TÜRK
TARIM ve DOĞA BİLİMLERİ
DERGİSİ

TURKISH
JOURNAL of AGRICULTURAL
and NATURAL SCIENCES

www.turkjans.com

Regional Concentration of Turkish Dried Fruits Exports

[a]Hasan ARISOY*, [a]Zeki BAYRAMOĞLU, [a]Yusuf ÇELİK, [b]Osman Orkan ÖZER

[a]Department of Agricultural Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey
[b]Department of Agricultural Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, Adnan Menderes University, Aydin, Turkey
*Corresponding author: arisoy@selcuk.edu.tr

Received: 03.01.2014 Received in Revised Form: 25.03.2014 Accepted: 27.03.2014

Abstract

Agricultural sector has also been affected by the globalization like the rest of the world. The increase in the world trade has continued. The monitoring of the development in dried fruits' trade which is one of the most important sectors in Turkish agricultural exports is very crucial. Raisins, dried apricots and figs are in the scope of this study. The aim of this study is to examine the changes in the value and direction of trade flow between Turkey and the countries which import dried fruits from Turkey. Trade Intensity Analysis Method which presents the course of trade flow among countries is used in the study. The study indicate that Turkey has not kept its export share for the raisins market in Holland, dried figs in England and dried apricots in France and England. The main reason of loss is that because other countries have accessed to their markets. This outcame implies that Turkey cannot effectively use its advantages in these markets.

Keywords: Dried fruits, trade intensity analysis method, concentration coefficient, Turkey

Türkiye'nin Kuru Meyve İhracatında Bölgesel Yoğunlaşma Durumu

Özet

Son yıllarda dünyayı etkisi altına alan küreselleşme dalgasından tarım sektörü de etkilenmiştir. Uluslararası tarım ürünleri ticaretindeki artış devam etmektedir. Türkiye'nin tarım ürünleri ihracatındaki en önemli fasıllardan biri olan kuru meyvelerin ticaretindeki gelişmelerin izlenmesi de son derece önemlidir. Araştırma kapsamına kuru üzüm, kuru kayısı ve kuru incir alınmıştır. Bu çalışma, Türkiye ile kuru meyveleri ithal eden ülkeler arasındaki ticaret akımının değerinde ve yönünde görülen değişimi incelemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmada ikili ticari ilişkilerin seyrini ortaya koyan Ticaret Yoğunlaşması Analiz Yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Sonuç olarak Türkiye son yıllarda kuru üzüm ticaretinde Hollanda, kuru incir ticaretinde İngiltere, kuru kayısı ticaretinde Fransa ve İngiltere pazarlarındaki payını aynı oranda koruyamamıştır. Bunun başlıca nedeni bu ülkelerin piyasalarına artık başka ülkelerin de girmiş olmasıdır. Bu durum Türkiye'nin gerçekten etkili olduğu pazarlarda avantajını kullanamadığını göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kuru meyveler, ticaret yoğunlaşması analiz yöntemi, yoğunlaşma katsayısı, Türkiye

Introduction

Although the development of countries is identified with the industrialization, the main factor in development is the trade of the goods produced. It means that a country first should produce goods and then sell them for its development (Eraktan, 2001).

Foreign trade policy comprises all kinds of intervention that affects the volume, composition and direction of the foreign trade of a country. On the other hand, the direction of foreign trade refers to countries or country groups that one country trade, whether or not this trade changes overtime and concentrates on certain countries or varies on the basis of countries. Countries can intervene in foreign trade to change its direction by using foreign trade policies. These interventions can be changed according to the foreign trade privileges of countries and their dependence on the crops they cannot produce or can purchase economically (Seymen et al., 2009).

World trade increases because of growing world population and demand growth based on

increased purchasing power in developing economies. World Trade Organization (WTO) estimates that world trade will increase by 5.6% in the end of 2013. Agricultural sector has been affected by the wave of globalization in the world so international agricultural trade has been increased. The world agricultural trade volume is increased by 2.5 fold in the last 10 years (2001-2010) like total world trade volume (FAOSTAT, 2013). There are unbalances between the supply and demand of agricultural products in the world. Moreover, developed countries protect their agricultural production by the measures of distorted international price mechanisms. Agricultural trade is negatively affected by these reasons but WTO sanctions on free trade are getting increased. Thus, it is estimated that the world agricultural trade will increase in next years, too.

Turkey designates a production strategy directed to export. The export of Turkey in 2011 is 135 billion dollars (TSI, 2013). The Turkish exports target is to reach 500 billion dollars in 2023, Turkish Republic's 100th anniversary. This strategy document is prepared in accordance with Turkey's commitments to the Customs Union between Turkey and EU, and WTO and Turkey's responsibilities determined by regional and bilateral trade agreements. Thus, it is targeted that 0.74% in 2013 which is the share of Turkey from the world trade will increase to 1.46% in 2023 (Official Gazette, 2012).

The world total dried fruits export value is 2.18 billion dollars. Turkish export value is 379 million dollars, 17.4% share from world trade. (ITS, 2013). Turkey is the main exporter of the most of dried fruits. The share of Turkish dried apricots from the world export value is 82%, dried fig 52% and raisins 28% (UNSD, 2012).The protein, carbohydrates, vitamins and minerals in dried fruits have great nutritional value so the developed countries demand dried fruits with increasing rates. Therefore, in recent years, the imports of these products have increased. In the last 10 years period (2001-2010), the import value of dried apricots increased by 3.2, dried fig 2.6 and raisins 2.5 fold. (UNSD, 2012).

The share of the dried fruits which are the one of the most important sectors is 8% in Turkish agricultural exports (TSI, 2012). Turkey has the comparative advantage in producing dried fruits in the world.Today's international trade is established on Ricardo's theory of comparative advantage. (Seyidoğlu, 1999; Utkulu, 2005; Yılmaz and Özken, 2012). Ricardo's theory defenses that a country must specialize on the products that it has more advantage in producing them. Thus, the welfares of both countries individually and of the whole world will increase (Ricardo, 1971). According to Ricardo, one country must specialize on the products that it has comparative advantage, produce and export them.

Turkey is the leader of the world in dried apricot and fig production. The leadership in the production of raisins has changed between the USA and Turkey along the years. The production share of Turkey from world dried apricot production is 66% (120 thousand tons), dried fig production 50% (57 thousand tons) and raisins production 30% (258 thousand tons) (Anonymous, 2012 a/b/c).

Turkey generally exports dried fruits to European Countries. After all, as Turkey's trade with the EU is examined, the share of export value of the products like dried fruits that Turkey has competitive power is very high. The increase in the world trade in recent years has caused to other exporting countries to be directed to the world markets and so competition has increased. Especially, dried fruits production and exports of European countries affect Turkish exports. For example, the dried fruits exports of Spain increased by 76% in last 5 years (2008-2012) (ITS, 2013). Küçükkiremitçi et.al. (2010) stressed that Turkey's biggest competitors in vegetable and fruit sectors are European countries such as Spain, Netherland. Therefore, it cannot solely be enough to present that the changes in the share of dried fruits that are important for exports in Turkey's agricultural trade. Within the increasing of world trade, to make clear the volume and direction of export concentration of Turkey is very important.Erkan (2011) in his study searched the competitive power of the conventional export products of Turkey. He used Balassa and Vollrath indexes. He showed that Turkey has competitive advantage in figs, raisins, hazelnuts, pistachios and dried apricots but competitive power decreased relatively. Türkekul (2009) stressed the importance of the standards directed to the health, quality and food safety to compete with European markets.

The aim of this study is to examine the change in value and direction of the trade between Turkey and the countries that import dried fruit by years. Thus, the Turkey's market share and the changes in this share can be determined in the course of time. The change for preferring Turkey's products in time will be presented.

Material and Method

Material

The main material of the study is the data from the United Nations Trade Statistics database (UNSD).

Table 1. Raisins

	Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
(000 $)	World Import value	707405	599666	601997	691263	864890	910111	1022301	1108749	1350776	1260752	1499297
	Turkey Export Value	196674	163051	156258	183960	231400	239729	289231	316827	349539	407512	417598
	England's Import Value	132071	113407	109662	126983	156776	159598	169829	187498	223955	205709	251558
	Turkey's Exports to England	48824	39991	37293	44482	58727	67296	76639	84652	85297	89804	113001
	Germany's Import Value	67474	58866	63548	70901	96631	88975	105393	118520	147220	127149	162412
	Turkey's Exports to Germany	30053	26901	27036	34140	45329	44251	52833	52635	52289	67719	72650
	Netherland's Import Value	48738	40063	40850	48008	58654	53103	64075	79778	94663	88533	110373
	Turkey's Exports to Netherland	27291	22739	21614	23910	32006	27240	36279	42065	45816	51913	54845
	Russia's Import Value	22328	20592	17469	21830	24418	28749	42851	54370	71218	91566	96771
	Turkey's Exports to Russia	1301	1693	1844	2651	2939	2859	4110	4631	6348	9442	6761
	Japan's Import Value	41543	36063	38653	40537	54975	57837	53964	59992	64896	57711	73828
	Turkey's Exports to Japan	988	877	722	1000	1516	2740	3962	3138	3061	2748	2792

United Nations Statistics Division, 2012

Moreover, the documents of the Institutions such as United Nations, the Organization of Food and Agriculture (FAOSTAT), Foreign Trade Undersecretariat (MOE), Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI) and Export Developing Center (IGEME) the information obtained from interviews with the authorities are used. Besides, the current scientific studies are referred to reviewing the literature.

Method

The similar methods are used for making analyses of international trade developments (Trade Intensity Analysis, Export Similarity Index, Balassa Index, Vollrath Index, Gravitational Model...). In this study, Trade Intensity Analysis Method was used. This method delivers the change of trade share and intensities between exporting and importing countries. The concept of trade intensities is based on the assumption that trade flows depend on the "push" of the exporting country, the "pull" of the importing country and on particular factors regulating bilateral relations (Froment and Zighera, 1964; Theil, 1967; Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften, 1969; ECE, 1973; Nagy, 1979; Eraktan, 1988). Thus, the contribution to the future planning of trading countries can be provided by determining the stability and continuity. Not only the trade between two countries but also commercial trade change of product groups can be determined by Trade Intensity Analysis (Francescon and Nagy, 1988).

The Similarity Export Index developed by Finger and Kreinin (1979) is used to determine which country or country groups are the closest rivals of a country or country groups in respect to product composition in targeted markets. Moreover, the change of export similarity of two countries or country groups between each other can be examined overtime by using The Similarity Export Index. The most important difference of this index from others is they make using the international standardized trade data compulsory (Ferman et.al., 2004; Altay, 2008).

Balassa (1965) calculated the comparative advantage based on the observable or observed trade relations by Balassa Index named after him. This index targets to determine empirically and comparatively the weak or strong sectors of countries with reference to the export share of countries (Hinloopen and Marrewijk, 2004). Since this index is based on the data after trade between countries, it comprises the effect of the nonprice factors, as much as relative prices which reflect to comparative advantages between countries (Li and Bender, 2002). Moreover, this index ensure examining the change in the relative factor density and productivity that countries own in the context of exporting products (Batra and Khan, 2005).

Vollrath (1991) suggested three alternative methods directed to the calculation of comparative advantages of countries. The first one of these is the Relative Trade Advantage (RTA). RTA is defined by the both exports and imports data. RTA is the difference between the Relative Export Advantage (RXA) which is equal to Balassa Index and Relative Import Advantage (RMA) which is similar to Balassa Index (Fertö and Hubbart, 2002). RXA is the ratio of export share of a country from world markets in a certain product to the export share of this country from world markets in all products (Frohberg and Hartmann, 1997). These characteristics of the index exclude the total exports (world export) of the countries and products in question and so prevent the recount of the country and product in question (Altay and Gürpınar, 2008). Relative Import Advantage Index is very similar to Relative Export Advantage. The basic difference between them is that import is placed in the equation instead of export. Vollrath stated that the most proper index is the "RXA" in terms of using them among the indexes developed by him since RXA make possible comparing competitive powers based on export performances the same targeted markets (Togan, 1993; Altay, 2008).

Trade Intensity Analysis method is used in order to search the world trade density for the chosen dried fruits (**dried apricot, dried fig, raisins**), presenting the form, value and direction of trade flow. With this way, the densities in the countries which Turkey trades and the changes in this area are examined. The criteria in prospect to choose the countries is the most crucial importers for every product in 2010 and their share of exports from Turkey.

The model depends on the assumption that importer country's export ratio is fixed. If this fixed ratio change in the course of time then it is considered that there is some factors here (Froment and Zighera, 1964).

Trade Concentration (territorialism) Coefficient = Xij * Xk / Xi * Xj

Xij =the export value of exporting country for importing country

Xk =the world export value of the product in question

Xi= the total export value of the product of exporting country in question

Xj= the total import value of the product of importing country in question

If both the exporter and importer countries are not affected by the structural and regional effects, the share of exporter country in importer

country and the share of importing country from total world trade in the product in question do not change. If the increase of the realized world trade share of exporting country is more than necessary, it shows that importing country the competition variable as a trading partner enhances its attitude and interest in behalf of exporting country.

Concentration coefficient between two countries are found by the share of realized world trade divided by the share of expected world trade and this coefficient increased in the course of time shows the development of trade relationship in time dimension. That the concentration coefficients are bigger than 1 shows that the importer country theoretically tends to the product of exporter country above the theoretically expected ratio.

Table 2. The concentration coefficients of Turkey in raisins

Years	England	Germany	Netherland	Russia	Japan
2000	1.33	1.60	2.01	0.21	0.09
2001	1.30	1.68	2.09	0.30	0.09
2002	1.31	1.64	2.04	0.41	0.07
2003	1.32	1.81	1.87	0.46	0.09
2004	1.40	1.75	2.04	0.45	0.10
2005	1.60	1.89	1.95	0.38	0.18
2006	1.60	1.77	2.00	0.34	0.26
2007	1.58	1.55	1.85	0.30	0.18
2008	1.47	1.37	1.87	0.34	0.18
2009	1.35	1.65	1.81	0.32	0.15
2010	1.61	1.61	1.78	0.25	0.14

Results

Raisins

According to the United Nations data, the value of world imports of raisins in 2010 is 1.5 billion dollars. The major importers of raisins are England (252 million $), Germany (162 million $), Netherland, (110 million $), Russia (97 million $) and Japan (74 million $). In other words, these countries are important markets for world producers.

The first five exporting countries of raisins are Turkey (418 million $), the USA (332 million $), Iran (319 million $), Chile (141 million $) and South Africa (80 million $).

Turkey exports raisins to a lot of countries but the countries that are important for Turkey are chosen and their trading density with Turkey is presented in this paper.

Raisins imports in the world have had a fast increasing trend. Concordantly, import values of countries like England and export values of countries like Turkey have increased. In the last period, the increase in Turkey's export value is the same as World's import value. This increase was 112% between 2000 and 2010. In this period the England market of Turkey also increased. While the imports of England increased by 90%, the exports of Turkey to England increased by 131% (Table 1).

There is a huge raisins trade between Turkey and England. The share of world trade of Turkey's raisins exports to England is always above the estimates. The calculated concentration coefficients show this increase in the trade density between Turkey and England. This coefficient reached up to 1.61 in 2010 (Table 2).

The other countries that Turkey imports raisins are Germany, Netherland, Russia and Japan. In recent years, the share of world trade of Turkey’s raisins exports to Germany is above the estimates (Table 1). The trade density been the two countries is continuing but there is not any sharp increase or decrease in trade density. Concentration coefficient was 1.60 in 2000 and 1.61 in 2010 (Table 2).

Table 3. Dried apricot

Years	(000 $)											
	World Import Value	Turkey Export Value	Russia's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to Russia	The USA's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to the USA	England's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to England	Germany's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to Germany	France's Import value	Turkey's Exports to France
2000	161 739	109 991	18 133	5 094	32 646	28 363	17 307	12 433	12 642	9 207	12 743	11 939
2001	132 078	88 106	16 121	5 297	21 613	18 579	15 377	10 507	10 736	9 167	9 569	8 555
2002	160 700	117 872	9 464	2 929	31 414	28 351	18 308	13 124	16 278	12 407	15 873	14 376
2003	194 305	150 343	8 019	6 195	37 212	34 492	23 852	16 951	18 384	14 218	19 571	17 719
2004	244 999	197 704	10 032	14 537	44 748	37 694	34 626	26 326	22 602	17 197	26 589	24 852
2005	240 313	179 735	16 552	16 807	36 403	31 450	31 827	20 864	23 325	16 420	23 763	19 012
2006	251 395	194 364	27 677	23 795	39 693	33 867	30 703	19 041	22 387	15 725	21 169	15 967
2007	294 565	236 021	32 250	29 545	43 327	39 446	32 500	22 370	29 401	23 407	24 855	19 467
2008	393 339	313 496	55 856	42 943	51 275	47 852	41 367	28 674	32 484	27 122	35 822	27 643
2009	380 184	278 866	77 554	31 958	46 481	42 057	33 951	23 568	33 841	28 143	27 198	23 069
2010	427 882	350 602	83 510	43 192	54 632	57 468	38 723	28 311	36 798	35 180	34 274	29 558

United Nations Statistics Division, 2012

The share of world trade from Turkey's raisins exports to Russia and Japan is below the estimates (Table 1). The trade density between these two important importer countries is below the expectation but the trade volume with Japan that is under the expectation has increased in recent years.

Although the raisins trade between Turkey and Netherland has increased, the trade density has decreased in recent years. While the share from world imports of Netherland increases, Turkey's contribution to the world exports has increased (Table 1). Moreover, the trade between Turkey and Netherland has increased but according to the calculated concentration coefficients, the trade density between Turkey and Netherland has not increased in recent years. The concentration coefficient decreased from 2.01 in 2000 to 1.78 in 2010 (Table 2).

Table 4. The concentration coefficients of Turkey in dried apricot

Years	Russia	USA	England	Germany	France
2000	0.41	1.28	1.06	1.07	1.38
2001	0.49	1.29	1.02	1.28	1.34
2002	0.42	1.23	0.98	1.04	1.23
2003	1.00	1.20	0.92	1.00	1.17
2004	1.80	1.04	0.94	0.94	1.16
2005	1.36	1.16	0.88	0.94	1.07
2006	1.11	1.10	0.80	0.91	0.98
2007	1.14	1.14	0.86	0.99	0.98
2008	0.96	1.17	0.87	1.05	0.97
2009	0.56	1.23	0.95	1.13	1.16
2010	0.63	1.28	0.89	1.17	1.05

Dried apricots

According to the United Nations data, the value of world imports of dried apricots in 2010 is 428 million dollars. The major importers of dried apricots are Russia (84 million $), USA (55 million $), England (39 million $), Germany (37 million $), France (34 million $).

The first five exporting countries of dried apricots are Turkey (350 million $), Germany (11 million $), USA (7 million $) and South Africa (6 million $).

Dried apricot imports of the world have had a fast increasing trend. Concordantly, import values of countries like Russia and export values of countries like Turkey have increased. In the last period, the increase in Turkey's export value is more than that of World's import value. This increase was 165% between 2000 and 2010. In this period, the Russian market for Turkey also increased. While the imports of Russia from Turkey increased by 361%, the exports of Turkey to Russia increased by 748% (Table 3).

There is a huge apricot trade between Turkey and Russia but trade concentration has fluctuated over time. While the calculated trade concentration coefficients were high for some years, they were below the expectations for some years. The trade concentration coefficient in dried apricots became 0.63 in 2010 (Table 4).

The other countries to which Turkey imports dried apricots are the USA, England, Germany and France. Turkey's dried apricot exports to all these countries have increased, paralleling to the increased world apricot trade but concentration coefficient has a decreasing trend in the apricot trade with England and France. The trade concentration coefficient between Turkey and England decreased from 1.06 in 2000 to 0.89 in 2010 in England and from 1.38 to 1.05 in France (Table 4).

There is not much change in trade density between Turkey and USA. Although there is not much trade relations between Turkey and Germany but trade concentration.

Dried figs

According to the United Nations data, the value of world imports of dried figs in 2010 is 353 million dollars. The major importers of dried figs are France (51 million $), Germany (49 million $), Italy (20 million $) and England (15 million $).

The first five exporting countries of dried figs are Turkey (185 million $), USA (22 million $), Iran (19 million $), Netherland (16 million $) and Germany (11 million $).

Table 5. Dried fig

Years	(000 $)									
	World Import Value	Turkey Export Value	France's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to France	Germany's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to Germany	Italy's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to Italy	England's Import Value	Turkey's Exports to England
2000	142 002	67 793	20 623	12 028	18 909	12 715	11 421	6 654	7 602	4 074
2001	138 415	72 928	22 829	14 291	19 478	13 642	9 818	7 476	6 234	2 099
2002	152 840	78 275	23 905	13 326	23 693	16 960	13 358	10 136	6 865	1 717
2003	176 023	89 438	27 484	16 769	25 602	15 819	13 940	10 102	9 877	3 159
2004	195 788	99 240	30 585	19 734	28 543	17 029	12 575	8 403	11 668	4 192
2005	229 729	117 675	34 243	21 928	30 225	20 409	14 173	10 245	12 230	4 693
2006	266 113	138 491	37 247	24 434	37 156	23 599	17 082	13 049	16 636	6 966
2007	310 093	168 442	42 102	27 582	48 085	33 232	18 242	14 168	19 580	8 669
2008	363 114	187 202	58 026	39 610	49 758	38 725	21 115	13 666	18 974	8 417
2009	357 862	176 816	51 538	33 363	50 393	36 395	19 028	14 088	18 710	6 216
2010	353 021	184 678	51 401	32 366	48 743	36 298	20 008	14 437	15 221	5 724

United Nations Statistics Division, 2012

Dried fig imports in the world have had a fast increasing trend. Concordantly, import values of countries like France and export values of countries like Turkey have increased. In the last period, the increase rate in Turkey's export value is much more than that of World's import. This increase was 172% between 2000 and 2010. In this period the French market for Turkey also increased. While the imports of France increased by 149%, Turkish exports to France increased by 169% (Table 5).

There is a huge dried figs trade between Turkey and France. The share of world trade between the two countries is above the expectations. In other words, there is a great trade partnership between them. On the other hand, trade concentration coefficients have not changed much over time. While the calculated trade concentration coefficients were high for some years, they were below the expectations for other years. The trade concentration coefficient for dried apricot trade became 1.22 in 2000 and 1.20 in 2010, i.e., there has been no change in trade density between two countries (Table 6).

The other countries that Turkey imports dried figs to are the Germany, Italy and England. Turkish dried figs exports to all these countries have increased, paralleling to the increased world figs trade but with the figs trade with England, trade concentration coefficient has a decreasing trend. The trade concentration coefficient between Turkey and England decreased from 1.12 in 2000 to 0.72 in 2010. There has been no change in concentration coefficient between Turkey and Germany like the example of France. The concentration coefficient between Turkey and Italy has been increased in recent years (Table 6).

Table 6. The concentration coefficients of Turkey in dried figs

Years	France	Germany	Italy	England
2000	1.22	1.41	1.22	1.12
2001	1.19	1.33	1.45	0.64
2002	1.09	1.40	1.48	0.49
2003	1.20	1.22	1.43	0.63
2004	1.27	1.18	1.32	0.71
2005	1.25	1.32	1.41	0.75
2006	1.26	1.22	1.47	0.80
2007	1.21	1.27	1.43	0.82
2008	1.32	1.51	1.26	0.86
2009	1.31	1.46	1.50	0.67
2010	1.20	1.42	1.38	0.72

Conclusions

Agricultural sector has also been affected by the globalization like the rest of the world. The increase in the world trade has continued. The monitoring of the development in dried fruits trade which is one of the most important sectors in Turkish agricultural exports is also the most crucial. For this reason, the markets in dried fruits that Turkey exports to are examined and the concentration coefficients that reflect the demand for Turkish products are calculated.

The Turkey's most important markets for raisins are England, Germany, Netherland, Russia and Japan. The imports of these countries increased 1.8 - 4.3 folds in last 10 years. The Turkish total and separately exports to these countries in the same period increased. Despite that, the density of exports to Netherland has decreased. In other words, the expanding market share of Netherland's dried fruit import has not increased parallel to Turkish export growth in this market.

Turkey's most important markets for dried apricots are Russia, USA, England, Germany, and France. The imports of dried apricots of these countries increased 1.7 - 4.6 folds in last 10 years. Although the Turkish total and separately exports to these countries in the same period increased, the density of exports to England and France has decreased.

The Turkey's most important markets for dried figs are France, Germany, Italy and England. The imports of dried figs of these countries increased 1.8 - 2.6 folds in last 10 years. Although the Turkish total and separately exports to these countries in the same period increased, the density

of exports to England which is an important market has decreased.

In the first years of the period examined, Netherland in raisins, England in dried figs and France and England in dried apricots trade are nearly the sole importers for these products but Turkey has not kept market share in these products and countries in recent years. The main reason of this is that other countries has accessed to these countries' markets. This situation shows that Turkey cannot use its advantage in these markets in which it really is effective once.

The markets that Turkey exports dried fruits to are generally the European countries whose quality control systems are evolved. The quality requirements of these countries are getting grown. The consumers' demand on product standards in these countries has been changed. Turkey's keeping its share in these markets and selling its products in higher prices depend on product quality and storing and packaging conditions. In this context, a legal procedure was made in 2005 on the technical regulations and standardization in foreign trade. Thus, it is aimed that Turkey can comply with the WTO and EU commitments and adopt the exporting measures and mechanisms that industrialized countries mostly tend and implement (Official Gazette, 2005). The lacks in implementing the regulations must be eliminated. An effective marketing system which compromise the activities such as producing, harvesting, packaging, storing and transporting in exporting agricultural products has to be established. The information flow should be provided between changing foreign demand and growing regions. For this reason, it is necessary that information be provided first to the farmers and they be notified about this fact.

The illiteracy ratio in Turkey is 18%. The R&D spending is the 0.2 - 0.4% of total transfers to the agriculture. The average of OECD is approximately 1.8% in this respect (Çakmak and Akder, 2005). These data clearly show that farmers must be trained and the activates of researches and extension must be paid attention to.

It must not be forgotten that the protection measures such as tariffs, tariff quotas, export subsidies in international trade affect the competition negatively. Moreover, the regional associations, bilateral trade agreements affect foreign trade intensity. This study only shows that Turkish competition power for global export markets in chosen products.

Today, it is considered that foreign trade is one of the most important factors for Turkey's sustainable development. A study carried out by Ministry of Economy showed that the Turkey has a potential that its exports can be increased by 30% (MOE, 2013). Of course, it is expected that Turkey will at least preserve its export density in the advantageous products like dried fruits, even access to new markets.

References

Altay, B., Gürpınar, K., 2008. Açıklanmış Karşılaştırmalı Üstünlükler ve Bazı Rekabet Gücü Endeksleri: Türk Mobilya Sektörü Üzerine Bir Uygulama. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, *İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10 (1): 257-274.

Altay, H., 2008. Karşılaştırmalı Üstünlükler Teorisi Kapsamında Türk Endüstrilerinin Avrupa Birliği (15) Pazarındaki Rekabet Gücü Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi: 1995 – 2007. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21, :215-240.

Anonymous, 2012a. Kuru İncir Sektör Raporu. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Ekonomi Bakanlığı, İhracat Genel Müdürlüğü, Tarım Ürünleri Daire Başkanlığı, Sektör Raporları, http://www.ibp.gov.tr/pg/sektorpdf/tarim/kuru_incir_2012.pdf (Accessed 15.01.2013).

Anonymous, 2012b. Kuru Kayısı Sektör Raporu. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Ekonomi Bakanlığı, İhracat Genel Müdürlüğü, Tarım Ürünleri Daire Başkanlığı, Sektör Raporları, http://www.ibp.gov.tr/pg/sektorpdf/tarim/kuru_kayisi_2012.pdf.(Accessed 5.01.2013).

Anonymous, 2012c. Kuru Üzüm Sektör Raporu. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Ekonomi Bakanlığı, İhracat Genel Müdürlüğü, Tarım Ürünleri Daire Başkanlığı, Sektör Raporları, http://www.ibp.gov.tr/pg/sektorpdf/tarim/kuru_uzum_2012.pdf (Accessed 15.01.2013).

Balassa, B., 1965. Trade Liberalization and Revealed Comparative Advantage. Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies, 33:, 99-123.

Batra, A., Khan Z., 2005. Revealed Comparative Advantage: An Analysis for India and China. Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, Working Paper, No: 168, New Delhi.

Çakmak, E., Akder, H., 2005. DTÖ ve AB'deki Gelişmeler Işığında 21. Yüzyılda Türkiye Tarımı. TÜSİAD, Yayın No:397, İstanbul.

ECE., 1973. Trade Network Projections and International Consistency Tests, UN Economic Bulletin for Europe, 24(2).

Eraktan, G., 1988. Auswirkungen der Assoziierung der Türkei mit der EWG auf die türkische Landwirtschaft. Publikationen der Landwirtschaftlichen Fakultät der

Universität Ankara-1064, Wissenschaftliche Forschungen und Studien-567, Ankara.

Eraktan, G., 2001. Tarım Politikası Temelleri ve Türkiye'de Tarımsal Destekleme Politikası. Uzel Yayınları, Ankara.

Erkan, B., 2011. Türkiye'nin Geleneksel Tarım Ürünleri İhracatındaki Rekabet Gücünün Açıklanmış Karşılaştırmalı Üstünlükler Bazında Analizi. 1. Uluslararası Dış Ticaret ve Tarım Stratejileri Sempozyumu, 08-10 December Kilis/Turkey.

FAOSTAT., 2013. Faostat Trade Indices http://faostat.fao.org/site/535/DesktopDefault.aspx?PageID=535

(Accessed 28.02.2013).

Ferman, M., Akgüngör, S. ve Yüksel, H.A., 2004. Türkiye'nin İhracat Rekabet Gücü ve Sürdürülebilirliği: Avrupa Birliği Pazarında Rakip Ülkeler ve Türkiye Açısından Bir Karşılaştırma. Türkiye İktisat Kongresi, 5-9 May, İzmir.

Fertö, I., Hubbard, L.J., 2002. Revealed Comparative Advantage and Competitiveness in Hungarian Agri-Food Sectors. Institute of Economics Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Discussion Papers, No: 2002/8, Budapest.

Finger, J.M., Kreinin, M.E., 1979. A Measure of Export Similarity and Its Possible Uses. The Economic Journal, Vol. 89, No: 356.

Francescon A., Nagy A., 1988. International Trade in Forest Products. International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, A B Academic Publishers, Great Britain.

Frohberg, K., Hartmann, M., 1997. Comparing Measures of Competitiveness. Institute of Agricultural Development in Central and Europe Discussion Paper, DP No: 2. s: 7.

Froment, R., Zighera, J., 1964. La structure du commerce mondial. Conference de la Society d'Econometrie.

Hinloopen, J., Marrewijk, C. V., 2004. Dynamics of Chinese Comparative Advantage. Tinbergen Institute, Discussion Paper, No: Ti 2004-034/2, Rotterdam.

ITS., 2013. International Trade Center, International Trade Statistics. http://www.trademap.org/tradestat/Country_SelProductCountry_TS.aspx (Accessed 20.03.2013).

Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften., 1969. Landwirtschaftliche Vorausschätzungen 1 – Methoden, Techniken und Modelle. Hausmitteilungen über Landwirtschaft: 48.

Küçükkiremitçi, O., Karaca, M.E. and Eşiyok, B.A., 2010. Türkiye'nin İhracatında Öne Çıkan Sektörlerde Temel Pazar Ülkeler, Rakipler ve Rekabet Gücü. Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Müdürlüğü, GA/01-01-10, February, Ankara.

Li, Kui-W., Bender, S., 2002. The Gain and Loss of Comparative Advantage in Manufactured Exports among Regions. Yale University Economic Growth Center, Discussion Paper, No: 853.

Linnemann, H., 1966. An Economic Study of International Trade Flows, North-Holland, Amsterdam.

MOE., 2013. Küresel Ticarette Türkiye'nin Yeniden Konumlandırılması: Dış Ticarette Yeni Rotalar. Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı Raporları, Ankara http://www.ekonomi.gov.tr/upload/98C9FBB8-D8D3- 856645209FC758B662CB/dtyr.pdf (Accessed 06.03.2013).

Nagy, A., 1979. Methods of Structural Analysis and Projection of International Trade. Studies No. 13, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Economics, Budapest.

Official Gazette., 2005. 13 Ekim 2005 Tarih ve 25965 Sayılı Resmi Gazete. Konu: Dış Ticarette Teknik Düzenlemeler ve Standardizasyon Rejimi Kararı, http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr (Accessed 06.03.2013).

Official Gazette., 2012. 13 Haziran 2012 Tarih ve 28322 Sayılı Resmi Gazete. Yüksek Planlama Kurulu Karar No: 2012/8, Tarih: 6/6/2012, Konu: 2023 Türkiye İhracat Stratejisi ve Eylem Planı, http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2012/06/20120613-31-1.pdf (Accessed 06.03.2013).

Ricardo, D., 1971. Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. Penguin Books, Middlesex.

Seyidoğlu, H., 1999. Uluslararası İktisat. Teori Politika ve Uygulama. 13. Baskı, Kurtiş Matbaası, İstanbul.

Seymen, D., Bilici, Ö. and Şanlısoy, S., 2009. Türk Dış Ticareti'nin Yönü, Dış Ticaret Politikası Perspektifinden Bir Değerlendirme. Anadolu International Conference in Economics, June 17-19, 2009, Eskişehir, Turkey.

Theil, H., 1967. Information and Economic Theory. North-Holland, Amsterdam.

Togan, S., 1993. 1980'li Yıllarda Türk Dış Ticaret Rejimi ve Dış Ticaretin Liberalizasyonu. Ankara: Türk Eximbank Araştırma Dizisi, No: 1.

TSI., 2012. İstatistik Göstergeler. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/Gosterge.do?metod=GostergeListe&alt_id=45 (Accessed 22.03.2013).

TSI., 2013. İstatistik Göstergeler. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?alt_id=12 (Accessed 22.03.2013).

Türkekul, B., 2009. Türkiye'nin Tarım Ürünleri Dış Ticaretinin Yapısal Analizi. Finans Politik ve Ekonomik Yorumlar. 46, (532):49.

UNSD., 2012. UN COMTRADE, United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database, Data Query, http://comtrade.un.org/db/ce/ceSearch.aspx (Accessed 08.07.2012).

Utkulu, U., 2005. Türkiye'nin Dış Ticareti ve Değişen Mukayeseli Üstünlükler. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Yayınları, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Matbaası, Alsancak / İzmir.

Vollrath, T.L., 1991. A Theoretical Evaluation of Alternative Trade Intensity Measures of Revealed Comparative Advantage. Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv 130: 265–279.

Yılmaz, M., Özken, A., 2012. Dış Ticarete Giriş. Gazi Kitabevi, Beşevler, Ankara.