

An Assessment of the Level of Globalization in the Baltic States

Irena Pekarskiene, Rozita Susniene

Kaunas University of Technology

K. Donelaicio st. 73, LT-44029, Kaunas, Lithuania

e-mail: irena.pekarskiene@ktu.lt, rozita.susniene@gmail.com

crossref <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.22.1.219>

The globalization phenomenon has become a subject of research in scholastic literature. The impact of globalization is the subject of ongoing debate, which is based more on personal provisions than on objective evidence. A need arises to evaluate the process of globalization based not on a subjective view, but rather on empirical studies grounded in scientific reasoning. Scholars, attempting to add rationality to the discussion, use empirical data, namely indicators of globalization. Such empirical evidence would allow for a more objective assessment of the essence of the globalization process, its scope and impact on various social sectors.

Quantitative assessment of globalization is a complex matter, since there is no generally accepted valuation methodology. Different quantitative indicators are used in the separate spheres of globalization: economic, cultural, social, and political. A need to measure the phenomenon of globalization as a whole, to establish an integrated set of indicators, presents itself. Attempts to assess the extent of globalization with one complex set of indicators are a new phenomenon, which has not been studied sufficiently.

Attempting to measure and assess a country's level of globalization, researchers use different sets of indicators and different methodologies. The extent of globalization in a state very often depends on the assessment methodology. The two most widely known and most frequently analyzed globalization indices, which bring together indicator groups of different areas of globalization - economic, political, social and cultural, are the Kearney globalization index and the Dreher (KOF) globalization index.

Kearney was the first to attempt to combine aspects such as personal contacts, technological and political integration together with measurements of economic globalization. The compilers of the index look for correlations between the globalization level of a state and economic, social, political and other characteristics of the country, but do not address the question of positive or negative effects of globalization. Dreher improved Kearney's index-creation methodology, expanding the number of indicators. Despite the fact that Kearney and KOF globalization indices are calculated by assessing the same - economic, political and social - aspects, the selection of different number of indicators, the different relative weight of the indicators, and different calculation methods lead to different results. The advantage of the KOF index is the ability to assess the impact of globalization on a country's development.

In the Baltic countries, the globalization processes are intense, but their volume and tendencies, the influence of globalization on the economic, social and cultural

development of the countries, and which quantitative assessment methods can be applied to measure the level of globalization are not known. The analysis, evaluation, and application of research and methodologies developed by foreign scholars would allow for an assessment of the volume and perspectives of globalization in the Baltic countries.

The aim of the article: to assess the level of globalization and the tendencies of its changes in the Baltic countries using the methodology of the KOF globalization index. The creation methodology and collected data of the KOF index enable one to investigate and compare the overall level of globalization and the dynamics of the globalization level in individual sectors of the Baltic countries and to assess the level of globalization in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, in the context of all the countries in the world. The collection and processing of data needed to calculate the index takes a long time, so the globalization indices of separate countries of the world published by the compilers of the KOF index reflect three-year-old globalization levels. To assess the level of globalization in the Baltic countries in recent years, it is appropriate to examine the correlation between the globalization processes in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and the socio-economic indicators of the countries. Using data from previous periods of the KOF globalization index, having determined the correlations between the processes of globalization and different economic-social indicators, and with the help of regression techniques, the future trends in the globalization level of Baltic countries can be foreseen.

Keywords: globalization, economic globalization, socio-cultural globalization, political globalization, globalization indices, globalization level of the state.

Introduction

Society is full of different opinions about the process of globalization and the impact of globalization on people's lives. Many scholars, politicians, academics, and journalists view globalization trends as inevitable and, in most cases, desirable. But for billions of people in the world, business-driven globalization is a threat to the normal way of life and a danger to national culture. For some, globalization is the panacea for all diseases, for others, vice versa, the cause of all illnesses. The impact of globalization is the subject of ongoing discussions, which are based more on personal views than objective evidence.

The very concept of globalization has gained a relatively emotional tone. A need arises to evaluate the process of globalization, not based on a subjective view, but on empirical studies grounded in scientific reasoning.

The phenomenon of globalization has become a subject of research in scholastic literature. Guillen (2001) observes that social scholars focus the most attention on the processes of globalization, attempting to summarize the work of various researchers. The exclusive feature of the scholastic studies of globalization is not only its abundance, but also the large diversity of scholars interested in the subject - from postmodernists and social theorists, who rarely get engaged in empirical studies, to empiricists, politicians or even management consultants.

Scholars debate the concept of globalization (Gilpin, 1998; Hudson, 2002; Markovic, 2008; McCann, 1998), the impact of globalization on government functions (Giddens, 2000; Makarevic, 2007; Reich, 1990; Rosenau, 2003), the economic (Castells, 2010; Dicken, 2003; Mukherjee, 2008; Sumner, 2004) and political (Hirst and Thompson, 1997) dimensions of the globalization process, and the impact of globalization on the environment (Bhagwati, 2004; Halle 2007; Lofdahl, 2002; Najam et al., 2007; Wijen et al., 2005).

Lithuanian scholars also investigate the impact of globalization, assessing the influence of globalization processes on different aspects of life: the economy and its separate sectors (Alimiene & Kuvykaite, 2008; Diskiene et al., 2008; Gyls, 2008; Juscius, 2001; Juscius & Lekaviciene, 2007; Kersiene & Savaneviciene, 2009; Macerinskas et al., 2003; Navickas & Malakauskaite, 2009; Niedvaras, 2008; Snieska & Bruneckiene, 2009), migration (Cekanavicius & Kasnauskieni, 2009; Bagdanavicius & Jodkoniene, 2008), culture (Ciegis et al., 2008), politics (Grizas, 2006), technology (Melnikas, 2008), and others.

Although the effects of globalization are continually studied, neither the pace nor the boundaries of expansion are fully clear. Scholars discuss whether the globalization process is occurring at all, whether it leads to convergence, whether it reduces the national authority of states, whether globalization is different from modernization, and whether a global culture is emerging. Sachs (1998) identifies four thematic questions, which cause the most discussion: 1) Does globalization influence more rapid economic growth? 2) What is the impact of globalization on macroeconomic stability? 3) Does globalization not increase income inequality? 4) How do institutions on all levels – national, regional and international – coordinate their efforts and responsibilities in the global market that has formed?

All of these questions are a source of endless discussions. Therefore, researchers, in order to provide for rationality in the discussions, invoke empirical data, namely indicators of globalization. Such empirical evidence would allow for a more objective assessment of the nature of globalization and its impact on different social sectors. Correlations between economic growth and globalization, between globalization and income inequality, and so on, based on quantitative indicators would serve as more persuasive evidence than mere theoretical considerations. Quantitative measurements would also allow for an assessment of the scale of globalization.

A quantitative assessment of globalization is a complex matter, since there is no generally accepted valuation methodology. Absolute objectivity is impossible, as the scholars who value globalization must choose a certain set of evaluation methods, which depends on their personal perception of globalization as a phenomenon. Some authors (Arribas et al., 2006; Brahmabhatt, 1998; Frankel, 2000; Hurrell, 1995; Wolf, 2001; 2002; Sirgy et al., 2004) focus on economic indicators, while others also add on political, cultural (Held et al., 2002; Hoffman, 2002; Steger, 2008, Zickiene, 2008), geographical and institutional (Brakman, 2006) indicators, but these tests do not include separate areas of globalization as a whole. Some authors (Davis, 2003) even argue that assessing globalization does not make sense, since it is impossible to create an assessment methodology, which would cover all aspects of globalization. The developers of the methodologies concur, but in their opinion even an incomplete assessment of globalization allows for conclusions and assumptions relative to the impact of globalization on various spheres of life.

In the separate spheres of globalization development – economic, cultural, social, and political – different quantitative indicators are used. A need to measure the phenomenon of globalization as a whole, to establish an integrated set of indicators, presents itself. Attempts to assess the extent of globalization in one comprehensive set of indicators are a new phenomenon, which has not been researched sufficiently. Researchers' efforts to quantitatively determine the parameters of globalization represent an important step in globalistics. The statistical analysis of the globalization processes provides an opportunity to not only describe the essential features of the globalization process, but also a sound basis for logical interpretation of evaluations. The statistical form of the components of globalization highlights the trends in aspects of globalization and reflects their change tendencies.

In the Baltic countries, the processes of globalization are intense, but the volume and tendencies of the processes, the impact of globalization on the countries' economic, social and cultural development, which globalization quantitative assessment techniques can be applied in measuring the level and rate of globalization are unknown. The analysis, evaluation, assessment, and application of research carried out and methodologies developed by foreign scholars would allow for assessing the volume and perspectives of the globalization process in the Baltic countries.

The subject of the article: the level of globalization in the Baltic countries. **Article objective:** using the methodology of the KOF globalization index, to assess the level of globalization in the Baltic countries and to forecast the trends of its change.

To achieve the objective, the following assignments are presented:

- to analyze and compare the quantitative evaluation methods of globalization;
- to assess the level of globalization in individual areas of the Baltic countries;
- to examine the correlation between the level of globalization and economic-social indicators of the Baltic countries;

- applying a regression analysis, to forecast the future trends of change in the level of globalization in the Baltic countries.

The research methods for the realization of the objective: a comparative analysis and summary of academic literature, a logical and graphical analysis, and a correlation-regression analysis.

An Assessment of the Globalization Level of a State, Using Globalization Indices

In order to measure and assess a country's level of globalization, researchers use different sets of indicators and different methodologies. In compiling integrated sets of globalization indicators and globalization indices, the volume of data varies, along with the number of the countries being studied, the time periods, the number of indicator blocks and indicators, data sources and other factors. Different index methodologies give greater or lesser importance to individual indicators or blocks of them. The two best known and most frequently analyzed indices of globalization, which bring together groups of indicators from different areas of globalization – economic, political, social and cultural – are the Kearney globalization index and the Dreher (KOF) globalization index.

The compilers of the Kearney globalization index were the first to propose a quantitative evaluation method that enables a comprehensive measurement for the expression of globalization processes. The authors of the index tried to include, in their opinion, the most important developments of the components of globalization, including international trade, financial movements, the flow of people, ideas, and information across national borders, and international political relations.

Calculations for the Kearney index were carried out from 2001 to 2007. The number of investigated countries during this period increased from 50 to 72, in addition to the previously created three indicator blocks (technology, personal international contacts, and economic-financial indicators), another one was formed, a block of political development indicators, and calculation of the index was being improved. Although the indicators of the index and their weightings in the index were changing, the actual methodology of the index for the entire period has essentially not changed. The 72 countries around the world assessed in the most recent 2007 globalization index made up 97 percent of the world gross domestic product and 88 percent of the world's population. In order to create a comprehensive picture of global integration, the main regions of the world have been incorporated, including developed and developing countries (Kearney, 2007).

Kearney globalization index is calculated by assessing a country's economic integration, technological ties, personal contacts, and political commitments. Economic integration encompasses data on foreign trade and direct foreign investment. Personal contacts encompass data on international travel and tourism, international telephone calls, international money transfers, personal transfers (including workers' remittance, compensation of employees, and other individual and non-governmental transfers). Technological ties include data on the number of internet users, the number of internet domains, and

secure servers used for transactions. Political integration is assessed in relation to each country's membership in various international organizations, personnel and financial support to the United Nations peacekeeping missions, ratification of multilateral treaties, and the number of transfers paid and received by the government (Table 1).

According to the compilers of the index, direct foreign investment and foreign trade are important to the development of globalization, so in calculating the Kearney globalization index, foreign direct investment is given triple weight, and foreign trade – double weight. The technological and political variables are entered into separate indicators, with each having the same weight in the overall indicator. The globalization index for each country is calculated by summing all scores every year.

Table 1

Indicators of the Kearney globalization index

Indicators, making up the globalization index	Weight
ECONOMIC INTEGRATION	7
Trade (Percent of GDP)	2
Foreign Direct Investment flows (percent of GDP)	3
Portfolio Investment (percent of GDP)	1
Payments received	1
PERSONAL CONTACTS	3
International Tourists and Travelers (percent of population)	1
International Telephone Calls (per capita)	1
Remittances and Personal Transfers (percent of GDP)	1
TECHNOLOGY	3
Internet Users (per capita)	1
Internet Hosts (per capita)	1
Secure Servers (per capita)	1
POLITICAL INTEGRATION	3
Embassies in the Country	1
Membership in International Organizations	1
Participation in U.N. Security Council Missions	1

(source: table created by authors using the Globalization Index)

According to the Kearney methodology, the most globalized countries in 2003-2007 were medium-sized states; of the world's largest countries, only the United States and Canada were in the top ten. However, the ratings of the countries varied greatly in the separate dimensions of globalization. The U.S. and Canada, being in the top ten of the most globalized countries, did not make into the top ten according to the economic integration indicator, but the U.S. was the leader in the technological communications index, while Canada took second place.

In 2007, the first of the Baltic countries debuts in the index - Estonia. Jeff Marne, the public relations director of Foreign Policy, said that Estonia is selected for the evaluation as the best representing the Baltic region. Named "the Baltic Tiger," it has found itself in the tenth place based on the extent of globalization of a country. On the World Bank's list of countries with the most favorable conditions for business, in 2007 Estonia was in seventeenth place out of 175, and based on the conditions of international trade - in the sixth spot. According to the compilers of the index, such high rates for the country result from the government's steps to integrate into the outer world, reduced influence of bureaucracy, a favorable tax system, and favorable conditions for investors. It is noted that Estonia successfully implements the latest Nobel

prizes-winning economic ideas and is completely free from the shackles of the communist era. Although based on technology integration indicators Estonia is only in 21st place, trends of this indicator's growth are clear. Estonia is the only of the former communist countries, which was ranked among the most globalized countries in 2007, while other post-communist countries, although not making into the top ten most globalized countries, also stood out as having high rates of economic integration.

The compilers of the Kearney globalization index evaluated the correlation between a country's level of globalization and the country's size, distribution of internet networks and levels of urbanization. Kearney (2007) notes that one common feature of the most globalized countries is their size. They are all small countries. Canada and the United States are the only large countries that regularly place in the top ten. Why do small countries hold such high spots? For example, countries such as Singapore and the Netherlands lack natural resources; Denmark and Ireland do not have the unlimited domestic market as, say, the United States. To be able to compete on a global scale, these countries have no choice but to intensify trade and attract foreign investment. This can even be said of a relatively removed country like Switzerland. The eight leading countries in the globalization index are placed in such high positions by their economic globalization indicators. Extending activities outside the country is sometimes the only way for a small country to find new development opportunities.

The more globalized countries, as a rule, have international internet networks covering a greater area. The United States has the largest online international network, and their potential is extremely high. Meanwhile, London is the intermediary to the transatlantic cyber-relations with Europe.

Kearney was the first to attempt to combine aspects such as personal contacts, technological and political integration with economic measurements of globalization. According to Mačerinskas and Pipinytė (2003), Kearney globalization index does not address the issue of positive or negative effects globalization. It simply calculates the changes in different areas of globalization and evaluates countries based on the results (from most to least globalized). The compilers of the index also look for correlations between a country's level of globalization and economic, social, political, and other characteristics of a country. The index is useful for evaluating countries' positions in a globalized world. The developers of the globalization index have made significant contributions, not only in theoretical-methodological, but also in practical terms.

Without disparaging the theoretical and practical significance of the globalization index, Juscius (2004) draws attention to the limited capabilities of this instrument in scientific research and points out the shortcomings of the index: the small number of blocks selected for the index, while cultural, environmental, population migration, military integration and many other spheres of globalization remain unmeasured in quantitative terms, small amount of blocks, relatively non-homogeneous assessment elements of globalization are combined, groups of indicators within the separate blocks

have varying significance levels, important processes being ignored in the groups of individual blocks in the globalization index, the reliability of statistical sources and methods of data collection.

The KOF globalization index was created in 2002 by Dreher and the Swiss Institute of Economics. The calculation of the first index started in 1970, with the statistical date of 122 countries. This enabled the comparison of the dynamics of indicators over a time period of more than 30 years. The calculation results were reported for the first time in 2002; thereafter the data was updated every year, the index calculation methodology continuously improved, and the number of countries surveyed increased (data of 208 countries in the 2010 index).

The KOF globalization index includes three key areas of globalization: economic, social, and political. Economic globalization is defined as the flow of goods, capital and services, as well as information, over long distances. When measuring economic globalization, two indices are formed: one measures the actual economic flows, the second measures restrictions on trade and capital. Political globalization is characterized by the expansion of public policy and includes three factors: the number of embassies, membership in international organizations, and participation in United Nations missions. Social globalization is expressed as the dispersal of ideas, information, images, and people and is divided into three categories: personal contacts, cross-border flows of information, and cultural ties (Table 2).

Dreher (2007) recognizes that the most difficult to measure are the aspects of globalization that are related to the flow of information and ideas. It is the most widespread area of globalization and therefore must absolutely be included in the calculation of the index. The KOF globalization index measures globalization on a scale of 1 to 100; the index is calculated using the component indicators with varying weights. In the KOF globalization index, the maximum weight is given to social globalization (38.5 percent); economic globalization makes up 36.5 percent (actual flow and limits are 50 percent each) and political – 25 percent.

The KOF world globalization index shows that globalization continues to grow, encouraged by growing economic and political globalization, while the social dimension of globalization is practically constant since 2001. The overall growth of globalization changed regardless of income level and the regional development, though the degree of globalization varies significantly. According to data from the KOF Index of Globalization, globalization is the most prevalent in Western countries, where the level of income is high.

Analyzing the results of the index, Dreher (2007) concludes that globalization is beneficial to the growth of the country. In general, rates of growth in the more globalized countries have been greater. This is especially true for the economic integration of countries and restrictions on trade and capital in developed countries. It is also noted that the dissemination of information flows promotes growth and, conversely, countries with slow growth are not very globalized.

Table 2

Indicators of the KOF globalization index

	Indices and Variables	Weights
1.	ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION	37%
1.1	Actual Flows	50%
	Trade (percent of GDP)*	18%
	Foreign Direct Investment flows (percent of GDP)*	21%
	Foreign Direct Investment stocks (percent of GDP)	22%
	Portfolio Investment (percent of GDP)*	19%
	Income Paid to Foreign Nationals (percent of GDP.)*	20%
1.2.	Restrictions	50%
	Hidden Import Barriers	24%
	Mean Tariff Rate	28%
	Taxes on International Trade (percent of current revenue)	27%
	Capital Account Restrictions	20%
2.	SOCIAL GLOBALIZATION	39%
2.1.	Data on Personal Contact	30%
	Telephone Traffic (percent of GDP.)*	13%
	Transfers (percent of GDP.)*	6%
	International Tourism (percent of total population)*	28%
	Foreign Population (percent of total population)	26%
	International letters (per capita)	28%
2.2.	Data on Information Flows	35%
	Internet Users (per 1000 people)*	25%
	Television (per 1000 people)	25%
	Trade in Newspapers (percent of GDP)	21%
	Radio (per 1000 people)	29%
2.3.	Data on Cultural Proximity	35%
	Number of McDonald's Restaurants (per capita)	40%
	Number of Ikea stores (per capita)	41%
	Trade in Books (percent of GDP)	19%
3.	POLITICAL GLOBALIZATION	25%
	Embassies in the Country*	35%
	Membership in International Organizations*	36%
	Participation in U.N. Security Council Missions*	29%

* These indicators are also used in the calculation of the Kearney globalization index.

(source: KOF Index of Globalization)

The KOF index is very valuable in a theoretical as well as practical sense. Dreher has improved the creation methodology of the Kearney index, has expanded the number of variables in the index. The exclusive advantage of the KOF index is the opportunity to assess the impact of globalization on the country's development. These deficiencies of the KOF index can be identified:

- a small number of indicator blocks;
- environment, migration, and military globalization indicators are not valued in the index;
- cultural indicators are not separated into an individual block and do not reflect the multi-faceted and complex aspect of cultural life;
- the choice of cultural indicators (although based on public opinion polls) is very questionable. In the individual blocks within the index, groups of indicators have different levels of materiality.

Comparing the Kearney and KOF indices of globalization, it must be admitted that the principles of the methodologies of the two indices are the same and their development objectives are consistent. Both indices

measure the extent and speed of globalization, both rank countries based on the level of globalization and look for links between a country's level of globalization and its economic, political and social characteristics. Noting the differences between the two indices, it can be argued that the KOF index methodology, as compared with the Kearney index is improved (Table 3).

The KOF index includes more detailed and accurate data: more indicators, a longer time period, and a greater number of countries. Although its creation was started later, the KOF index covers a longer period and allows for a comparison of the level of globalization and its changes in a large number of countries over a time period of more than thirty years. The KOF index reflects the globalization and development trends of individual areas on a more detailed level.

Table 3

Comparison of KOF and Kearney globalization indices

Comparison criteria	Kearney index	KOF index
Number of countries	72	208
Volume of data, in years	6	30
Number of fields evaluated	4	3
Number of indicators	13	24
Evaluation of a country's level of globalization	Yes	Yes
Correlation between a country's level of globalization and the characteristics of individual areas	Yes	Yes
Is the impact of globalization on a country's economic growth assessed?	No	Yes

(source: table created by authors)

Both indices investigate correlations between the level of globalization and of characteristics of individual areas, but it should be noted that the KOF index has been designed such that it is possible to measure the impact of individual aspects on economic growth. Meanwhile, the creators of the Kearney index do not raise such objectives. Since the authors used different methodologies, the index calculation results are significantly different. The differences in the assessment of the most globalized countries are determined by the different weights assigned to indicators of individual areas. In the Kearney index, economic indicators are given the decisive weight, while in the KOF index the block of social indicators has largest weight. Despite the fact that Kearney and KOF globalization indices are calculated by assessing the same - economic, political and social aspects, the selection of a different number of indicators, different weights assigned to the indicators, and different calculation methodologies lead to different results.

In order to improve the calculation methodology of discussed globalization indices, it is useful to also include indicators of other areas – environment, migration, globalization, military targets – and add on but also separate the block of cultural characteristics into a distinct sector. In the opinion of some scholars (Groggaard, et al., 2005; Juscius & Lekaviciene, 2007), the shortcoming of a state-level globalization index is that the studies of globalization indices are focused on an individual state level, using criteria with limited reliability. In their view, the main subject of the investigation should not be the

national, but a lower level (Kobrin, 1991; Sullivan, 1994). For example, in the economic sphere, the search for sources of globalization (including quantitative indicators) should be at the microeconomic level.

An Assessment of the Level of Globalization in the Baltic countries

The level of globalization in the Baltic countries is measured in the KOF globalization index starting in 1991. The index calculations are carried out each year, prior year data is constantly being adjusted. The most recent calculations were done in 2010 using data from 2007. Data from the KOF index enables one to not only compare the overall level of globalization in the Baltic countries and the dynamics of the level of globalization of individual areas, but also evaluate the level of globalization in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in the context of the overall world. The positions of the Baltic countries among 208 countries in the world based on each country's overall level of globalization and individual (economic, social and political) areas are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Globalization indices of the Baltic countries, 2007

Placement	Country	Globalization Index
26	Estonia	79.49
33	Lithuania	74.73
37	Latvia	71.61
Economic Globalization		
7	Estonia	91.66
21	Latvia	83.67
27	Lithuania	81.50
Social Globalization		
32	Estonia	72.97
38	Latvia	69.40
45	Lithuania	67.57
Political Globalization		
63	Lithuania	75.94
86	Estonia	71.62
123	Latvia	57.09

(source: created by the authors using data from the KOF Index of Globalization)

It can be argued that the overall level of globalization in the Baltic countries is quite high in the context of the world. The indicators of globalization of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, confirm the conclusion of the compilers of the index that small countries, as a rule, are more globalized. The high level of globalization in the Baltic countries is determined by economic and social globalization indicators. The index of economic globalization in Estonia is particularly high – the country fell into the top ten of the most economically globalized countries in the world. In a worldwide context of social globalization, the Baltic countries also hold relatively high positions, but according to indices of political globalization, they rank much lower. Latvia is the least politically globalized.




Figure 1. Globalization indices of the Baltic countries, 1991-2007

(source: created by authors using data from the KOF Index of Globalization)

The creation methodology of the KOF index allows the comparison between the level of globalization of individual areas in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The overall level of globalization and the changes in the globalization process in the Baltic countries were determined by the dynamics of globalization processes of individual areas. Comparing the level of globalization among the Baltic countries, it is clear that Estonia is the most globalized (figure 1).

The high level of globalization in Estonia was determined by the extremely high degree of the country's indicators of economic integration into the global economy. In the economic area, the level of globalization in Estonia is the highest during the entire period (figure 2).




Figure 2. Indices of economic globalization in the Baltic countries, 1991-2007.

(source: created by authors using data from the KOF Index of Globalization)

The high level of economic globalization in Estonia was due to favorable conditions for business and international trade, the Estonian government's policy favorable to integration, which limited the influence of

bureaucracy, a favorable tax system, and good conditions for investors. In addition, Estonia's proximity to and resilient economic relations with Finland influenced a higher level of the economic globalization index than that of the other two Baltic countries. In Latvia and Lithuania, the rate of economic integration into the global market is much lower, and the level and velocity of the globalization process in these countries differ insignificantly. The Lithuanian economic globalization process was not as smooth; its economic globalization index is the lowest of the Baltic countries. At the beginning of the time period, there is a noticeable growth tendency in the globalization process in the economies of the three Baltic countries, which was influenced by the rapid development of markets in the countries, their having gained independence, the spread of international trade, the decline in trade barriers, entry into the World Trade Organization, the re-orientation of national markets and assimilation of new markets, and the growth of direct foreign investment. Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian economies are historically tied to each other and, consequently, their development trends of economic globalization are similar.

In the social aspect, the disparities in the levels of globalization are less obvious, although in this area as well, Estonia's level of globalization is the highest, and Lithuania's – the lowest (figure 3).




Figure 3. Indices of social globalization in the Baltic countries, 1991-2007.
(source: created by authors using data from the KOF Index of Globalization)

After regaining their independence, the Baltic countries became more open, tourism and personal relations with foreign countries intensified, new information technologies spread rapidly. All of this has influenced the growth of the process of social globalization. Trends of the processes of social globalization in Lithuania and Estonia are similar but differ in time only, and since 2003 the position of the social globalization index for all three Baltic countries is practically constant.

In the area of political globalization, the changes in globalization indices were the highest in all of the Baltic countries (Figure 4).




Figure 4. Indices of political globalization in the Baltic countries, 1991-2007.
(source: created by authors using data from the KOF Index of Globalization)

After the declaration of national independence, foreign embassies were established, various international treaties were created, and the Baltic countries joined NATO, the European Union, and other international organizations. Lithuania was the first on the path to the restoration of independence and became the most globalized Baltic country in terms of politics.

The political globalization Indices in Lithuania and Estonia increased at the same pace, just during different time periods. In Lithuania, the political globalization index grew the most in 1994 (an increase of 108 percent compared to 1993), and in Estonia, the index had the highest growth in 1995 (an increase of 83 percent compared to 1994). The processes of political globalization in these two Baltic countries occur at a similar level since 2004 also, when compared with 2003, indices in Estonia and Lithuania rose by 7 percent and 6 percent, respectively; annual political globalization growth is the same and stable: 1-3 percent. The level of political globalization in Latvia is lowest, but the process occurs dynamically and a pronounced upward trend remains.

The collection and processing of the data needed to calculate the index takes a long time, so the globalization indices of separate countries of the world published by the compilers of the KOF index reflect globalization levels that are three years old. In order to assess the level of globalization of the Baltic states for 2008-2010, correlation between the globalization process and the socio-economic indicators in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia has been investigated.

Examining the correlations between the globalization level and economic-social indicators in the Baltic countries shows that the processes of globalization correlate strongly with economic development and changes in different dimensions of social life, but the nature and strength differ in different countries (Table 5).

Table 5

Coefficients of correlation between the globalization index and economic-social indicators in the Baltic countries

Indicator	Globalization Index (GI)		
	Lithuanian GI	Latvian GI	Estonian GI
GDP	0.9430	0.9050	0.8597
Direct foreign investment	0.9305	0.9092	0.7981
Average monthly earnings	0.8891	0.9214	0.8868
Unemployment rate	-0.8626	-0.9599	-0.4117
Magnitude of immigration	0.9223	0.7939	0.8301
Magnitude of emigration	0.8030	-0.1709	0.8699

(source: created by authors)

In Lithuania, the strongest correlation is between the level of globalization and the country's GDP growth, the

scale foreign direct investment, and the magnitude of immigration.

In Latvia, the level of globalization is most strongly associated with the rate of unemployment, the change in the average monthly salary, the volume of direct foreign investment and, GDP growth.

Estonia's level of globalization is the most strongly correlated with average monthly wages, magnitude of emigration, and the country's GDP growth.

Having examined the linkage between the individual factors, a strong linearity is determined among the independent factors, therefore the forecast of individual globalization indices of the Baltic States for 2008-2010, was confined to one indicator - the GDP of the Baltic countries.

Linear regression models are created with the help of the EView program (Table 6), where the dependent variable Y is the country's globalization index and the independent variable X_i is the country's GDP.

Table 6

Forecast of the globalization index in the Baltic countries for 2008 - 2010 using linear regression equations

	Lithuania	Latvia	Estonia
Linear regression equation	$Y=58.87546+0.000173 \cdot X_i$	$Y=57.47940+0.001120 \cdot X_i$	$Y=73.36294+2.81E-05 \cdot X_i$
R ²	0.857728	0.802243	0.809313
t-Statistic	30.37532	29.13321	81.12470
F-Statistic	36.17269	24.34030	25.46518
Prob.	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prob.(F-statistic)	0.000952	0.002621	0.002342
GI	2008	75.95	80.23
	2009	78.11	79.99
	2010	74.79	79.40

(source: created by authors)

The developed linear regression models are the key, as in the case of all three models, the t-Statistic values are greater than the critical value of Student's distribution (1.860), F-Statistic values are greater than the critical value of Fisher's distribution (5.32), and probability is equal to 0.0000 (with the chosen significance level of 0.05).

With the aid of linear regression equations, the forecast shows that in 2008, the level of globalization should increase in all three Baltic countries. This trend should continue in Lithuania and Latvia even in 2009, when the indices of globalization in both countries will attain their highest values: the forecast for the 2009 globalization index is 75.71 in Latvia, and 78.11 in Lithuania. In 2010, the same decline in the level of the globalization index is forecasted for Lithuania and Latvia (4.3 and 4.5 per cent compared to 2009), when the globalization process of both countries will be at the levels of 2007. Meanwhile in Estonia, where the estimated level of globalization should reach the highest point in 2008 (80.23), the decline in the level of globalization is already projected for 2009, albeit a small one of only 0.3 percent and 0.7 per cent when compared to 2009. In 2010, Estonia should, without a doubt, remain the most globalized state of the Baltic countries.

In summary, the level of globalization in the Baltic countries during the 1991-2007 period was increasing, but due to the economic recession in the countries caused by the global financial crisis, a significant – in Latvia and

Lithuania – and slight – in Estonia – decline in the level of globalization is forecasted.

Conclusions

An assessment of the globalization level of a state includes a large number of variables and range of their values. In the calculation of the globalization index, the volume of data, the number of indicators, time periods, data sources and so on vary. The use of various assessment methodologies generates different results; therefore, the extent of a country's global integration is determined by the methodology used. In studying the level of globalization in countries, the most widely used are the Kearney and KOF indices.

The Kearney globalization index does not address the question of the impact of globalization – it simply calculates the changes in the different areas of globalization and assesses the countries based on the obtained results. The index evaluates correlations between a country's level of globalization and the country's economic, social, political, and other characteristics. The index is beneficial to countries wishing to evaluate their position in a globalized world.

The advantage of the KOF Index is the opportunity to assess the impact of globalization on a country's development. Both globalization indices have similar disadvantages: small amount of indicator blocks, a limited number of indicators, lack of indicators for individual

fields, the same relative weights of non-homogeneous indicators in the index, and varying significance of blocks within the index. The practical application of indices is limited by the lack of sources for statistical data and the reliability of collection methods, in addition to the complex calculation method.

Overall, globalization level of the state in all three Baltic countries is quite high. Analysis of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian globalization indicators confirms scholars' findings that small countries are more globalized. The most globalized of the Baltic countries is Estonia. The especially high level of the country's globalization is due to the rapid economic globalization process in Estonia... Lithuania is in the lead in the field of political globalization among the Baltic states. The least globalized of all three Baltic states is Latvia, with the country's globalization indicators in the political field especially low.

In all three Baltic countries, growth trends are observed in the level of globalization overall and the individual fields of globalization - economic, political and socio-cultural.

The correlation analysis of the globalization processes and the development indicators of the Baltic countries showed that the globalization processes are strongly linked to the economic development and changes in individual spheres of social life in the Baltic countries, but the nature and strength of the correlation vary in different countries. Although during the 1991-2007 period the level of globalization in the Baltic countries was increasing, due to the economic recession in all three Baltic states caused by the global financial crisis, a decline in the level of globalization is forecasted in the coming years.

References

- Alimiene, M., & Kuvykaite, R. (2008). Standardization\Adaptation of Marketing Solutions in Companies Operating in Foreign Markets: an Integrated Approach. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(1), 37-47.
- Arribas, I., Perez, F., & Tortosa-Ausina, E. (2006). Measuring International Economic Integration: Theory and Evidence of Globalization. *MPRA Paper*, No.16010.
- Bagdanavicius, J., & Jodkoniene, Z. (2008). Brain Drain from Lithuania: the Attitude of Civil Servants. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(2), 55-60.
- Bhagwati, J. (2004). In Defense of Globalization. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brahmbhatt, M. (1998). Measuring Global Economic Integration: A Review of the Literature and Recent Evidence. *Working paper, The World Bank*, Washington.
- Brakman, S., Garretsen, H., Marrewijk, Ch., & Witteloostuijn, A. (2006). Nations and firms in the global economy: An Introduction to International Economics and Business. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castells, M. (2010). The Rise of the Network Society. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers.
- Cekanavicius, R., & Kasnauskiene, G. (2009). Too High or Just Right? Cost-benefit Approach to Emigration Question. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(1), 28-36.
- Ciegis, R., Gaveniauskas, A., Petkeviciute, N., & Streimikiene, D. (2008). Ethical Values and Sustainable Development: Lithuanian Experience in the Context of Globalisation. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy* 14(1), 29-37.
- Davis, L. E. (2003). Globalization's Security Implications. *Rand Issue Paper IP-245-RC*.
- Dicken, P. (2003). Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21st Century. London: SAGE Publications.
- Diskiene, D., Galiniene, B., & Marcinkas, A. (2008). Managerial Attitudes in the Context of Global Challenges: the Lithuanian Survey. *Transformations in Business and Economics*, 3 (15/7), 21-38.
- Dreher, A. (2007). Does globalization affect growth? Evidence from a new index of globalization. *Applied Economics* (38/10), 1091-1110.
- Frankel, J. A. (2000). Globalization of the Economy. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, Aug.
- Giddens, A. (2000). Runaway World: How Globalisation Is Reshaping Our Lives. London: Profile Books.
- Gilpin, R. (1998). Tarptautiniu santykiu politine ekonomija. Vilnius: Algarve.
- Gylys, P. (2008). Ekonomika, antieconomika ir globalizacija. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
- Grizas, R. A. (2006). Globaliniai ekonominiai procesai. Vilnius: Ekonomikos mokymo centras.
- Grogaard, B., Gioia, C., & Benito, G. R. G. (2005). An Empirical Investigation of the Role of Industry Factors in the Internationalization Patterns of the Firms. *SMG Working Paper* (9),
- Guillen, M. (2001). Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Ceitic of Five Key Debates in the Social-Science Literature. *Annual Review of Sociology* (27).
- Halle, M. (2007). Environment and Globalization: Understanding the Linkages. *Encyclopedia of Earth*, April 8.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (2002). Globaliniai pokyciai: politika, ekonomika ir kultura. Vilnius: Margi rastai.

- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1997). *Globalization in Question: the International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hoffman, S. (2002). Clash of globalizations. *Foreign Affairs*, July/August.
- Hudson, R. (2002). On the Globalization of Business. *British Journal of Management* (13), 362-366.
- Hurrell, A., & Woods, N. (1995). Globalization and Inequality. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* (24/3), 447-470.
- Juscius, V. (2001). Globalus gamybos-paskirstymo-vartojimo saveikos pokyciai. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(2), 72-76.
- Juscius, V. (2004). The Issues of Quantitative Assessment of Globalization. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(5), 49-56.
- Juscius, V., & Lekaviciene, D. (2007). The Impact of Internationalization and Globalization on the Competitiveness of Companies. *Economics and Management* (12), 746-753.
- Kearney, A. T. (2007). The Globalization Index. *Foreign Policy Magazine*, November/December, 68-76.
- Kersiene, K., & Savaneviciene, A. (2009). The Formation and Management of Organizational Competence Based on Cross-cultural Perspective. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(5), 56-67.
- Kobrin, S. J. (1991). An Empirical Analysis of the Determinants of Global Integration. *Strategic Management Journal* (12), 17-31.
- KOF Index of Globalization. Available in internet: <http://globalization.kof.ethz.ch/>.
- Lofdahl, C. (2002). Does trade help or hurt the natural environment: Perspectives from lateral pressure theory. Colorado: *University of Colorado at Boulder*.
- Macerinskas, J., Matekonienė, J., & Pipinytė, A. (2003). Globalizacijos poveikio valstybės ekonomikai pagrindinės koncepcijos. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(3), 68-75.
- Macerinskas, J., & Pipinytė, A. (2003). Globalization Measurement Methodology. *Organizacijų vadyba: sisteminiai tyrimai* (28), 71-85.
- Makarevic, A. V. (2007). Vozdeistviye globalizacii na ekonomiceskije funkcii gosudarstva. Available in internet: <http://e-journal.spa.msu.ru/images/File/avtorefMakarevich.pdf>.
- Markovic, M. R. (2008). Managing the organizational change and culture in the age of globalization. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* (1/9), 3-11.
- McCann, J. M. (1998). Globalization: Real Time Relationships Among Dispersed Individuals and Organizations. *Dawn of the Participation Age*, May.
- Melnikas, B. (2008). Integral Spaces in the European Union: Possible Trends of the Social, Economic and Technological Integration in the Baltic Region. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* (1/9), 65-77.
- Mukherjee, I. (2008). Impact of Globalization on International Trade. *ICFAI Journal of International Business* (1/3), 28-45.
- Najam, A., Runnals, D., & Halle, M. (2007). Environment and Globalisation: Five Propositions. Canada: *International Institute of Sustainable Development*. Available in internet: http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2007/trade_environment_globalization.pdf.
- Navickas, V., & Malakauskaite, A. (2009). The Possibilities for the Identification and Evaluation of Tourism Sector Competitiveness Factors. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(1), 37-44.
- Niedvaras, J. (2008). On the Phenomenon of Globalisation. *Transformations in Business & Economics* (3/15), 18.
- Reich, R. B. (1990). Who Is Us? *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 53-64.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2003). *Distant Proximities: Dynamics Beyond Globalization*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sachs, J. (1998). *Unlocking the mysteries of Globalization*. *Foreign Policy*, Spring.
- Sirgy, M. J., Lee, D. J., Miller, C., & Littlefield, J. E. (2004). The Impact of Globalization on a Country's Quality of Life: Toward an Integrated Model. *Social Indicators Research* (68), 251-298.
- Snieska, V., & Bruneckiene, J. (2009). Measurement of Lithuanian regions by regional competitiveness index. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(1), 45-57.
- Steger, M. B. (2008). *Globalizacija: labai trumpas įvadas*. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
- Sullivan, D. (1994). Measuring the Degree of Internationalization of a Firm. *Journal of International Business Studies* (25/2), 325-342.
- Sumner, A. (2004). Why We Are Still Arguing About Globalization? *Journal of International Development* (16), 1015-1022.
- Wijen, F., Zoeteman, K., & Pieters, J. A. (2005). *Handbook of Globalization and environmental policy: National government interventions in global arena*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Wolf, Ch. (2001). Globalization: Less Than Meets the Eye. *Straddling Economics and Politics: Cross-cutting Issues in Asia, United States, and the Global Economy*, 15-18.
- Wolf, Ch. (2002). Globalization: Meaning and Measurement. *Straddling Economics and Politics: Cross-cutting Issues in Asia, United States, and the Global Economy*, 3-14.
- Zickiene, S. (2008). Global Integration: Scope of Assessment Methods. *Socialiniai mokslai* (2/60), 22-31.

Irena Pekarskienė, Rozita Susniene

Baltijos šalių globalizacijos lygio vertinimas

Santrauka

Globalizacijos reiškinio fenomenas tapo tyrimų objektu mokslinėje literatūroje. Dėl globalizacijos poveikio vyksta nuolatinės diskusijos, kurios remiamos daugiau asmeninėmis nuostatomis nei objektyviais įrodymais. Pati globalizacijos sąvoka įgijo santykinai emocinį atspalvį. Kyla poreikis įvertinti globalizacijos procesą, remiantis ne subjektyvia nuomone, bet empiriniais tyrimais pagrįstais moksliniais argumentais. Mokslininkai, siekdami suteikti diskusijoms racionalumą, remiasi empiriniais duomenimis, t.y. globalizacijos rodikliais. Tokie empiriniai įrodymai leistų objektyviau vertinti globalizacijos esmę ir jos įtaką įvairioms socialinio gyvenimo sritims. Kiekybiniai matavimai taip pat leistų įvertinti ir globalizacijos mastą.

Globalizaciją vertinti kiekybiškai yra sudėtinga, nes nėra visuotinai priimtoms vertinimo metodologijos. Atskirose globalizacijos plėtros sferose – ekonominėje, kultūrinėje, socialinėje, politinėje – naudojami skirtingi kiekybiniai rodikliai. Atsiranda poreikis įvertinti globalizacijos reiškinį kaip visumą, sudaryti integruotą rodiklių rinkinį. Mėginimai globalizacijos mastą įvertinti vienu kompleksiniu rodiklių rinkiniu – naujas ir pakankamai neištyrtas reiškinys.

Baltijos šalyse globalizacijos procesai vyksta intensyviai, tačiau nežinoma, kokia šio proceso apimtis ir tendencijos, kokia globalizacijos įtaka šalių ekonominiams, socialiniams ir kultūriniam plėtojimuisi, kokius globalizacijos kiekybinio vertinimo metodus būtų galima taikyti globalizacijos lygiui matuoti. Užsienio mokslininkų atliktų tyrimų ir sukurtų metodikų analizė, įvertinimas ir jų taikymas leistų įvertinti Baltijos šalių globalizacijos proceso apimtį ir perspektyvas. Straipsnio tikslas – taikant KOF globalizacijos indekso metodiką, įvertinti Baltijos šalių globalizacijos lygį ir nustatyti jo kitimo tendencijas.

Siekdami išmatuoti ir įvertinti šalies globalizacijos lygį, mokslininkai naudoja skirtingus rodiklių rinkinius ir taiko skirtingą metodiką. Todėl taikant įvairias vertinimo metodikas, gaunami skirtingi rezultatai. Taikoma metodika nulemia šalies globalizacijos mastą. Labiausiai žinomi ir dažniausiai analizuojami du globalizacijos indeksai, kuriuose sujungiamos atskirų globalizacijos sričių: ekonominės, politinės, socialinės-kultūrinės, rodiklių grupės: Kearney globalizacijos indeksas ir Dreherio (KOF) globalizacijos indeksas.

Kearney pirmasis sujungė tokius aspektus: asmeniniai kontaktai, technologijos ir politinė integracija, kartu su ekonominės globalizacijos matavimais. Indekso sudarytojai ieško koreliacijos ryšių tarp šalies globalizacijos lygio ir ekonominių, socialinių, politinių ir kt. šalies charakteristikų, tačiau nesprenžia klausimo apie globalizacijos teigiamą ar neigiamą poveikį. Dreher patobulino Kearney indekso sudarymo metodiką, išplėtė indekso rodiklių skaičių. Išskirtinis KOF indekso privalumas – galimybė įvertinti globalizacijos įtaką šalies plėtojimuisi. Kadangi autoriai taiko skirtingą metodiką, indeksų skaičiavimo rezultatai gerokai skiriasi. Labiausiai globalizuotų šalių vertinimo skirtumus lemia tai, kad atskirų sričių rodikliams suteikiami skirtingi lyginamieji svoriai. Kearney indekse svarbiausi yra ekonominiai rodikliai, o KOF indekse – socialinių rodiklių blokas. Nepaisant to, kad Kearney ir KOF globalizacijos indeksai skaičiuojami vertinant tuos pačius – ekonominius, politinius ir socialinius aspektus, skirtingo rodiklių skaičiaus parinkimas, skirtingas rodiklių svoris ir skirtingos skaičiavimo metodikos lemia skirtingus rezultatus. Siekiant patobulinti aptartų globalizacijos indeksų skaičiavimo metodiką, būtų pravartu įtraukti ir kitų sričių – aplinkos, migracijos, karinės globalizacijos – rodiklius, taip pat papildyti ir išskirti į atskirą sritį kultūros rodiklių bloką. Ekonominėje sferoje būtų naudinga atlikti globalizacijos kiekybinį vertinimą mikroekonominium lygmeniu.

KOF indekso sudarymo metodika ir sukaupti duomenys leidžia palyginti Baltijos valstybių bendrą šalies globalizacijos lygį ir atskirų sričių globalizacijos lygio dinamiką bei įvertinti Lietuvos, Latvijos ir Estijos globalizacijos lygį bendrame visų pasaulio šalių kontekste.

Remiantis KOF indekso duomenimis, galima teigti, kad Baltijos šalių globalizacijos lygis yra gana aukštas. Lietuvos, Latvijos ir Estijos globalizacijos rodikliai patvirtina indekso sudarytojų išvadą, kad mažos šalys yra labiau globalizuotos. Aukštą Baltijos šalių globalizacijos lygį lemia ekonominės ir socialinės globalizacijos rodikliai. Bendrą Baltijos šalių globalizacijos lygį ir globalizacijos proceso greitį lemia atskirų sričių globalizacijos procesų dinamika. Estija yra labiausiai globalizuota tarp Baltijos valstybių. Aukštą šios šalies globalizacijos lygį lėmė nepaprastai dideli šalies ekonominės integracijos į pasaulinį ūkį rodikliai. Aukštą Estijos ekonomikos integracijos lygį sąlygojo palankios sąlygos verslui ir tarptautinei prekybai, Estijos vyriausybės vykdoma integracijai palanki politika, apribojanti biurokratijos įtaką, palanki mokesčių sistema ir geros sąlygos investuotojams. Be to, aukštesniam nei kitų dviejų Baltijos šalių ekonominės globalizacijos indekso lygiui darė įtaką Estijos kaimynystė ir glaudūs ekonominiai ryšiai su Suomija. Socialinėje srityje globalizacijos lygio skirtumai nėra tokie akivaizdūs, nors ir šioje srityje Estijos globalizacijos lygis yra aukščiausias, o Lietuvos – žemiausias. Po Nepriklausomybės atkūrimo Baltijos šalys tapo atviresnės, suintensyvėjo turizmas, asmeniniai ryšiai su užsieniu, sparčiai plito naujos informacinės technologijos. Visa tai darė įtaką socialinės globalizacijos proceso augimui. Politinės globalizacijos srityje globalizacijos indeksų pokyčiai buvo didžiausi visose Baltijos šalyse. Šalims paskelbus Nepriklausomybės atkūrimą, steigėsi užsienio šalių ambasados, buvo sudaromos įvairios tarptautinės sutartys, Baltijos šalys įstojo į Europos Sąjungą ir NATO, kitas tarptautines organizacijas. Lietuva pirmoji pasuko nepriklausomybės atkūrimo keliu ir tapo labiausiai globalizuota valstybe politiniu požiūriu. Latvijos politinės globalizacijos lygis yra žemiausias.

Globalizacijos procesai Baltijos šalyse stipriai koreliuoja su ūkio plėtojimosi ir atskirų socialinio gyvenimo sričių pokyčiais, tačiau skirtingose šalyse ryšių pobūdis ir stiprumas skiriasi. Lietuvoje stipriausias koreliacinis ryšys yra tarp globalizacijos lygio ir šalies BVP augimo, tiesioginių užsienio investicijų apimtys ir migracijos masto. Latvijoje globalizacijos lygis labiausiai susijęs su nedarbo lygiu, vidutinio mėnesinio darbo užmokesčio augimu, tiesioginių užsienio investicijų apimtimi ir BVP didėjimu. Estijos globalizacijos lygis labiausiai koreliuoja su vidutiniu mėnesiniu darbo užmokesčiu, emigracijos mastais ir šalies BVP didėjimu.

Ištyrus atskirų veiksnių tarpusavio ryšius, nustatytas stiprus nepriklausomų veiksnių kolinearumas, todėl, prognozuojant Baltijos šalių 2008 – 2010 m. globalizacijos indeksus., buvo apsiribota vienu rodikliu – Baltijos šalių BVP. Atlikus prognozes naudojant tiesinės regresijos lygtis, matyti, kad 2008 m. visose trijose Baltijos šalyse globalizacijos lygis turėtų didėti. Ši tendencija Lietuvoje ir Latvijoje turėtų išlikti iki 2009 m., kai abiejų šalių globalizacijos indeksai yra aukščiausių verčių: prognozuojamas 2009 m. Latvijos globalizacijos indeksas – 75,71, Lietuvos – 78,11. 2010 m. Lietuvoje ir Latvijoje prognozuojamas vienodo lygio globalizacijos indekso mažėjimas, kai abiejų šalių globalizacijos procesai bus 2007 m. lygio. Estijoje, kurios globalizacijos lygis aukščiausiai įvertit turėtų pasiekti 2008 m. (80,23), globalizacijos lygis turėtų mažėti 2009 m., tačiau nedaug. 2010 m. Estija neabejotinai turėtų išlikti labiausiai globalizuota valstybė tarp Baltijos šalių.

Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad 1991–2007 m. laikotarpiu Baltijos šalių globalizacijos lygis didėjo. Tačiau dėl pasaulio finansinės krizės sukeltos šalį ekonomiką nuosmukio Lietuvoje ir Latvijoje globalizacijos lygis labai mažės, o Estijoje – nedaug.

Raktažodžiai: *globalizacija, ekonominė globalizacija, socialinė-kultūrinė globalizacija, politinė globalizacija, globalizacijos indeksai, šalies globalizacijos lygis.*

The article has been reviewed.

Received in June, 2010; accepted in February, 2011.

DOI: 10.5755/j01.ee.22.1.219