An Investigation Into the Antecedents of the Export Performance Literature

by

Carlos M. Sousa and Bakr A. Alserhan

University College Dublin

Competitive Paper

Suggested Track: Business strategy, economics and the evaluation of the contemporary Multinational Enterprise

28th EIBA Conference
Athens University of Economics and Business
Athens, Greece
8-10 December 2002

Correspondence:

Carlos M. Sousa

Business Research Programme - N305

The Michael Smurfit Graduate School of Business

University College Dublin

Blackrock, Co. Dublin - Ireland

Tel: +353 1 716 8811; Fax: +353 1 716 8993

Email: Carlos.Sousa@ucd.ie

An Investigation Into the Antecedents of the Export Performance Literature

Abstract

There have been numerous studies published over the last two decades on the determinants and measures of export performance. However, in spite of these research efforts there is a lack of synthesis and agreement in conceptualizing export performance. This article attempts to review and synthesize the knowledge on the subject. As a result, this study reviews and evaluates more than 40 articles to assess determinants and measures of export performance. Based on a grouping procedure three broad groups of factors are identified as determinants of export performance. The measures of export performance were divided into objective and subjective measures and guidelines are given regarding their application. Suggestions for researchers and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: Export Performance, internal factors, external factors, subjective and objective measures

The area of export performance is attracting at an increasing pace academic as well as managerial attention. The fact that globalisation has become an undisputed reality has led to an increasing number of firms that search for opportunities abroad in order to survive. Increasing world globalization has therefore made exports an important activity for many firms (Leonidou and Katsikeas 1996). However, for a firm to be successful abroad it is necessary to identify the drivers of the firms' export performance.

Numerous studies have been concerned with identifying the key variables that affect export performance. Aaby and Slater (1989), Madsen (1987), and more recently Zou and Stan (1998) represent remarkable efforts to summarize and review export performance literature. However, despite this research effort in identifying and examining the influence of various determinants of export performance, there has been little agreement in conceptualizing, operationalizing and measuring export performance (Aaby and Slater 1989; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Shoham 1998; Styles 1998). One result of such little consensus is that findings become inconsistent and even contradictory between studies (Aaby and Slater 1989; Bonaccorsi 1992; Madsen 1987; Moini 1995). The literature on export performance is therefore probably one of the most widely research and least understood areas of international marketing.

DETERMINANTS OF EXPORT PERFORMANCE

Over time, countless number of independent variables has been used to assess export performance. However, these variables can be grouped according to the underlying construct that they attempt to measure (Aaby and Slater 1989). Thus, using a procedure similar to Aaby and Slater (1989), three broad groups of factors have been acknowledged to influence the export performance of the firm. These groups of factors are: environmental factors (Dow 2000; Madsen 1987), organizational characteristics (Bonaccorsi 1992; Koh 1991), and export marketing strategy (Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985). Table 1 lists these broad groups of variables used in previous research. Based on the existing knowledge this review is organised as follows: (1) the environmental factors; (2) organizational characteristics; and (3) export marketing strategy.

****

Insert Table 1 about here

****

Environmental Factors

The environmental factors consist of the external factors that pose both opportunities and threats to the firm which cannot be controlled. The external factors, in spite of their recognized importance (Aaby and Slater 1989; Cavusgil and Zou 1994), have received little attention in the export literature (Katsikeas, Leonidou, and Morgan 2000; Zou and Stan 1998). Thus, a review of the variables that address the influence of the external environment on the performance of the firm is elaborated below. These variables are: (1) psychic distance; (2) foreign market attractiveness; and (3) trade barriers.

Psychic distance

The term psychic distance was used in prior research by Beckerman (1956) and Linnemann (1966) before it become well known in the work of Johanson and Wiedersheim-Paul (1975) and Johanson and Vahlne (1977). They are usually considered the roots in the internationalisation process literature, where the extension of activities in a market is related to the psychic distance, suggesting that firms would enter new markets with successively greater psychic distance. Johanson and Wiedersheim-Paul (1975) defined the concept psychic distance as factors preventing or disturbing the flows of information between firms and market such as differences in language, culture, political systems, level of education, level of industrial development, etc. They assume that the first developments are in the domestic market and that internationalisation is a consequence of a series of incremental decisions, that is, firms are presumed to successively enter markets at an increasing psychic distance from the home market.

The concept of incremental internationalisation is explained further by Johanson and Vahlne (1977) by formulating a dynamic model where one decision becomes the input for the next. Thus firms are predicted to start their internationalisation by moving into those markets they can most easily understand, entering more distant markets only at a later stage. Accordingly Bilkey and Tesar (1977) argue that the firm’s export development process tends to proceed in stages with firms entering those markets they can most easily understand and move to more distant markets only as they gain more experience. Experience in close countries appears therefore to be necessary before going to more distant markets, furthermore with experience, the perceived importance of some barriers may decrease (Shoham and Albaum 1995).

The assumption however, that psychically close countries are easily understood and managed by the firm than distant ones may not be necessarily true. O'Grady and Lane (1996) found that only 7 out of 32 Canadian retail companies were being successful in the United States. They argue that “perceived similarity can cause decisionmakers to fail because they do not prepare for the differences" (p. 310). This illustrates the O'Grady and Lane (1996) psychic distance paradox that starting in a country psychically close to home may result in failure. Firms must acknowledge that cultural differences tend to stand out more than the similarities however, it is the similarities that sometimes are more important (Bradley, 1999).

Ultimately, the overall support for the psychic distance concept is substantial. The firm must be aware that each country is unique with their own characteristics and so even psychicological close countries should be treated as a foreign market.

Foreign market attractiveness

When a firm decides to go to a foreign market it has to be aware that such a decision can create both opportunities and threats for the firm. The selection of the market tends therefore to be conditioned by the foreign market attractiveness. In reviewing the literature Madsen (1987) found nine studies which include the relationship between export market attractiveness and export performance. Of these, five found a positive relationship while four studies found no relationship between export market attractiveness and export performance. As a result he concludes that the findings are unclear but recognize the importance of avoiding highly competitive markets and identifying growing markets. Similar results were found by Cooper and Kleinschmidt (1985). They reported that the relationship between foreign market potential and export performance is not significant. Madsen (1989) however found later that export market attractiveness has a quite a strong impact on export sales and that export markets with high growth and little local competition tend to result in high sales.

Interesting findings are also presented by Christensen, Rocha, and Gertner (1987). They concluded that successful exporters were more likely to export to developed countries than ex-exporters. In a similar vein, Dominguez and Sequeira (1993) found a positive relationship between exporting to developed countries and export performance. The rationale for this finding appears to be that in less developed countries it is more likely to encounter some political and economic instability, which makes continuous exporting to such countries a quite difficult task (Christensen, Rocha, and Gertner 1987).

To finish it is however, important to realise that an export market that is attractive for one firm does not necessary mean that it is good for another firm. Furthermore certain aspects of the market might present good operational conditions but not fit the firm's strategy at different levels (Yip, Biscarri, and Monti 2000). Thus, when selecting a market effort has to be made in order to find a market that will be optimal in all dimensions of the firm's strategy.

Trade barriers

The study of trade barriers is an issue of extreme importance in the export marketing literature, since it often reduce many firms from initiating, developing or sustaining export activities. Thus, the decisive impact of barriers on the export performance has attracted the attention of many scholars (e.g. Cavusgil and Nevin 1981; Leonidou 1995b; McGuinness and Little 1981; Shoham and Albaum 1995).

The role of barriers during the initial stages of export involvement is of particular interest since any failure at an early stage may inhibit the firm's progress towards internationalization (Leonidou 1995b). Furthermore, Leonidou (1995b) found that firms with small size and relatively few years of export experience tended to over-emphasize some export barriers. In another study by Cavusgil and Nevin (1981), focusing on barriers that hinder the firm's involvement in export marketing, found that the most important barriers to trade were largely attributable to top management's lack of determination to export.

Although trade barriers play an important role, they alone are not sufficient reason to impede the firm's engagement in export activities. Other factors such as environmental, organizational characteristics and export marketing strategy have to be taken in consideration when analysing the export performance of the firm.

Organizational Characteristics

Organizational characteristics have been frequently cited as important determinants of export performance (Beamish, Karavis, Goerzen, and Lane 1999; Holzmuller and Kasper 1991; Koh 1991). In the following section, organizational characteristics are divided into three categories. These include variables related to firm size, management commitment, and export experience.

Size

The relationship between firm size and export performance has been one of the most extensively studied in the export marketing literature (Aaby and Slater 1989; Bonaccorsi 1992; Moen 1999). In spite of the amount of such studies there has been little consensus concerning the impact of this variable on the export performance of the firm (Reid 1982). However, considerable attention has focused on the proposition that export performance is positively correlated with firm size (Bonaccorsi 1992). The rationale for this finding is that larger firms have more resources (personnel, financial, technology, marketing) in order to compete in the international markets (Aaby and Slater 1989).

Management commitment

The relationship between management commitment and export performance has been investigated by a number of studies (Bauerschmidt, Sullivan, and Gillespie 1985; Dominguez and Sequeira 1993; Koh 1991). There seems to be a general agreement in the export marketing literature that management commitment is of considerable importance and is positively associated with export performance. Reviewing the literature we find that Aaby and Slater (1989) identified thirteen studies, which include the relationship between management commitment and export performance. He concluded that all thirteen studies found a positive relationship between management commitment and propensity to export.

Management commitment in exporting appears therefore to be a necessary organisational ingredient for the export performance (Koh 1991). Axinn (1988) found that export performance is related with managers who believed that exporting offers better returns and better growth opportunities than their home market. Thus, management should start to devote time and resources to explore foreign marketing opportunities (Cavusgil 1984).

In sum, this seems to support the intuitive belief that a firm must be committed to exporting in order to be successful. Management commitment is therefore affirmed as a key determinant of export performance

Export experience

Like other determinants of export performance there is no consensus among the researchers about the relationship between export experience and export performance. In most cases, however, export experience has been associated positively with export performance (Dean, Menguç, and Myers 2000; Koh 1991). In a review of 17 empirical studies of export performance Madsen (1987) identified ten studies, which include the relationship between knowledge of export marketing and export performance. Of these, five found a positive relationship and two found a negative association while three studies found no relationship between knowledge of export marketing and export performance.

Firms with no export experience have been found to over-emphasize some of the export barriers (Leonidou 1995b). An increased export experience enables managers consequently, to improve their awareness of the difficulties and problems in exporting and are therefore capable of using a more appropriate and aggressive marketing strategies in gaining sales abroad (Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Hoang 1998; Koh 1991). On the other hand export experience has also been found to be negatively associated with export performance (Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985). The argument appears to be that younger firms must focus on foreign markets for sales expansion since established firms will have competitive advantages in the domestic market (Ursic and Czinkota 1984).

Although the findings are mixed the combined effect of these studies provides some support for the notion that increased export experience will increase the firm's export performance.

Export Marketing Strategy

The importance of export marketing strategy has become more evident with the intensification of competition and turbulence on the markets in which the firm operates. The vital role that export marketing strategy plays in determining the export performance of the firm has been emphasized by a sizeable number of studies (e.g. Aaby and Slater 1989; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985). The specific factors included in this category and that will be further analysed are: price competitiveness, product adaptation/standardization, and channel strategy.

Price competitiveness

Price competitiveness is perceived to be one of the most serious barriers for a firm to start exporting (Leonidou 1995b). Firms that are trying to enter and maintain a profitable position in the export market are therefore, expected to draw attention to their prices relative to the competition. Thus, it is expected that export performance is influenced positively by price competitiveness. This is consistent with Kirpalani and Macintosh (1980) findings in which pricing is found to be highly associated with export success. Madsen (1987) in his study, found seven studies which related price competitiveness with export performance. Of these three found a positive relationship and two a negative association while two studies did not find any significant relationship between price competitiveness and export performance. Consequently, he concluded that price competitiveness only marginally affects export performance (Madsen 1989).

Accordingly these findings provide some support for the view that price competitiveness should not be considered as the only or major determinant of export performance. The results are however mixed and as a result no clear export pricing guidelines can be drawn from these findings.

Product adaptation/standardization

An important aspect of the export marketing literature is the study of the variable product adaptation/standardization as a determinant of export performance. There is however some conflicting findings regarding his relationship with export performance. In a review of the literature Madsen (1987) found four studies with a positive relationship and one with a negative association between product adaptation and export performance. Consequently he concludes that a product adaptation strategy "seems to be a good idea." Some empirical evidence also supports the positive relationship between performance and product adaptation (Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Shoham 1999). A more inconclusive result was reported by Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner (2000) they found that differentiation strategy, which is similar to adaptation, is positively related to export effectiveness but is inversely associated with export intensity and export sales. Christensen, Rocha, and Gertner (1987) went further and stated that successful exporters were more likely to be manufacturers of standardized products. The rationale for supporting product standardization in the literature appears to be attached to the belief that firms' can market standardized products all over the world, achieving economies of scale with resultant lower cost and higher margins. Although this appears reasonably, attention should be paid to the fact that consumers across "countries" differ on values, attribute importance, brand loyalty and other aspects that reflect their cultural background. As a result, a product adaptation strategy would enhance the firm's export performance including in the long-term.

Channel strategy

The selection of the right export channel strategy to be used by the firm is extremely important in order to be successful in the foreign markets. The cooperation in the export channel will lead to effective implementation of marketing strategy and have a positive effect on performance (Madsen 1989; Rosson and Ford 1982). The channel support is therefore perceived as a logical consequence of commitment to the export activity (Cavusgil and Zou 1994) and such support is mostly important when the export market is particularly competitive. In reviewing the literature Madsen (1987) for example, found five studies, which related channel support with export performance and in all five studies both variables turned out to be positively associated.

While there appears to be a wide consensus among the researchers about the positive association between channel support and export performance, the selection of the export channel strategy seems to be more controversial. Koh (1991) for example reported that firms perceive higher profitability when exporting through their own export department than through an export agent. In apparent contrast Christensen, Rocha, and Gertner (1987) found that trading companies were more than three times as likely to be used by the successful exporters than by ex-exporters.

Although, there seems to be little consensus concerning the selection of the appropriate export channel strategy, it appears to be clear that such a selection will influence the performance of the firm in the long-term.

EXPORT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

A large number of studies have identified a great variety of indicators to measure export performance. There appears however to be widespread agreement that export performance is a multifaceted concept and that it can not be correctly measured by any single indicator (Aaby and Slater 1989; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Francis and Collins-Dodd 2000; Samiee and Roth 1992; Shoham 1998). Table 2 illustrates a variety of indicators used by previous researchers in order to measure export performance. The indicators were divided into objective and subjective measures of performance. Indicators that are based mainly on absolute values such as return on assets, export sales level, export market share among others are called objective measures. While indicators that measure the perceptual or attitudinal performance such as perceived export success are considered to be subjective measures of performance. In order to illustrate the difference between objective and subjective measures, consider the following example. Export intensity can be measured by the percentage of export sales to total sales (objective) or it can be measured by asking the manager how satisfied he his with the firm's export intensity (subjective measure).

****

Insert Table 2 about here

****

Objective and subjective measures

A review of the literature suggests that the two principal modes of performance assessment are objective and subjective measures (Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996). The literature appears however to suggest a preference for the use of objective performance indicators (Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Yeoh 2000; Zou, Taylor, and Osland 1998), such as export intensity, export sales growth, export sales volume and export profitability. However, the use of objective export performance indicators may be of little use for comparisons across businesses and cross-country studies because of differences in terms of competition, technology intensiveness, market structure (Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996), accounting and sales procedure (Styles 1998).

Thus, increasingly more researchers are starting to use subjective measures to assess the export performance of the firm. Furthermore there appears to be evidence that subjective and objective measures are positively associated (Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Dess and Robinson 1984; Shoham 1998; Styles 1998). Previous research has shown that the main reason for choosing subjective over objective measures is that firms are extremely reluctant to provide objective data (Francis and Collins-Dodd 2000; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Robertson and Chetty 2000; Styles 1998). Moreover assuming that objective data was received there would also be the issue of the interpretation and accuracy of such data (McGuinness and Little 1981; Robertson and Chetty 2000). The use of subjective measures appears therefore to be advantageous because it is easier to collect (Shoham 1998). Furthermore, management evaluation of the firm performance appears to be more guided by their subjective perceptions rather than by objectives measures (Madsen 1989). This seems to support the adoption of subjective measures to assess export performance.

Still another important issue is the use of appropriate performance measures to capture short- and long-term performance. Short-term performance can be operationalized by subjective and objective measures such as satisfaction with export intensity, the absolute size of these sales, and profits margins (Shoham 1999). While long-term performance can be assessed by changes in sales and profitability with similar satisfaction items over period of time, rather than for the last year. This period of time to assess performance is usually measured for the previous three (e.g. Francis and Collins-Dodd 2000; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996) or five years (e.g. Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Shoham 1998). Furthermore, managers should be aware that the use of measures that are typically related to short-term goals are often to static to grasp the dynamic changes of the firm and its environment and should therefore not stand alone (Madsen 1998). A firm, for example, that seeks a high market share may accept lower prices to achieve higher export sales, resulting in reduced export profitability.

In brief, it seems clear that export performance is a multifaceted concept and that no single indicator is sufficient to provide a reliable assessment of export performance.

Furthermore, there is still no general valid operationalization of export performance on which to base a set of indicators. Using however, a combination of indicators, both subjective and objective, can enhance the possibility of accurately measuring the export performance of the firm.

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this article was to review and synthesize the conceptual and operational aspects of available research on export performance. The first starting point was a review of a set of export performance indicators used in previous research. During this time a great number of studies have found numerous indicators to measure export performance (for an overview see Aaby and Slater 1989; Katsikeas, Leonidou, and Morgan 2000; Madsen 1987). The use of multiple measures of export performance appears to be necessary to fully realize the strengths of each indicator and minimize the impact of their shortcomings (Evangelista 1994). While findings relating to some indicators appear to be consistent (e.g. management commitment), there are other determinants which results are inconclusive (e.g. firm size, export experience). These discrepancies may have resulted from a serious of conceptual, methodological, and practical limitations, obstructing theory advancement in this area (Aaby and Slater 1989; Madsen 1987). There is a need, therefore, of a unified conceptualisation and uniform measurement of export performance. Another conceptual problem is the tendency among researchers to ignore results of previous studies on export performance, resulting in duplication and relative stagnation of research in the area. Additionally, there is a need of cross-cultural validation of export performance measures since many studies were done in a one-country context (Styles 1998; Zou, Taylor, and Osland 1998).

In addition to this, the export marketing literature has been criticized for providing only fragmented results and for not being able to develop a widely accepted model of export performance, thus limiting theoretical advancement in this field. There is a need, therefore, in moving toward frameworks and conceptualisations that explain the export performance of the firm in a more convincing manner. Some valuable contributions have been made by the work of Aaby and Slater (1989) and Cavusgil and Zou (1994). The fact that Aaby and Slater (1989) only centred their attention on internal factors gives motive to expand this conceptualisation of export performance. Cavusgil and Zou (1994) building upon the work of Aaby and Slater (1989) gave a broader overview of export performance incorporating both internal and external factors, which contains both economic and strategic dimensions as well as subjective and objective measures of performance. Thus, export performance should be assessed at two broad levels – the external environment level, and the internal level. This study has yielded valuable information by reviewing a set of variables that belong to the external as well as internal level in which future research can be based on in order to develop a consistent conceptualisation and measurement of export performance.

REFERENCES

Aaby, Nils-Erik, and Stanley F. Slater. 1989. "Management influences on export performance: A review of the empirical literature 1978-1988." *International Marketing Review* 6(4):7-26.

Axinn, Catherine N. 1988. "Export Performance: Do Managerial Perceptions Make a Difference." *International Marketing Review* 5(2):61-71.

Baldauf, Artur, David W Cravens, and Udo Wagner. 2000. "Examining Determinants of Export Performance in Small Open Economies." *Journal of World Business* 35(1):61-79.

Bauerschmidt, Alan, Daniel Sullivan, and Kate Gillespie. 1985. "Common Factors Underlying Barriers to Export: Studies in the US Paper Industry." *Journal of International Business Studies* 16(Fall):111-123.

Beamish, Paul W., Lambros Karavis, Anthony Goerzen, and Christopher Lane. 1999. "The relationship between organizational structure and export performance." *Management International Review* 39(1):37-54.

Beckerman, W. 1956. "Distance and the Pattern of Inter-European Trade." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 38(1):31-40.

Bilkey, Warren J. 1982. "Variables associated with export profitability." *Journal of International Business Studies* 13(Fall):39-55.

Bilkey, Warren J., and George Tesar. 1977. "The export behavior of smaller-sized Wisconsin manufacturing firms." *Journal of International Business Studies* 8(1):93-98.

Bonaccorsi, Andrea. 1992. "On the relationship between firm size and export intensity." *Journal of International Business Studies* 23(4):605-635.

Cavusgil, S Tamer. 1984. "Organizational Characteristics Associated with Export Activity." *Journal of Management Studies* 21(1):3-22.

Cavusgil, S Tamer, and John R Nevin. 1981. "Internal Determinants of Export Marketing Behavior: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Marketing Research* 18(February):114-119.

Cavusgil, S. Tamer, and Shaoming Zou. 1994. "Marketing strategy - performance relationship: An investigation of the empirical link in export market ventures." *Journal of Marketing* 58(January):1-21.

Christensen, Carl H, Angela da Rocha, and Rosane Kerbel Gertner. 1987. "An Empirical Investigation of the Factors Influencing the Export Success of Brazilian Firms." *Journal of International Business Studies* 18(Fall):61-77.

Cooper, Robert G, and Elko J Kleinschmidt. 1985. "The Impact of Export Strategy on Export Sales Performance." *Journal of International Business Studies* 14(Spring):37-55.

Dean, David L, Bulent Menguç, and Christopher P Myers. 2000. "Revisiting Firm Characteristics, Strategy, and Export Performance Relationship: A Survey of the Literature and an Investigation of New Zealand Small Manufacturing Firms." *Industrial Marketing Management* 29(5):461-477.

Dess, Gregory G, and Richard B Robinson. 1984. "Measuring organizational performance in the absence of objective measures: The case of the privately held firm and conglomerate business unit." *Strategic Management Journal* 5(3):265-273.

Diamantopoulos, Adamantios, and Karen Inglis. 1988. "Identifying Differences Between High- and Low-Involvement Exporters." *International Marketing Review* 5(2):52-60.

Dominguez, Luis V, and Carlos G Sequeira. 1993. “Determinants of LDC Exporters' Performance: A Cross-National Study.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 24(First Quarter):19-40.

Dow, Douglas. 2000. “A Note on Psychological Distance and Export Market Selection.” *Journal of International Marketing* 8(1):51-64.

Evangelista, Felicitas U. 1994. “Export Performance and its Determinants: Some Empirical Evidence from Australian Manufacturing Firms.” Pp. 207-229 in *Advances in International Marketing*, edited by S Tamer Cavusgil, and C Axinn. JAI Press.

Francis, June, and Colleen Collins-Dodd. 2000. “The impact of firms' export orientation on the export performance of high-tech small and medium-sized enterprises.” *Journal of International Marketing* 8(3):84-103.

Hoang, B Peter. 1998. “A Causal Study of Relationships Between Firm characteristics, International Marketing Strategies, and Export Performance.” *Management International Review* 38(Special Issue 1):73-94.

Holzmuller, Hartmut H, and Helmut Kasper. 1991. “On a Theory of Export Performance: Personal and Organizational Determinants of Export Trade Activities Observed in Small and Medium-Sized Firms.” *Management International Review* 31(Special Issue):45-70.

Johanson, Jan, and Jan-Erik Vahlne. 1977. “The internationalization process of the firm - A model of knowledge development and increasing foreign market commitments.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 8(1):23-32.

Johanson, Jan, and Finn Wiedersheim-Paul. 1975. “The internationalization of the firm - Four Swedish cases.” *Journal of Management Studies* 12(3):305-322.

Johnston, Wesley J, and Michael R Czinkota. 1982. “Managerial Motivations as Determinants of Industrial Export Behavior.” Pp. 295 in *Export Management: An International Context*, edited by Michael R Czinkota, and George Tesar. Praeger Publishers.

Katsikeas, Constantine S, Leonidas C Leonidou, and Neil A Morgan. 2000. “Firm-level export performance assessment: Review, evaluation, and development.” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 28(4):493-511.

Katsikeas, Constantine S., Nigel F. Piercy, and Chris Loannidis. 1996. “Determinants of export performance in a European context.” *European Journal of Marketing* 30(6):6-35.

Kirpalani, V H, and N B Macintosh. 1980. “International Marketing Effectiveness of Technology-Oriented Small Firms.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 11(Winter):81-90.

Koh, Anthony C. 1991. “Relationships among Organisational Characteristics, Marketing Strategy and Export Performance.” *International Marketing Review* 8(3):46-60.

Leonidou, Leonidas C. 1995a. “Empirical research on Export Barriers: Review, Assessment, and Synthesis.” *Journal of International Marketing* 3(1):29-43.

Leonidou, Leonidas C. 1995b. “Export Barriers: Non-Exporters' Perceptions.” *International Marketing Review* 12(1):4-25.

Leonidou, Leonidas C., and Constantine S. Katsikeas. 1996. “The export development process: An integrative review of empirical models.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 27(3):517-551.

Linnemann, Hans. 1966. *An Econometric Study of International Trade Flows*. North Holland Pub Co.

Madsen, Tage Koed. 1987. “Empirical export performance studies: A review of conceptualizations and findings.” Pp. 177-198 in *Advances in International Marketing*, edited by S Tamer Cavusgil. JAI Press.

Madsen, Tage Koed. 1989. “Successful Export Marketing Management: Some Empirical Evidence.” *International Marketing Review* 6(4):41-57.

Madsen, Tage Koed. 1998. “Executive Insights: Managerial Judgment of Export Performance.” *Journal of International Marketing* 6(3):82-93.

McGuinness, Norman W, and Blair Little. 1981. “The Influence of Product Characteristics on the Export Performance of New Industrial Products.” *Journal of Marketing* 45(Spring):110-122.

Moen, Øystein. 1999. “The relationship between firm size, competitive advantages export performance revisited.” *International Small Business Journal* 18(1):53-72.

Moini, A H. 1995. “An Inquiry into Successful Exporting: An Empirical Investigation using a Three-stage Model.” *Journal of Small Business Management* 33(July):9-25.

O'Grady, Shawna, and Henry W. Lane. 1996. “The psychic distance paradox.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 27(2):309-333.

Reid, Stan. 1982. “The Impact of Size on Export Behavior in Small Firms.” Pp. 295 in *Export Management: An International Context*, edited by Michael R Czinkota, and George Tesar. Praeger Publishers.

Reid, Stan D. 1983. “Managerial and Firm Influences on Export Behavior.” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 11(3):323-332.

Robertson, Christopher, and Sylvie K Chetty. 2000. “A Contingency-Based Approach to Understanding Export Performance.” *International Business Review* 9(2):211-235.

Rosson, Philip J, and L David Ford. 1982. "Manufacturer-Overseas Distributor Relations and Export Performance." *Journal of International Business* 13(Fall):57-72.

Samiee, Saeed, and Kendall Roth. 1992. "The Influence of Global Marketing Standardization on Performance." *Journal of Marketing* 56(April):1-17.

Samiee, Saeed, and Peter G P Walters. 1990. "Influence of Firm Size on Export Planning and Performance." *Journal of Business Research* 20(3):235-248.

Shoham, Aviv. 1998. "Export performance: A conceptualization and empirical assessment." *Journal of International Marketing* 6(3):59-81.

Shoham, Aviv. 1999. "Bounded Rationality, Planning, Standardization of International Strategy, and Export Performance: A Structural Model Examination." *Journal of International Marketing* 7(2):24-50.

Shoham, Aviv, and Gerald S Albaum. 1995. "Reducing the Impact of Barriers to Exporting: A Managerial Perspective." *Journal of international Marketing* 3(4):85-105.

Styles, Chris. 1998. "Export performance measures in Australia and the United Kingdom." *Journal of International Marketing* 6(3):12-36.

Tookey, D A. 1964. "Factores Associated with Success in Exporting." *Journal of Management Studies* 1(March):48-66.

Ursic, Michael L, and Michael R Czinkota. 1984. "An Experience Curve Explanation of Export Expansion." *Journal of Business Research* 12(2):159-168.

Yeoh, Poh-Lin. 2000. "Information Acquisition Activities: A Study of Global Start-Up Exporting Companies." *Journal of International Marketing* 8(3):36-60.

Yip, George S., Javier Gomez Biscarri, and Joseph A. Monti. 2000. “The role of the internationalization process in the performance of newly internationalizing firms.” *Journal of International Marketing* 8(3):10-35.

Zou, Shaoming, and Simona Stan. 1998. “The determinants of export performance: A review of the empirical literature between 1987 and 1997.” *International Marketing Review* 15(5):333-356.

Zou, Shaoming, Charles R Taylor, and Gregory E Osland. 1998. “The EXPERF scale: A cross-national generalized export performance measure.” *Journal of International Marketing* 6(3):37-58.

Table 1: Determinants of export performance used in previous research

Environmental	Relevant literature
Psychic distance	(Bilkey and Tesar 1977; Dow 2000; Johanson and Vahlne 1977; Johanson and Wiedersheim-Paul 1975; Madsen 1987; Madsen 1989; O'Grady and Lane 1996; Shoham and Albaum 1995)
Foreign market attractiveness	(Christensen, Rocha, and Gertner 1987; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985; Dominguez and Sequeira 1993; Madsen 1987; Madsen 1989; Yip, Biscarri, and Monti 2000)
Trade barriers	(Bilkey and Tesar 1977; Cavusgil and Nevin 1981; Leonidou 1995a; Leonidou 1995b; Madsen 1987; Madsen 1989; McGuinness and Little 1981; Shoham and Albaum 1995)
Organizational characteristics	**Relevant literature**
Size	(Aaby and Slater 1989; Axinn 1988; Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Bonaccorsi 1992; Cavusgil 1984; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985; Diamantopoulos and Inglis 1988; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Moen 1999; Reid 1983; Samiee and Walters 1990)
Management commitment	(Aaby and Slater 1989; Axinn 1988; Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Bauerschmidt, Sullivan, and Gillespie 1985; Cavusgil 1984; Dean, Menguç, and Myers 2000; Diamantopoulos and Inglis 1988; Dominguez and Sequeira 1993; Francis and Collins-Dodd 2000; Johnston and Czinkota 1982; Koh 1991; Madsen 1989; Robertson and Chetty 2000)
Export experience	(Axinn 1988; Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985; Dean, Menguç, and Myers 2000; Diamantopoulos and Inglis 1988; Dominguez and Sequeira 1993; Hoang 1998; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Koh 1991; Leonidou 1995b; Madsen 1987; Madsen 1989; Ursic and Czinkota 1984)
Export marketing strategy	**Relevant literature**
Price competitiveness	(Bilkey 1982; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Kirpalani and Macintosh 1980; Koh 1991; Leonidou 1995b; Madsen 1989)
Product adaptation/standardization	(Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Christensen, Rocha, and Gertner 1987; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985; Madsen 1987; Samiee and Roth 1992; Shoham 1999; Tookey 1964)
Channel strategy	(Bilkey 1982; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Christensen, Rocha, and Gertner 1987; Koh 1991; Madsen 1987; Madsen 1989; Rosson and Ford 1982; Shoham 1999)

Table 2: Export performance measures used in previous research

Objective measures	Relevant literature
Export intensity	(Axinn 1988; Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Bonaccorsi 1992; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985; Dominguez and Sequeira 1993; Francis and Collins-Dodd 2000; McGuinness and Little 1981; Moen 1999; Shoham 1998; Tookey 1964; Yeoh 2000)
Export sales growth	(Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Cooper and Kleinschmidt 1985; Dominguez and Sequeira 1993; Madsen 1989; Moen 1999; Samiee and Roth 1992; Styles 1998; Yeoh 2000)
Export sales volume	(Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Dominguez and Sequeira 1993; Francis and Collins-Dodd 2000; Madsen 1989; Shoham 1998)
Export profitability	(Francis and Collins-Dodd 2000; Madsen 1989; Samiee and Roth 1992; Shoham 1998; Shoham 1999)
Export market share	(Shoham 1998; Shoham 1999)
Subjective measures	**Relevant literature**
Export profitability (satisfaction)	(Bilkey 1982; Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Moen 1999; Robertson and Chetty 2000; Shoham 1998; Shoham 1999; Zou, Taylor, and Osland 1998)
Export Intensity (satisfaction)	(Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Robertson and Chetty 2000; Shoham 1998)
Export sales growth	(Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Robertson and Chetty 2000; Shoham 1998; Shoham 1999; Zou, Taylor, and Osland 1998)
Market share	(Baldauf, Cravens, and Wagner 2000; Katsikeas, Piercy, and Loannidis 1996; Moen 1999; Zou, Taylor, and Osland 1998)
Satisfaction with overall export performance	(Moen 1999; Robertson and Chetty 2000; Styles 1998)
Perceived export success	(Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Zou, Taylor, and Osland 1998)
Perceptions of the achievement of strategic goals	(Cavusgil and Zou 1994; Styles 1998)