00%	57.25%	49.42%
366	Textile and Apparel	-2.006 -1.972	0.330 12.155	0.300 0.991	0.023 3.035	0.027 1.151	-0.025 -0.663	48.39%	46.48%	53.41%	52.44%
96	Leather and Products	-3.266 -3.391	0.405 9.388	0.676 2.259	0.019 1.344	-0.012 -0.531	0.105 1.418	74.38%	79.68%	79.88%	84.30%
349	Wood and Products	-4.344 -5.529	0.291 12.108	0.983 4.279	0.025 3.266	-0.022 -1.220	-0.052 -1.379	53.37%	50.25%	55.78%	53.19%
155	Printing and Publishing	-4.822 -4.501	0.371 15.400	1.250 4.045	0.040 3.810	-0.049 -2.171	-0.012 -0.208	52.04%	52.63%	58.48%	59.27%
175	Chemicals, prod. and fibres	-5.536 -5.743	0.422 20.018	1.648 5.718	0.057 8.499	-0.086 -4.089	-0.109 -1.851	44.45%	40.08%	50.77%	46.69%
181	Rubber and Plastic	-5.538 -4.172	0.536 20.732	1.570 3.977	0.063 8.003	-0.082 -2.794	-0.095 -1.803	55.72%	49.47%	60.18%	55.29%
347	Mineral mat. and Prod.	-4.168 -5.271	0.323 18.813	0.943 3.899	0.029 5.601	-0.020 -1.116	0.124 4.008	53.68%	58.09%	59.73%	63.35%
697	Basic met. and prod.	-4.723 -7.453	0.358 26.887	1.226 6.466	0.038 8.465	-0.047 -3.349	0.045 1.836	46.39%	48.47%	50.35%	53.13%
417	Machinery excl. Electr.	-5.691 -8.291	0.328 19.799	1.436 7.145	0.040 5.782	-0.059 -4.050	-0.082 -2.773	54.82%	50.19%	59.58%	55.41%
202	Electr. and Opt. Eq.	-1.642 -1.667	0.418 15.683	0.520 1.795	0.031 3.401	-0.008 -0.392	0.012 0.242	42.79%	43.05%	50.15%	50.40%
225	Transport Eq.	-7.305 -10.167	0.367 13.043	2.018 9.231	0.051 5.832	-0.106 -6.549	0.008 0.180	46.20%	46.20%	54.78%	54.96%
91	Utilities	-6.778 -5.697	0.237 7.623	1.899 5.316	0.015 1.357	-0.087 -3.159	-0.179 -3.004	37.27%	33.94%	46.25%	44.22%
136	Extraction	-7.434 -5.469	0.411 19.015	1.895 4.739	0.088 11.044	-0.093 -3.164	-0.137 -2.588	80.48%	70.40%	80.55%	70.17%
292	Fumiture	-5.275 -5.382	0.44 19.827	1.432 4.884	0.057 7.823	-0.067 -3.041	-0.059 -1.289	50.77%	48.78%	55.51%	54.69%

Both our estimates and those of the other authors (see for example Brada et al. (1995) and Brock (1997)) point to a greater variance in sectoral average efficiencies than that found in the work of Danilin et al (1985) which studied the Soviet textile enterprises. The average efficiency levels in the latter paper were found to be narrowly grouped around 92%. In contrast, we only find average efficiency levels exceeding 90% in two sectors in Bulgaria (Utilities end Extraction). There are two points to be made here. First, as conceded by Danilin and coauthors, high efficiency levels do not necessarily mean that the enterprises are efficient

in an absolute sense. Rather, it may be the case that all firms in the sector are very similar, so each one is producing close to the best practice frontier. Our findings suggest that in the course of transition, the firms' behavior has become more diverse which resulted in increased variation of firms' efficiency levels within industrial branches. Second, consistent with Brads et al. (1997) we find also high efficiency levels for 'Extraction': More than 96% in Bulgaria in 1993 and 1994 but dropping off to 66% in 1995. The hypotheses put forward by Ickes and Ryterman (1997) is that in a Soviet type economy dominated by the large heavy industry enterprises , their efficiency levels would be high both because of increased control on the `'priority" enterprises and because of dispatching of the better managers to those firms. As tables 4 and 5 show, the average efficiency levels in the extraction branch are high in both countries but with the course of time they decrease significantly. This could reflect a decreasing relative importance of heavy industry enterprises in the former planned economies. However, one must keep in mind that high efficiency levels estimates are not necessarily testifying about high technical efficiency in the "absolute" sense. Also, low relative efficiency levels may be the reflection of a situation whereby a few very efficient producers push the production frontier upwards so that most firms look inefficient relative to them.

Along with the branch average efficiency levels, tables 4 and 5 also provide weighted branch average efficiencies where firms' shares of value added for that sector were used as weights. We find weighted average efficiencies dominate the unweighted ones for all sectors and years in both countries. This strongly suggests that most value added in both countries is produced by more efficient producers. The average amount by which weighted average efficiency estimates exceed the normal ones is similar in both countries and constitutes 12% and 15% in Romania and Bulgaria, respectively, which suggests there exists a positive relationship between firms efficiency levels and the relative amount of output they produce. This relationship is rather surprising because the mainstream hypotheses concerning the operation of planned economies, is that big industrial enterprises were responsible for the inefficiency of economy as a whole. Our findings, however, conform to the Ickes..Ryterman hypotheses (1997) and to the empirical findings of Brada et al. (1997) and suggest that the large output enterprises are also the more efficient ones. We test this proposition more rigorously by incorporating explanatory variables for efficiency levels into the maximum likelihood estimation of stochastic production frontier below find a significant positive relationship between firms' technical efficiency levels and their size.

One of the challenges of the transition reforms was to increase firms' technical efficiency. It was expected that the introduction of market forces into the transition economies would make the way firms use their inputs more efficient. Tables 4 and 5 show the evolution of the average efficiency per sector over time. The highest growing sector in terms of efficiency levels in both countries is "Mineral materials and products" (31% growth from 2003 to 2005 in Bulgaria and 8% in Romania from 2004 to 2005). This growth, however, is occurring around 50% efficiency level. The fastest declining efficiency levels are found in Bulgaria (23% decline from 2003 to 2005 in the Extraction sector and 19% decline in Romania in the Food and Beverage sector from 2004 to 2005). In both countries, we find that only about half of the estimated sectors are displaying increasing efficiency levels while their number is only

one third in Romania. Thus our estimates do not reveal reasonably high average efficiency levels (>75%) for most of the sectors and years nor do they point to any evidence of steadily increasing efficiency levels for the years 2003-2005. While some sectors became more efficient, others did not. This could be related to the initial conditions some sectors were facing, or to the way in which reforms were implemented in different sectors. In any case, the different evolution of efficiency suggests that reforms filter through in a very heterogeneous way.

We next want to identify what explains efficiency in both countries. In particular, we will analyze' whether size and profitability are systematically correlated with the technical efficiency of the enterprises. For this purpose, we are employing joint maximum likelihood function incorporating efficiency explanatory variables (Battese and Coelli (1995)). We measure firms' size as its market share. To avoid the specification problem, however, we are using lagged firm size in our estimation. Profitability is measured as the firm's profit margin, defined the redo of firms' Profit (Loss) before tax to their Turnover.

We focus on these explanatory variables for two reasons. Transition countries are characterized by very large firms end it is believed that the large firm sizes could lead to an inefficient way of production. Ickes and Ryterman (1997) develop a model where they show that the size distribution of firms in centrally planned economies implies a bimodal distribution under transition in which the most efficient firms are the larger 'ones. The source for this difference is the willingness of the planner to maximize the size of efficient producers while reducing that of the inefficient ones. While in the market economy, the latter would eventually exit, this would be considered politically undesirable under the plan or in the early stages of transition, so that the inefficient firms would not immediately exit. Given the slow pace of reforms both in Bulgaria and Romania, we would expect this result to hold.

Turning to profitability, the reasoning is based on the competitive mechanisms in a market economy. Competitive pressure creates incentives for firms to become more technically efficient. This would reduce costs and allow them to survive. The least efficient firms will make losses and have to exit. Such a mechanism was expected to start functioning as a result of the introduction of economic reforms. Under the plan, the relationship between profitability and efficiency could be negative for a number of reasons. Kornai (1986), for example, pointed out a process he termed "profit levelling" which essentially consists of reallocation of resources by the central planners from the more successful firms to the less successful ones. The ratchet effect was also responsible for the lack of incentives to be efficient. The planners set targets for the enterprises, and once the target has been met, a new, usually higher target was fixed for the next period. As a result, neither managers nor the workers had en incentive to increase efficiency of the production process. Instead, missing the target often paid off.

The results of explaining efficiency are provided in tables 6 and 7. In both countries and for all years (now reduced by one because we are using lagged firm size) we found a positive relationship between firm size and efficiency. This relationship is significant at a 1% level in 7 branches out of 15 in Bulgaria and in 2 sectors in Romania. In the latter country, the

relationship is significant at a 10% level in 5 sectors. Also for profitability, we found it's systematically positively correlated with efficiency. In Bulgaria, it is significant at the 1% level in all branches but the `Furniture". In Romania, it is only insignificant in the "Printing and Publishing" branch. In the work of Brada et al. (1997), the same positive relationship is found for most branches in Hungary, although it is positive only for one half of the branches in Czechoslovakia. The authors are arguing that in Czechoslovakia, the practice of profit-leveling still existed in that country in 2000, the year they do their estimates in. We would similarly conclude that reforms in Bulgaria and Romania were successful in the sense that they hardened the budget constraints which translated into the profit-based incentives to be more efficient. Thus our two hypotheses are confirmed for a number of sectors.

Finally, in table 8 we pooled the two countries and assumed that as both countries have access to the same technology they could face the same production possibility frontier. This allows us to test whether there is an intercept shift of the frontier for the country under consideration and whether any of the countries is more efficient then the other. So, we included a country dummy (1 for Romania, 0 for Bulgaria) both into the stochastic production frontier and into the set of efficiency explanatory variables. Again our main result comes through, there is .a positive and statistically significant relationship between size, profitability and efficiency in all 15 sectors. The production frontier lies in most cases et a higher level in Romania than in Bulgaria, suggesting that Romania is more technologically advanced. In addition, in the efficiency model, Romanian firms reach a higher efficiency level than Bulgarian ones.

Table 6. Bulgaria: Explaining Efficiency Levels, 2004-2005

firms	NACE	Const	LnK	LnL	LnK^2	LnL^2	Year 2004	Profitability	Size	Av Eff 2004	Av Eff 2005
115	Food and Beverage	-3.000	0.525	0.930	0.022	-0.046	-0.198	0.018	17.739	62.22%	59.91%
		-2.131	17.115	2.104	1.845	-1.324	-2.926	7.717	1.797		
143	Textile and Apparel	-3.404	0.371	0.615	-0.018	-0.002	-0.070	0.004	89.696	74.84%	76.08%
		-2.098	6.747	1.143	-1.005	-0.054	-1.308	5.458	3.519		
40	Leather and Products	-10.677	0.347	3.028	0.018	-0.197	-0.038	0.037	46.559	66.60%	66.68%
		-3.366	4.309	2.919	0.703	-2.346	-0.400	5.226	2.024		
42	Wood and Products	-3.193	0.387	0.718	0.007	-0.017	-0.030	0.029	45.443	60.82%	63.59%
		-1.273	3.455	0.798	0.345	-0.213	-0.319	3.312	3.399		
45	Printing and Publishing	-0.871	0.753	-0.71	0.039	0.049	-0.016	0.018	2.514	92.35%	92.72%
		-0.126	7.680	-0.031	1.331	0.258	-0.113	5.400	1.488		
41	Chemicals, prod. and fibres	-5.362	0.438	1.305	-0.007	-0.058	-0.131	0.016	3.936	88.20%	91.79%
		-1.854	5.721	1.624	-0.118	-0.991	-1.079	5.387	0.563		
38	Rubber and Plastic	3.701	0.593	-1.144	-0.068	0.109	-0.001	0.022	23.375	63.35%	65.77%
		2.430	6.291	-2.379	-2.339	2.896	-0.006	3.442	2.043		
45	Mineral mat. and Prod.	-3.510	0.497	0.805	0.058	-0.013	-0.185	0.040	50.235	64.41%	66.03%
		-1.068	4.248	0.740	1.654	-0.149	-2.239	4.372	2.728		
98	Basic met. and prod.	-5.164	0.465	1.326	0.045	-0.058	-0.141	0.007	26.331	57.09%	58.84%
		-3.882	7.993	3.299	2.005	-1.877	-1.773	6.333	4.797		
122	Machinery excl. Electr.	-9.978	0.347	2.832	0.055	-0.180	-0.125	0.011	92.370	56.44%	59.40%
		-4.847	7.763	4.299	2.755	-3.459	-1.736	8.317	15.571		
101	Electr. and Opt. Eq.	-12.138	0.687	3.938	0.111	-0.302	-0.057	0.009	75.407	56.50%	60.71%
		-4.488	13.526	4.442	4.794	-4.180	-0.760	7.886	3.179		
18	Transport Eq.	1.793	0.531	-0.679	-0.043	0.081	-0.426	0.003	0.116	64.95%	58.10%
		4.144	1.672	-2.221	-0.684	2.353	-0.954	3.517	0.095		
7	Utilities	-1.769	0.799	0.502	-0.056	-0.007	-0.483	0.017	0.726	89.60%	84.50%
		-1.841	9.150	2.157	-5.013	-0.502	-1.250	3.322	1.032		
36	Extraction	-0.257	0.403	-0.202	0.036	0.066	-0.125	0.038	22.493	56.69%	57.33%
		-0.98	5.362	-0.266	0.775	1.183	-1.218	4.770	1.124		
66	Fumiture	-9.273	0.506	2.900	0.005	-0.213	-0.104	14.916	0.102	70.57%	70.79%
		-1.887	2.457	1.640	0.113	-1.359	-1.137	0.656	0.776		

Table 7. Romania: Explaining Efficiency Levels, 2005

firms	NACE	Const	LnK	LnL	LnK^2	LnL^2	Profitability	Size	Av Eff 2005
825	Food and Beverage	-7.091	0.346	1.810	0.032	-0.090	0.026	108.833	74.80
		-7.912	27.561	5.527	5.723	-4.260	17.510	12.691	
377	Textile and Apparel	-2.789	0.283	0.379	0.015	0.021	0.033	137.608	76.55
		-2.340	10.058	1.025	1.518	0.721	11.484	4.149	
102	Leather and Products	-1.052	0.377	0.042	-0.010	0.033	0.022	39.170	79.11
		-0.595	7.634	0.077	-0.514	0.794	4.693	1.897	
360	Wood and Products	-4.717	0.313	1.009	0.016	-0.027	0.030	12.772	76.69
		-5.158	11.067	3.573	1.601	-1.219	9.659	0.709	
157	Printing and Publishing	-5.240	0.309	1.097	0.033	-0.031	0.029	0.111	92.94
		-5.441	2.893	2.688	1.967	-0.770	0.891	0.014	
183	Chemicals, prod. and fibres	-5.061	0.393	1.238	0.042	-0.051	0.003	15.539	76.74
		-3.629	12.150	3.044	3.265	-1.709	3.707	1.874	
187	Rubber and Plastic	-6.066	0.464	1.499	0.064	-0.071	0.027	0.266	80.14
		-3.694	12.295	3.075	5.060	-1.967	7.924	0.995	
361	Mineral mat. and Prod.	-5.294	0.326	1.192	0.024	-0.040	0.034	42.844	81.37
		-6.594	17.707	4.850	4.096	-2.117	11.459	1.820	
716	Basic met. and prod.	-6.062	0.373	1.482	0.034	-0.067	0.003	28.627	77.63
		-9.230	20.479	7.580	5.961	-4.541	5.115	1.496	
426	Machinery excl. Electr.	-6.589	0.302	1.514	0.047	-0.063	0.022	13.102	83.69
		-7.828	15.066	6.111	5.484	-3.418	12.724	1.056	
205	Electr. and Opt. Eq.	-4.619	0.361	1.023	0.041	-0.035	0.021	11.820	90.90
		-3.572	9.758	2.588	3.487	-1.153	5.427	0.782	
236	Transport Eq.	-6.025	0.210	1.220	0.022	-0.033	0.021	5.892	93.59
		-6.110	6.695	4.161	2.633	-1.498	7.287	0.801	
97	Utilities	-8.273	0.252	2.046	0.044	-0.103	0.061	31.899	77.07
		-4.152	6.409	3.556	3.004	-2.411	6.193	1.947	
148	Extraction	-8.361	0.408	2.184	0.076	-0.118	0.025	0.158	81.48
		-7.781	13.394	6.517	6.528	-4.579	9.199	0.158	
298	Fumiture	-7.090	0.370	1.707	0.042	-0.082	0.028	8.691	89.57
		-9.362	11.640	7.386	4.151	-4.622	11.092	1.074	

Table 8. Pooling: Explaining Efficiency Levels Using Country Dummy

firms	NACE	Const	LnK	LnL	LnK^2	LnL^2	Country	Year 2004	Profitability	Size	Country	Av Eff
1055	Food and Beverage	-6.356	0.374	1.974	0.024	-0.109	4.436	-0.221	0.018	13.047	-4.542	7.92
		-9.194	26.262	8.213	4.838	-5.781	5.596	-3.639	24.130	12.723	-5.682	
663	Textile and Apparel	-4.364	0.227	1.243	-0.023	-0.063	2.811	0.033	0.004	106.44 5	-2.231	17.82
		-4.527	8.916	4.051	-2.716	-2.616	25.272	0.760	8.692	26.125	-21.177	
182	Leather and Products	-7.578	0.204	2.222	0.003	-0.137	0.994	-0.017	0.011	31.880	-0.365	29.54
		-7.752	6.337	7.023	0.343	-5.382	12.625	-0.353	6.033	24.053	-3.487	
186	Wood and Products	-3.957	0.450	0.973	0.022	-0.038	-0.086	-0.089	0.072	32.222	4.100	73.50
		-3.979	9.256	3.096	1.542	-1.538	-1.003	-1.00	5.255	1.842	2.574	
247	Printing and Publishing	-3.410	0.318	1.035	-0.002	-0.038	-0.032	-*0.040	0.015	18.235	0.578	34.02
		-1.990	7.119	2.425	-0.150	-1.248	-0.126	-0.224	6.995	4.115	1.958	
265	Chemicals, prod. and fibres	-0.683	0.417	1.215	0.041	-0.048	-4.610	-0.293	0.007	0.995	8.020	64.59
		0.327	13.429	3.169	3.103	-1.669	-3.109	-1.929	5.338	0.587	3.303	
263	Rubber and Plastic	-4.284	0.555	1.109	0.036	-0.051	0.033	-0.095	0.025	0.523	0.032	70.05
		-4.164	14.797	5.506	2.735	-2.081	0.217	-0.780	5.433	1.219	0.047	
451	Mineral mat. and Prod.	-4.043	0.298	1.060	0.016	-0.031	-0.412	-0.108	0.018	22.748	0.542	53.70
		-5.505	14.527	4.678	2.438	-1.806	-3.764	-1.384	9.645	5.434	5.101	
912	Basic met. and prod.	-4.846	0.382	1.266	0.035	-0.051	-0.583	-0.128	0.005	23.026	2.400	75.47
		-8.833	21.669	7.107	5.706	-6.765	-5.609	-1.785	8.491	2.718	9.121	
670	Machinery excl. Electr.	-6.236	0.337	1.496	0.047	-0.064	-0.168	-0.165	0.014	28.250	2.708	73.61
		-6.767	17.394	5.367	5.095	-3.054	-2.379	-2.584	9.165	2.027	4.153	
407	Electr. and Opt. Eq.	-1.443	0.373	0.258	0.006	0.018	-0.372	-0.007	0.006	49.352	2.698	66.92
		-1.161	11.564	0.679	0.576	0.597	-4.171	-0.084	6.404	5.529	8.823	
272	Transport Eq.	-4.734	0.222	0.914	0.007	-0.012	0.023	-0.349	0.004	2.641	0.147	73.79
		-4.812	6.252	3.120	0.709	-0.563	0.123	-2.532	4.412	0.899	0.647	
111	Utilities	-6.536	0.249	1.651	0.043	-0.068	-0.070	-0.490	0.039	2.299	-0.635	56.17
		-6.786	6.791	5.978	4.402	-3.475	-0.294	-2.205	6.958	1.950	1.942	
220	Extraction	-5.291	0.216	1.318	0.022	-0.039	-0.418	-0.119	0.023	11.095	0.212	48.63
		-4.834	7.886	3.918	2.272	-1.537	-2.506	-1.168	15.534	2.162	1.399	
430	Fumiture	-2.653	0.375	1.215	0.007	-0.049	-0.130	-0.182	0.016	12.459	0.305	7.04
		-1.828	10.265	3.280	0.450	-1.725	-1.294	-2.495	12.945	1.961	2.420	

5. Conclusions and policy implications

Using the concept of stochastic production frontier, we estimated firms' technical efficiencies for 15 industrial sectors in Bulgaria in the period of 2003-2005 and Romania in 2004-2005. The results of this exercise can be summarized as follows:

1. Efficiency levels are widely dispersed with the Extraction branch displaying high efficiency levels in both countries. This sector's priority status under the former system may

account for this observation.

2. In both countries, the bulk of value added is produced by relatively more efficient producers.

3. The biggest firms are found to be systematically more efficient. Combined with the previous observation, this indicates that big enterprises in the two countries are both efficient and account for. a significant fraction of the countries' value added. The Ickes-Ryterman hypotheses which states that the bigger industrial enterprises are also more efficient because of their priority status under the plan, is thus supported by our statistical evidence.

4. Higher efficiency levels are associated with more profitability in both countries. This relationship is found to be robust to model Specifications and is always statistically significant.

Perhaps one of the most important challenges of any research on transition issues is to gain insights into the desirable economic policies which could be applied by the reformers. We focus on two issues of the economic policy pursued in the transition countries dismantling of large enterprises into a number of smaller production units (1) end progressive taxation (2).

1. *Breaking so larger enterprises.* Not uncommon is the opinion that big enterprises in the Soviet type economies were largely inefficient because their existence was motivated by political rather than economic reasons. However, in accordance with. the Ickes-Ryterman model, the negative relationship between firms' size (measured as market share of the enterprises) and efficiency was found to be 'positive in all sectors. Depending on specification of the model, this positive relationship is significantly positive in a number of branches in our sample ranging from half to the whole. Our estimates thus indicate that reorganizing large enterprises in the two countries into the smaller production units does not necessarily pay off, at least in terms of technical efficiency levels of the firms.

2. *Progressive taxation.* Dee of the reasons why the relationship between firms' profitability and efficiency ran be negative might be the profit levelling put into practice through the use of progressive taxation mechanism. It might be regarded as a market reforms version of the ratchet effect which plagued the Soviet type economies. Under progressive taxation system, the higher profits of more efficient enterprises are taken away from the more efficient enterprises and can later be used by the state authorities to bail out the less efficient firms which is essentially the ratchet effect. Our evidence of a positive relationship between firms' profitability and efficiency suggests that under progressive taxation mechanism, namely the most efficient firms are carrying the tax burden. For that reason, levying lump sum taxes in the early stages .of transition rather than the progressive ones may speed up the transition process by providing more incentives for the firms to be efficient.

References

A. Richter & M. Schaffer. (1996). `The performance of De Novo private finns in Russian manufacturing", *CERT discussion paper*. No. 96/10, March.

Aghion and Blanchard. (1994). "On the Speed of Transition in Central and Eastern Europe",

NBER *macroeconomic annual*.

B. De Borger, K. Kerstens, W. Moesen & J. Vanneste. (1994). "Explaining differences in productive efficiency: an application to Belgian municipalities", *Public Choice,* 80(3-4), pp. 339-358…

B. W. Ickes & R. Ryterman. (1997). "Entry without exit: economic selection under socialism", *World Bank mimeo*.

D. Aigner, C. Lovell-and P. Schmidt. (1997). "Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production functin models", *Journal of Econometrics,* 6, ρρ. 21-37.

D. Kemme & S. Neufeld. (1991). 'The estimation of technical efficiency in polish industry: 1961-1986", *Economic Systems,* 15, 1, April, pp. 43-56.

G. Battese and T. Coelli. (1995)."A model for technical inefficiency effects in a stochastic frontier production function", *Empirical Economics,* 20, ρρ. 325-332.

G. Brock. (1997). "Are Russian Firms Efficient?", *Journal of International and Comparative Economics,* 5, pp. 45-66

GE Battese and TJ Coelli. (1993)."A stochastic fontier production function incorρorating a model for technical inefficiency effects", *Working Papers in Econometrics and Applied Statistics,* No 69, Department o Econometrics, University of New England Armidale.

H. Hughes & P. Hare. (1994). 'The international competitiveness of industries in Bulgaria. Czechoslovakia, Hungary and,Poland". *Oxford Economic Papers,* 46 , pp.200-221.

J. Brads, A. King & C. Ma. (1997). "Industrial economics of the transition: determinants of enterprise efficiency in Czechoslovakia and Hungary", *Oxford Economic Papers,* 49, pp. 104-127.

J. Breda & A. King. (1994). "Differences in the technical and allocative efficiency of private and socialized agricultural units in pre-transformation Poland", *Economic Systems,* 18, 4, December, pp. 363-376

J. Earle, S. Estńn & L. Leschenko. (1996). "Ownership structures, patterns of control and enterprise behavior in Russia", *Centre for Economic Performance,* LSE, DP 315.

J. Konings.(1997). "Firm growth and ownership in transition countries", *Economics Letters,* 3, September.

J. Kornai. (1986). 'The Soft Budget Constraint", *Kyklos,* 39, pp.3-30.

K. Kalijaran. (1981). "An econometric analysis of yield variability in paddy production", *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics,* 29, pp. 283-294.

M. Boycko, A. Shleife & R. Vishny. (1996). "A theory of privatisation", *The Economic Journal,* 106, March, pp. 30-319.

M. Pitt & L. Lee. (1981). "Measurement απd Sources of Technical Inefficiency in the

Indonesian Weaving Industry", *Journal of Development Economics,* 9, pp. 43-64.

R. Hoffer & J. Payne. (1993). "Efficiency in social versus private agricultural production: the case of Yugoslavia", *Review of Economics and Statistics,*pp. 153-157.

S. Chu, D. Aigner & M. Frankel. (1970). "On the log-quadratic law of production", *Southern Economic Joνrnal* 4, pp. 32-39

V. Danilin, I. Materav & S. Rosefrelde, C. (1985). "Measuring enterprise efficiency in the Soviet Union: a stochastic frontier analysis", *Economics,* 52, pp. 225-233

W. Meeusen & J. van den Broeck. (1977). "Efficiency estimation from Cobb-Douglas production functions with composed error", *International Economic Review,* 18, ρρ.435-444.

X. Liu, 7. Zheng & A. Bigsten. (1995). "Ownership structure απd technical efficiency in Chinese enterprises (1986-90)", *Gothenburg University-School of Economics and Commercial Law,* Memorandum No 217, October.

Notes

Note1. Hofler and Payne (1993) find for Yugoslavia that the private sector agricultural firms display higher efficiency levels than the social sector.

Note 2. This index various between 1 and 5, where 5 marks the highest development similar as a developed industrial economy.

Note 3. Early contributors include Pitt and Lee (1981), Kalijaran (1981) and in the contenx of public econoics, De Borger, Kerstens, Moesen, Vanneste (1994) and in the transition contenxe.g. Brada et al. (1997).