

Odagiri, Hiroyuki

Article

Comment: Kommentar zu: Intensity of Competition in Emerging Markets and in Advanced Economies

Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung

Provided in Cooperation with:

German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

Suggested Citation: Odagiri, Hiroyuki (2001) : Comment: Kommentar zu: Intensity of Competition in Emerging Markets and in Advanced Economies, Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung, ISSN 1861-1559, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, Vol. 70, Iss. 2, pp. 203-, <https://doi.org/10.3790/vjh.70.2.203>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/99216>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

**Comment on
“Intensity of Competition in Emerging Markets
and in Advanced Economies”**

By Hiroyuki Odagiri*

I very much agree with the authors' view that competition or, probably more accurately, contestability is an important mechanism for corporate governance. In other words, a behavioral approach may be more fruitful than a structural approach to discuss the mechanism with which corporate managers are disciplined. With this viewpoint, the authors' application of persistence-of-profits (POP) methodology is quite welcome.

In the POP literature, persistence in terms of long-run profits and the persistence of short-term excess profits are usually separated. The authors discuss only the latter in this paper and I wish to encourage them to discuss the former as well.

It is good to know that the persistence coefficient, which is a coefficient to measure persistence in the latter sense, is rather lower in developing countries than in Japan, the US and European nations. We also know that in these developing countries big conglomerate firms, like Korea's chaebols, are common. In view of the recent difficulties with chaebols, one may suspect that such big conglomerates may have failed to achieve persistently supra-normal profits despite their market and political power because of diseconomies of scale and X-inefficiencies.

In view of the pre-war experience in Japan in which zaibatsu played a major role (Odagiri, Goto, 1996), such conglomerates may have been necessary in the course of economic development, but the diseconomies may now outweigh the economies. Also, their presence may impede entry by new start-up firms. Yet, unlike the post-war zaibatsu dissolution of Japan which was forced by the occupation army, it is difficult in most countries, politically or otherwise, to force the conglomerates to dissolve and divest. Here seems to lie a difficulty in the present developing countries, such as in Korea.

Reference

Odagiri, Hiroyuki, Akira Goto (1996): Technology and Industrial Development in Japan: Building Capabilities by Learning, Innovation, and Public Policy, Oxford.

* Professor at Hitotsubashi University.