

:

*

:

.1

.(WTO)

:

:

.2005/9/21

2005/4/5

*

/

(Porter, 1990)

(Porter, 1990)

:
(Differentiation)

(Focus)

:
(Cost Leadership)

.1

.2

.3

(Rose,

1978)

(Schonberger, 1985)

.2

)

.(

:

:

)

79

(Stevenson, 1982)

.(2003

1972

% 0.66

%1

22

.(Oughton, 1997)

(Nelson, 1989)

1983-1961

%.9.7

1990-1966

(Amjad, 1977)

%1

()

%0.7

%1

(Yvonne et al., 1995)

%0.53

(Bloodgood

(Kristin, 2004)

380

and Katz, 2004)

%2.5

2003

%4.8

1995

(1994)

%73

(Weiss, 1992)

%.30

%56

(2000)

%69

%50

(2002)

-1989

1996

(Mahdavi, 2002)

-1977

13

(Carbo, 1989) .1999

1980 1970

:

(Wendy et al., 2001)

14

.1990-1970

%1

(Charles, 2001)

%0.253 %0.308

7

12

%1

.1995-1982

%.0.217

(Ehsan and Lawrence, 2002)

	(2002)		
13 (Mahdavi, 2002)	%1	.%2.5	
	(1990)		1986
(Feinberg, 1989)		3.8	14
-1974	84		26
	1987		
%10	(1997)		
. %1.6			
(2002)			
	1997-1976	%100	
		%65.8 %12.4	
.%12 -			-1
			-2
.3			
			-3
			:
			:
P= ATC (1+ PC)1			
	P :		(Appreciation)
	ATC	(Depreciation)	
	PC		
1			
		(Guncavdi and	
			Orbay, 2002)
	:		
P = {(F.C + Σ Pi Mi +O)/Q} .(1+PC.2		1993-1983	28
	F.C :		
.i Pi i	Mi		
	O	(Wisdom, 2003)	

$$\sum P_i M_i = L.W + E_W.Q.P_W + E_E.Q.P_E + E_F.Q.P_F + E_{ML}.Q.P_{ML} + E_{MI}.Q.(P_i\$/\$) + M_i.t \quad \dots 5 \quad (PC)$$

$$\begin{matrix} Q & W & L: \\ & E_W & P_w \\ E_F & P_E & E_E \\ & E_{ML} & P_F \\ & P_{ML} & \\ P_i\$ & & E_{MI} \\ & \$ & \\ t & & M_i \end{matrix} \quad (5) \quad (P_i M_i)$$

$$(P \$) \quad .(\$)$$

$$M_i \quad t \quad E_{Mi} = M_i / Q \quad \dots 3$$

$$(CU) \quad M_i \quad Q \quad E_{Mi} \quad i \quad M_i = E_{Mi} \cdot Q \quad \dots 4 \quad (4)$$

CU = Q/QE 6

Q=WH_{ac}/E_{acwh} 7

QE = WH/E_{wh} ...8

WH= LD.HD.L ...9

)

(

(6 5)

QE Q

:WH

(LD)

9

(HD)

.L

$P = \{(F.C + L.W + W_E.Q.P_W + E_E.Q.P_E + F_E.Q.P_F + M_{LE}.Q.P_L + M_{IE}.Q.(P_i\$/\$) + M_{I,t+O}) / CU.QE\} \cdot (1+PC) \dots 10$

:WH_{ac}

:E_{wh}

10

E_{acwh}

2003

(1)

(1)

(2003)

0.9		0.16	
1425	/	25	/
1.5		300	
950	/	8	
0.4		13.68	
0.42	/ ³	0.4	
0.3	³ /	291500	
540	/	57	
0.066	/	1590	
198	/	0.65	
0.027	/	250	/
		220880	

(/ 1698.4)

10

/ 1731

/ 1698.4

(1)

/ 1716.3

10

(2)

(2)

1731	1716.3	1703.7	0.37	0.4	280	300
1731	1716.3	1705.6	0.365	0.4	15	13.68

(2)

20

0.37 0.4

/ 1468.7 1464.2

/ 1703.7 1698.4

15 13.68

0.4

0.365

/ 1470.3 1464.2

.1705.6 1698.4

()

10

(3)

(3)

1731	1716.3	1707.9	262.5	250	
1731	1716.3	1767.9	1496.3	1425	
1731	1716.3	1717.3	0.715	0.65	
1731	1716.3	1767.9	0.945	0.9	
1731	1716.3	1797.6	1.4	1.5	
1731	1716.3	1748	0.45	0.4	

(3)

0.45 0.4 %5 -1
 49.6 9.5
 1748 0.4 1698.4 69.2
 .045 .%5

-2

%10 18.9 69.2

.%11 / 1.4 1.5 -3
 950 / 1018
 10 1698.4 / 1797.6

(4) -4

(4)
 (2003)

1731	1716.3	1704.6	0.054	0.027
1731	1716.3	1698.5	0.5	0.3
1731	1716.3	1719.7	0.1	0.066
1731	1716.3	1699.3	225	198
1731	1716.3	1698.5	0.6	0.42
1731	1716.3	1699.2	550	540

(4)

1704.6 1698.4 :
 / 0.054 0.027 :
 : 0.3
 1689.4 ³ / 0.5
 1719.7 1698.4 1698.5
 / 0.1 0.066

%60

0.0001

.3

0.024 0.004

.4

()

.4

% 26
%31

%12

.5

:

.1

)

(

%73

%81 (2000)
%78

%56
%50
(1997)

:

.1

%53

.2

.4

(

(

(

.5

.2

.6

.3

.21 2003

2002

1997

1997-1976

.884-871 3 18

.85-83

2002

2003

18

1996-1989:

2002

.238-223 1

:

1995

1994

11

.99-85 25

.211-171 3

2000

1997

:

2

.23

.198-165 2

2002

Bloodgood, James and Jeffrey Katz. 2004. Manufacturing Capacity, Market Share and Competitiveness, *Competitiveness Review*, 14(1and2): 60-69.

.70-51 67 24

- Porter, M. 1990. The Competitive Advantage of Nations.
- Randy A. Nelson. 1989. On The Measurement of Capacity Utilization, *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, XXXVII(3): 273-286.
- Rashid, Amjad. 1977. Profitability and Industrial Concentration in Pakistan, *Journal of Development Studies*, 13(3): 181-199.
- Richard J, Schonberger. 1985. Operation Management, USA, Texas, Business Pub. Co., 35-42.
- Rodney, Stevenson. 1982. X-Inefficiency and Interfirm Rivalry: Evidence from the Electric Utility Industry, *Land Economics*, 58(1): 52-65.
- Rose, S. 1978. The Secret of Japan Export Progress, *Fortune*, 30, 56-62.
- Wendy Carlin, et al. 2001. Export Market Performance of OECD Countries: an Empirical Examination of the Role of Cost Competitiveness, *The Economic Journal*, III, 128-162.
- Weiss, John. 1992. Trade Policy Reform and Performance in Manufacturing: Mexico 1975-1988, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 29(1): 1-23.
- Wisdom. H.W. 2003. The Effect of Exchange Rates on Southern Pine Exports, *Forest Product Journal*, 53(10): 19-24.
- Yvonne M. Prince and A. Roy Thurik. 1995. Do Small Firms Price-Cost Margins Follow Those of Large Firms? *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 47(4): 321-327.
- Carbo, Vittorio and McNelis, Paul. 1989. The Pricing of Manufacturing Goods During Trade Liberalization: Evidence from Chile, Israel and Korea, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71(3): 491-500.
- Charles, K. and Paul, Seabright. 2001. Competition, Privatisation and Productive Efficiency: Evidence from the Airline Industry, *Economic Journal*, 3 (473): 591-619.
- Ehsan, U. Choudhri and Lawrence L. Schembri. 2002. Productivity Performance and International Competitiveness: an Old Test Reconsidered, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 35(2): 341-362.
- Feinberg, Robert. 1989. The Effect of Foreign Exchange Movements on U.S. Domestic Prices, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71(3): 505-511.
- Guncavdi, Oner and Orbay, Benan. 2002. Exchange Rate, Market Structure and Price-Cost Margins: Evidence from a Developing Country, *Applied Economics*, 34, 783-789.
- Kristin, Forbes. 2004. U.S. Manufacturing: Challenges and Recommendations, *Business Economics*, 30-37.
- Mahdavi, Saeid. 2002. The Response of the US Export Prices to Change in the Dollars Effective Exchange Rate: Further Evidence from Industry Level Data, *Applied Economics*, 34, 2115-2125.
- Oughton, C. 1997. Competitiveness Policy in the 90s. *The Economic Journal*, 107 (444): 1484-1485.

Evaluation of Price Competitiveness: Quantitative Approach

*Said Al-Tarawneh**

ABSTRACT

This study aims to formulate a mathematical model to analyze the factors that affect price competitiveness. The model takes into account external factors such as: government policy toward exchange rate, tax custom rate, and energy prices. The model also considers internal factors such as: capacity utilization rate, and input efficiency use. The results revealed that both factors affect price competitiveness. The study investigates that enhancing competitiveness required:

- 1) Reconsideration of both tax custom rate and energy prices.
- 2) Increasing the use efficiency of production inputs and the level of capacity utilization.

KEYWORDS: Price Competitiveness, Energy Cost and Competitiveness, Government Policy and Competitiveness, Capacity Utilization and Competitiveness.

* Department of Economics, Faculty of Business Administration, Mu'tah University, Al-Karak, Jordan. Received on 5/4/2005 and Accepted for Publication on 21/9/2005.