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Abstract

In this study, drawing on resource-based view and dynamic capabilities approach is aimed to investigate the effects of marketing capabilities and export market orientation on export performance. In this regard, suggesting hypotheses about the relationships between these variables, the model has been proposed. Using survey data of 416 manufacturing firms based in Turkey that are exporting to international markets, the model was tested by confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modelling.

Results indicate that marketing capabilities (i.e., product development, channel management, selling and delivery management) are positively and significantly affects export market orientation. Also, there is a strong relationship between export market orientation and export performance (i.e., financial performance, strategic performance and satisfaction with export venture).
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Introduction

In the ever-increasing intense competition environment, it has become inevitable that firms carry their activities from national markets to international, even to global markets, in order to extend their market shares, increase income, obtain scarce resources with low costs, reduce local market risks and get a sustainable competitive advantage. Exporting is the most widely preferred strategy by the firms to enter the foreign markets in terms of requiring less financial sources and having lower risks compared to other entering modes of international markets (i.e. license, franchising, manufacturing, management agreements, joint ventures, direct investment, mergers and acquisitions etc.) (Murray et al., 2007). However, even though exporting gives some advantages to firms in entering the international markets compared to other modes, it is not possible to say that firms would definitely get successful outcomes in
foreign markets. In this respect, it is seen that relevant literature includes a great number of research on the factors that affecting firms’ export performance. When the studies on export performance are examined, it can be said that the indicators of export performance are generally covered in five groups. These are; firm characteristics (Aaby and Slater, 1989; Holzmüller and Kasper, 1991; Dominguez and Sequeira, 1993; Kaynak and Kuan, 1993; Ito and Pucik, 1993; Cavusgil and Zou, 1994; Das, 1994; Katsikeas et al., 1996; Brouthers et al., 2009; Kocak and Abimbola, 2009; Singh, 2009; Aktepe et al., 2011), management characteristics (Holzmüller and Kasper, 1991; Das, 1994; Holzmüller and Stöttinger, 1996; Brouthers et al., 2009), product characteristics (Cavusgil and Zou, 1994; Das, 1994; Kocak and Abimbola, 2009), export market characteristics (Holzmüller and Kasper, 1991; Kaynak and Kuan, 1993; Cavusgil and Zou, 1994; Das, 1994; Aktepe et al., 2011; Morgan et al., 2012) and export marketing strategies (Aaby and Slater, 1989; Madsen, 1989; Dominguez and Sequeira, 1993; Kaynak and Kuan, 1993; Cavusgil and Zou, 1994; Brouthers et al., 2009; Morgan et al., 2012) etc. Aaby and Slater (1989), Zou and Stan (1998), Sousa et al., (2008) and Wheeler et al., (2008) also contribute export performance indicator literature with meta-analysis studies.

In the field of export performance research, it is seen that interest towards export market orientation, which is an indicator factor for export success, has increased from the second half of 1990s (Sousa et al., 2008). Thus, researchers (Cadogan and Diamantopoulos, 1995; Cadogan et al., 1999; Collins-Dodd, 2000; Cadogan et al., 2002; Akyol and Akehurst, 2003; Cadogan et al., 2003; Cadogan and Cui, 2004; Knight and Cavusgil, 2004; Dodd, 2005; Murray et al., 2007; Cadogan et al., 2009; Murray et al., 2011) tended to conduct studies that aim at revealing the relationships between the exporting firms that mostly adapted and implemented export market orientation and their export performances.

Being successful in international markets cannot be easy every time due to the fact that international marketing environment is more complicated, dynamic and muti-dimensional. In order for the firms to gain sustainable competitive advantage and reach superior performance in foreign markets, they need to develop capabilities appropriate for international market environments. Firms need to find new markets, adapt their products in line with the needs of these markets and/or develop new export products, determine pricing strategies, select appropriate distribution channels and pursue promotional activities in order to be long-term and permanent in foreign markets. This can be possible through the presence of marketing capabilities. Thus, in order to get a regular and continuous success in exporting performance, firms need to follow-up the rivals, customers and other environmental conditions in the foreign
market according to their resource and capabilities as being export market oriented (Murray et al., 2007).

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship among firms’ marketing capabilities, their export market orientation and export performance. In this respect, this study aims at examining the extent to which export performance in foreign markets are affected through firms’ marketing capabilities and export market orientation. The integrative model suggested for the purpose of removing single way model approaches detected in both theoretical and experimental in the former studies on the factors affecting export performance and the discussions to be made within this framework are thought to be the contributions of this study to the relevant literature.

In the study, initially the theories regarding the model developed within the purpose of the research were mentioned. In this respect, the content of resource-based view and dynamic capabilities approach and its relationship with the relevant literature were explained. Next, in light of the theoretical information, the hypothesis and the research model were developed. Later, a questionnaire was prepared for the validity of the hypothesis and the research model and it was conducted with the member firms of Turkish Exporters’ Association, which was selected as the sample. Data obtained were analyzed and finally interpretations were made regarding the findings.

**Theory framework**

*Resource-Base View*

Resource-based approach explains the reason of firms’ demonstrating different performances in the same industry with having different resources and capabilities. In this scope, resource-based approach examines the relationship between firm’s internal characteristics and its performance (Barney, 1991). According to Morgan et al., (2006) resource-based theory emphasizes the importance of resource heterogeneity among firms on affecting firms’ performance. Based on this theory, resource heterogeneity causes performance differences among firms because the fact that firms have different and various resources affect their ability to form and implement competitive strategies and thus their performances. However, despite its important effect in explaining firms’ performances, the theory is criticized due to the fact that suitable for stable markets, doesn’t have any suggestion for maintaining the sustainability of competitive advantage and insufficient in explaining development and
expansion of resources to gain competitive advantage (Morgan et al., 2009a; Aktepe et al., 2011).

In contrast, according to Song et al., (2007) resource-based approach clarifies how firms should allocate their resources to obtain and use competitive capabilities. Song et al., (2007) emphasize that in the resource-based approach firms should have capabilities but it is not enough for superior performance. If firms could assign their resources for the best-use and invest in these capabilities and integrate them, they would get a sustainable competitive advantage with the creation of unique capabilities and increase their performance for long-term (Song et al., 2007). According to Nath et al., (2010), resource-based theory argues that firms would have different and various levels and natures of resources and capabilities. Based on the theory, firms’ survival depends on their capabilities of creating new resources (that they would build on their capabilities) and developing capabilities that are more difficult to copy to gain competitive advantage.

Resource based approach is one of the approaches that is most frequently used to support the theoretical framework particularly in exporting research (Singh, 2009). For instance, according to resource-based theory, firm resources are directly related with firm performance. In this respect, the resources of the export venture must be directly related with performance outcomes of export venture (Morgan et al., 2006). Thus, in the marketing literature, it is emphasized that resource-based approach is used in several studies on the effect of marketing and other functional resource and capabilities on the firm performance (Sloteagraaf and Dickson, 2004; Akdeniz et al., 2010; Freeman et al., 2010; Nath et al., 2010; Murray et al., 2011). In the relevant literature, experimental findings were also found regarding the direct and/or indirect effect of firm resources on firm performance. For instance resources and capabilities indirectly and positively affect the export performance through competitiveness (Morgan et al., 2004), technological intensity and internalization (Dhanraj and Beamish, 2003) and export marketing strategies (Cavusgil and Zou, 1994) etc. Resource based approach argues that the export performance of the firms depends on the firm-level activities. In this respect, in some studies conducted within the scope of resource-based approach findings regarding the direct effect of some factors such as firm size (Singh, 2009); the research and development and advertisement costs used for measuring firm resources (Singh, 2009); market planning capabilities (Sloteagraaf and Dickson, 2004); marketing capabilities (Akdeniz et al., 2010; Nath et al., 2010); operational skills (Nath et al., 2010) and international diversification strategies with goods and services (Nath et al., 2010) on export performance. Also, Cadogan et al., (2009) state that drawing on resource based theory export market orientation activity is a rare and inimitable business
resource, in other words, capability and this helped firms obtain sustainable competitive advantage and superior business performance.

Dynamic Capabilities Approach

Dynamic capabilities approach was developed to find an answer to the question why some firms cannot be successful in maintaining their competitive advantage in the long run although they have relatively superior resources in the dynamic markets (Teece et al., 1997). In this approach, the concept *dynamic* corresponds to the capacity of renewing the abilities in order to adapt to the changing environment. According to Teece et al., (1997), such innovative ventures become important especially when marketing timing is essential, technological change is rapid and estimating competition and market conditions is difficult. *Capabilities* represent the role of strategic management in adapting, integrating and reconstructing internal and external organizational skills, sources and functional capabilities appropriately in order to respond to the needs of changing environment (Teece et al., 1997). In this respect Teece et al., (1997) defined *dynamic capabilities* as the firm’s capability to create, integrate and reconstruct internal and external abilities. Griffith and Harvey (2001) examined this term in a global framework and defined as creating inimitable resources that can ensure worldwide competitive advantage to the firm and include effective coordination of its inter-organizational relationships. Zahra and George (2002) and Zahra et al., (2006) defined dynamic capabilities as change oriented abilities that assist adjusting or reconstructing the resources in order to meet the changing customer demands and developing competitive strategies. On the other hand, Mengüç and Auh (2006) defined dynamic capabilities as “constructing the innovativeness and market orientation by integrating”. Aktepe et al., (2011) argued that market orientation and entrepreneur and learning orientation would accelerate early internalization as the firm’s dynamic capability. Similarly, Kocak and Abimbola (2009) reviewed market orientation with entrepreneurship and organizational learning, which are the other important capabilities of the firms and examined their effect on the performance of born global firms. Morgan et al., (2012) based the effectiveness of export marketing plan as the main factor that effecting export performance on dynamic capabilities theory. According to dynamic capabilities theory, the most important factor that ensures the implementation effectiveness of the planned marketing strategies is the capabilities the firm has. Firms use these capabilities to transforming marketing strategies decisions into appropriate tactics and resource allocation for current and future potential markets.
Dynamic capabilities enable firms to take advantage with new ventures and the strategies they developed are entering new market areas, performing successful mergers, learning new skills, overcoming stagnation and producing new technologies with research and development units (Zahra et al., 2006). Such activities also increase organization’s agility and market responsiveness. Also, dynamic capabilities facilitate and encourage internalizations. To further generalize, dynamic capabilities have a great importance for firms especially in the international markets for creating new ventures, successfully entering markets and survival.

Hypotheses development

Marketing capabilities are based on “market knowledge about the experiences and customer needs” that the firm obtains while estimating and meeting customer needs through market orientation (Morgan et al., 2012). In this respect, these capabilities were generated by the information that is hard to copy by rivals and that is secretly held (Murray et al., 2011). Thus, these capabilities are more essential in rapidly changing dynamic sectors where especially the need for knowledge has increased (Ruiz-Ortega et al., 2008). According to Griffith et al., (2009), marketing capabilities is the ability of the firm to integrate its knowledge, skill and resources in order to meet the changing market needs and resist to the competitive pressure. In this respect marketing capabilities is a common process where tangible and intangible resources are exploited together in order to create valuable outcomes. Marketing capabilities became a unique by combining the employees’ knowledge and skills with their past experiences in new product development, sales and distribution activities. As a result, these capabilities cannot be easily imitated by the rivals and assist firms for achieving sustainable competitive advantage.

According to Morgan et al., (2012), based on dynamic capabilities theory and marketing literature, the most important marketing capabilities are “architectural and specialized export marketing capabilities”. Architectural export marketing capabilities, the exporting firm’s process of obtaining export market intelligence and using this information in appropriate export marketing strategies. In the model of Morgan et al., (2012) these capabilities are composed of “process and interpret export market information, distribute it to the related decision makers and develop an export marketing strategies”. Specialized export marketing capabilities, needed for implementing export marketing strategies that related to export marketing program. In the model, these capabilities include “product development, pricing, channel management, selling, delivery management, marketing communication and post-sale service”. As Morgan et al., (2012) assume that the interaction of different marketing capabilities enhance the company’s high performance in creating a synergic value, they supplemented “marketing capability
integration”, which is the combination of these two capabilities, into their model. Indeed, the dynamic capabilities theory emphasizes the view that the company’s different organizational capabilities may be complementary characteristics and can create additional economic gain. As a result of their studies, Morgan et al., (2012) found that marketing capabilities would enable the company to successfully implement its export marketing strategy as it planned and therefore enhance its export performance.

Blesa and Ripolles (2008) point out that marketing capabilities facilitate knowledge of customers, product development and adaptation, as well as meticulous manipulation of key marketing tactical elements to target foreign customers with quality, differentiated goods. Blesa and Ripolles (2008) adapted marketing capabilities typology developed by Day (1994)’s and also added the ‘network capability’ in to their model. In this respect, they measured marketing capabilities with four factor as network capabilities (mutual trust and sharing the goals, expertise and mutual commitments with strategic partners), outside-in capabilities (sensitivity to the market and consumer relations), inside-out capabilities (experience in finance, human resources and business management) and spanning capabilities (ability of customer service, launching successful new products, managing marketing, using market information). Blesa and Ripolles (2008) found that marketing capabilities have a positive impact on the company’s international commitment, entry modes and economic performance.

Katsikeas et al., (1996) used production and marketing capabilities as a factor of competitive advantage and found that marketing capabilities have a positive effect on export performance. Similarly Vorhies and Morgan (2005)’s study demonstrates that there is a positive relationship between marketing capabilities and business performance. According to the researchers, certain capabilities mentioned in the literature as inputs used in producing valuable outputs are the elements of conventional marketing mix. Based on the literature, the researchers included ‘sales, management of the market information, marketing planning and implementation’ as elements of marketing mix. Additionally, they proved that the common effect of these capabilities on performance is much higher and positive than the separate effect.

According to Akdeniz et al., (2010) marketing capabilities include ‘marketing communication, selling and market information management’. Akdeniz et al., (2010) examined the transformation of dealers’ marketing inputs (advertisement, marketing, showroom expenses and consumer relationships investments) into the marketing capabilities’ effect on their total sales as an indication of financial performance. Scope of the resource-based approach, Nath et al., (2010) searched the firm’s functional capabilities as ‘marketing and operational capabilities’
and ‘product, service and international diversification strategies’ effect on the financial performance in the logistics sector. They found that, marketing and operational capabilities of firm’s enhance their business performance. On the other hand, Krasnikov and Jayachveran (2008) assumed that different capabilities do have different impacts on performance. They concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between the firm’s marketing, R&D and operational capabilities and performance, and also found that the effect of the marketing capabilities is higher than the other capabilities. Slotegraaf and Dickson (2004) define marketing planning capabilities as the ability to anticipate and respond to the market environment in order to direct firm’s resources and actions in ways that align the firm with the environment and achieve the firms’ financial targets. They found that marketing planning capabilities have a direct, curvilinear and negative effect on the financial performance.

According to Morgan et al., (2009a), marketing capabilities are value creation mechanisms which are static and inimitable. Morgan et al., (2009a) examined the relationship between the marketing capabilities such as brand management, market sensitivity and consumer relationships and firm’s profit, based on dynamic capabilities and resource-based and endogenous growth theories. As a result, the stronger brand management and market sensitivity capabilities, the higher will be the profit growth rates. However, consumer relationships capabilities have a negative impact on the profit growth rates.

Desarbo et al., (2005) assume marketing as a one of the strategic capabilities and measured with variable such as “knowledge of customers and competitors, integration of marketing activities, skill to segment and target markets and the effectiveness of pricing and advertising programs” then investigate its effect on firm’s performance. They found that understanding interaction of capabilities and environmental factors’ by the managers have a significant effect on the SIBs’ performance.

Depending on this body of knowledge, there are a wide range of studies (Katsikeas et al., 1996; Blesa and Ripolles, 2008; Murray et al., 2011; Morgan et al., 2012) supporting the positive impact of marketing capabilities (product, price, distribution, marketing communication, sales, market information management, marketing planning and implementation) on export performance.

However, there is limited number of studies with regard to the effect of export-market orientation on marketing capabilities. For instance, according to Day (1994), marketing capabilities depend on the “past experience” accumulated during the anticipating and responding the demands of the consumers via market orientation and “market information”
about the customer demand. Murray et al., (2011) suggests that the development of unique and valuable capabilities is a difficult process as it increases the firm’s knowledge requirement in its complicated export environment. According to Murray et al., (2011), market orientation is a leading factor in developing the marketing capabilities in terms of the generating, disseminating and responding the required export intelligence. In this respect, they examined the mediator role of marketing capabilities (new product development, pricing and marketing communication) between export market orientation and export performance. As a result of their study there is a significant relationship between export-market orientation and marketing capabilities. In particular, they determined a relationship between new product development capabilities and product and strategic export performance. Besides they discovered a relationship between the pricing capabilities and financial and strategic export performance. In this respect, they proved an indirect relationship between export market orientation and export performance with a mediator role of marketing capabilities. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H1.** **Marketing capabilities (i.e., product development, pricing, channel management, selling, delivery management, marketing communication, post-sale service), will be positively related to the export market orientation.**

Export market orientation is a market oriented strategy executed in the export environment. Cadogan et al., (2009) defines it as firm’s efforts to integrate its marketing concept into their export operations. Akdeniz et al., (2010) relates it to the capabilities of building and managing the communication and the relationship with the consumers. According to Kohli and Jaworski (1990), Narver and Slater (1990) and Cadogan et al., (2001), export market orientation refers to the firm continuously and regularly activity of monitoring the consumers, rivals and other environmental factors in the international market environment in order to develop and offer products meeting the demands of consumers in the export market (Murray et al., 2007). Cadogan et al., (2002) defined *export market orientation activity* as “the generation of market intelligence pertinent to the firms exporting operation, the dissemination of this information to appropriate decision makers and the design and implementation of responses directed toward export customers, competitors and other extraneous export market factors which affect the firm and its ability to provide superior value for export customers”. In this respect, if firms’ level of export market orientation is high, it is expected that they can reach more information about the needs of consumers in export market. Also, firms would better understand strategies of rivals in export markets and could respond them better (Dodd, 2005). Hence, export market oriented behavior assist firms to gain the ability to create superior value for their foreign customers. If
the firm could continuously identify and respond to current and future needs and preferences of
their customers, it achieves better position by satisfying their customers than its rivals (Cadogan
et al., 2002). According to Murray et al., (2008), export market orientation is a valuable resource
for developing and implementing effective pricing and promotion strategies as well as the new
product development.

It is seen that interest towards export market orientation, which is the indicator factor of
export success, in the field of export performance research has gradually increased from the
second half of 1990s (Sousa et al., 2008). Thus, researchers (Cadogan and Diamantopoulos,
1995; Cadogan et al., 1999; Collins-Dodd, 2000; Cadogan et al., 2002; Akyol and Akehurst,
2003; Cadogan et al., 2003; Cadogan and Cui, 2004; Knight and Cavusgil, 2004; Dodd, 2005;
Murray et al., 2007; Cadogan et al., 2009; Murray et al., 2011) mostly aim to explore the
relationships between exporting firms that adopted export market orientation behavior and their
export performance. Cadogan et al., (1999) developed the existing market orientation scales
which had previously been designed in relevant literature (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Narver
and Slater, 1990), more comprehensive and adapted to export markets and examined its cross-
cultural consistency. Cadogan et al., (1999) found a positive and significant relationship
between export market orientation and export performance (sales, goals of management and
global evaluation of firm’s export successes). Murray et al., (2007) improved the studies of
Cadogan et al., (1999) examined whether export market orientation and export performance
scales differ among domestic and foreign firms manufacturing and exporting in China through a
cross-cultural analysis. As a result they determined the scale’s stability. Also in their studies,
they found that the effects of export market orientation factors on export performance
(satisfaction with export venture and financial performance) differed among foreign and
domestic firms in China. It was concluded that there was a positively significant relationship
between the generation of market intelligence and export performances of the foreign firms in
China. In addition Cadogan et al., (1999) declare that there is no significant relationship
between dissemination of this information and export performances of the domestic and foreign
firms in China although there is a positive and significantly relationship between responding the
export intelligence and export performances of the domestic firms in China. Murray et al.,
(2011) examined the relationship between market orientation, marketing capabilities, internal
and external factors, competitive advantages for effects on firms export performance (financial,
strategic and product) in China. They found that marketing capabilities had a mediator role
between export market orientation and export performance. Cadogan et al., (2002) analyzed the
moderator role of export market environment between export market orientation and export performance. As a result of their study, export performance was positively related with the activities of export market orientation without the effect of environmental factors. Cadogan et al., (2003) investigated the effect of export market orientation behavior on firms’ export performance in unstable and dynamic export market environments. Researchers detected a positive relationship between market orientation behavior and export growth performances. Also they found an indirect relationship between market orientation behavior levels and export profit performances of exporters driven by growth. Moreover, they concluded that competitive intensity and technological change in export markets had a moderate the effect on the relationship between exporters’ market oriented behaviors and export performances. Similarly Akyol and Akehurst (2003) and Dodd (2005) found a positive relationship between export market orientation and export performance. Knight and Cavusgil (2004) revealed that born global firms could achieve success in international performance through the strategies they developed with the scope of their international market and entrepreneurial orientations. In other words, there is an indirect relationship between international market orientation and international performance. On the other hand, Cadogan and Cui (2004) concluded that export performance of export agencies high levels of export market orientation behavior in China decreased as the level of export market orientation increased. Cadogan and Cui (2004) argued that the reason why their hypotheses were not supported with analysis was the insufficiency of research models. Similarly, Cadogan et al., (2009) revealed that as the export market orientation level of the exporting firms extremely increased, their export performance would decrease. Cadogan et al., (2009) explained the reason of this result as investing in EMO behavior, for increasing its level, represents an opportunity cost because it is drawing on resources that would be better employed elsewhere (e.g., investing in developing greater technological orientation or other market-driving approaches) for providing customers with value. Francis and Collins-Dodd (2000) found a positive and significant relationship between proactive export orientation of high-tech (information and telecommunication) SME’s export performance. It was also concluded that passive export orientation has a negative and significant relationship with export intensity and export sale, indicators of export performance, but no relationship with growth in export intensity and gross export profit (Francis and Collins-Dodd, 2000). According to Cadogan et al., (1999) and Murray et al., (2011), the complexity of export market environment leads to increase the requirement of information. In this respect, within the studies examining export performance, it is necessity to consider firms’ market orientation in the export markets. In light of this information, it is expected that market oriented firms continuously obtain
appropriate export market information, share this information with export staff or other decision makers in the organization and they may increase their export performance by rapidly responding to changes in the export market (Murray et al., 2011). Thus, the final hypothesis is as follows:

**H2.** Export market orientation will be positively related to the firm’s export performance (i.e., financial performance, strategic performance and satisfaction with export venture).

In relevant literature, no studies have been observed to investigate the effect of marketing capabilities on firms’ export performance through export market orientation by measuring in various dimensions. For instance, in the study by Morgan et al., (2009b), it is detected the effect of marketing capabilities and market orientation on firm performance in common and separately, but their effect on each other wasn’t examined. In a study of Murray et al., (2011), it was concluded that export market orientation affected “new product development, pricing and marketing communication capabilities” in a positive way. However, in contrast with the reviews and discussions in literature, in this research and model, export performance was measured within the scope of “the effect of marketing capabilities on export market orientation”. The suggested model towards removing the mentioned gaps is shown in Figure 1.
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**Marketing Capabilities**
- Product development
- Pricing
- Channel management
- Selling
- Delivery management
- Marketing communication
- Post-sale service

**Export Market Orientation**

**Export Performance**
- Financial performance
- Strategic performance
- Satisfaction with export venture
Method

-Research context

Following the suggested hypothesis and the research model in this study, it is planned that the firms operating in any sub-branches of the manufacturing sector in Turkey were selected as sample on condition of continuously and regularly exporting. According to the regulation published by the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Economy, “Real or legal persons that would export are obliged to be a member of the closest Exporter’s Association which operates in the sector of the goods they would export and where there are the center or branch addresses registered to the trade registry” (http://www.tim.org.tr/tr/kurumsal-tim-ve-birlikler-yasasi.html). Thus, the population of this study is the member firms of the Turkish Exporters’ Association. However, it is not possible to reach the entire Exporters’ Associations. There are thirteen Exporters’ Association General Secretariat serving exporters and Exporters’ Associations in Turkey (http://www.ekonomi.gov.tr). Due to the contact information list of the exporting firms can be provided from Aegean, Antalya, Denizli, Central Anatolian, Southeast Anatolia, and Black Sea Exporters’ Association General Secretariat web sites, the database of 21344 firms, members of Exporters’ Association in July 2012, are the sample framework of this study. Therefore, the sector, the size and source of the capital (foreign/domestic) are not taken into consideration.

Sample volume determining is also important in sample selection. According to Hair et al., (2006:731), sample size can be determined based on the analysis. In this respect, while determining sample volume, Confirmatory Factor Analysis that is planned to be used in this study was also considered. Hair et al., (2006:731) stated that the number of samples that will be used in the Confirmatory Factor Analysis is the same number suggested in the Structural Equation Modeling. According to Anderson and Gerbing (1988), sample volume should be at least 150 in research conducted with Structural Equation Modeling. Also, Hair et al., (2006:741) stated that there are various sample numbers as 50, 100, 150, 200, 400 that can be preferred in Structural Equation Modeling. On the other hand, in case sample size exceeds 400, sensitivity increases and any kind of difference can be detected and goodness of fit statistics may be weakened (Hair et al., 2006: 741). In this respect, sample size may generally be determined as between 150 and 400. According to Gegez (2007) sample size can be determined by the studies with similar topic in the literature. For instance Cadogan et al., (2009) examined the effect of export market orientation on export performance in dynamic markets by confirmatory factor
analysis. Researchers mailed a questionnaire to 309 manufacturing firms in various industries (electronic, machine, textile, pharmaceutical etc.), which were registered in the database of Hong Kong Trade Council, selected through random sampling. In this study, sample size was determined as 400, considering the analysis and the number of samples used in the similar studies in literature.

-Measure development

In relevant literature, there are a great many studies that examine the relationship of marketing capabilities with firm performance (Vorhies and Morgan 2005; Akdeniz et al., 2010; Murray et al., 2011; Morgan et al., 2012). In these studies, marketing capabilities are generally evaluated within the scope of marketing mix strategies in the marketing literature. For instance, Murray et al., (2011) measured marketing capabilities by “new product development, pricing and marketing communication” variables in their study where they investigated the effect of competitive advantage and marketing capabilities on export performance. Morgan et al., (2012) defines firms’ export marketing capabilities as three variables (architectural, specialized and marketing capability integration). In this study, marketing capabilities measured with the dimensions of “product development, pricing, channel and delivery management, marketing communication, sales and post-sales services”, using the architectural export marketing capabilities scale of Morgan et al.,(2012), in order to examined marketing mix strategies as a whole. In this respect, marketing capabilities are measured with a five-point scale comprised of 28 items and 7 dimensions (1=much worse than competitors; 5= much better than competitors). The firms were asked to consider the assessing their export marketing capabilities relative to major competitors in the export markets.

Market orientation was examined within the scope of export, employing exploratory research by the pioneer study of Cadogan and Diamantopoulos (1995) in the relevant field. Following an empirical research was conducted by the same authors in 1996 (Cadogan et al., 2002). Cadogan et al., (1999) defined export market orientation with four variables such as “generation, dissemination, and responsiveness of export intelligence and coordinating mechanism”. Export intelligence generation is the all activities which constitute the creation of export market intelligence (e.g., export market research, export assistance) and which are focused towards export customer, competitors or the environmental changes in the export market affecting the firm, its customers and its competitors. Export intelligence is generated by export staff or other departments such as R&D and marketing departments or activities.
intelligence dissemination includes all activities contain sharing export market intelligence and which are focused towards export customer, competitors or the environmental changes in the export market affecting the firm, its customers and its competitors. Export intelligence is shared among export staff and all other departments. Export intelligence responsiveness is planning and implementing all reactions to the export intelligence that has been generated and disseminated which are directed towards the customers, competitors or environmental changes in the export market affecting the firm, its customers and competitors. Coordinating mechanism is composed of several interrelated factors such as communication and common understanding, organizational culture emphasizing responsibility, cooperation and contribution, removing conflicts among functions and common business focused goals etc. In a field of export market orientation, the studies (Akyol and Akehurst, 2003) using these four factors in the scale of EMO, developed by Cadogan et al. (1999), is limited. Despite that, it is seen that the scale of Cadogan et al., (2002) without coordinating mechanism, have been adapted and used by many studies (Cadogan et al., 2003; Cadogan and Cui, 2004; Dodd, 2005; Murray et al., 2007; Cadogan et al., 2009; Murray et al., 2011). Based on these studies, in this research, the scale of Cadogan et al., (2009) was preferred which was reviewed and improved without including coordination mechanism to the export market orientation scale of Cadogan et al., (1999). Thus, depend on Cadogan et al., (2009) export market orientation is measured on a five-point scale, from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree, with 14 items.

The mostly criticized part of the export performance literature is the absence of a unified and generally accepted measure for capturing export performance. Without a unified performance measure, findings of different export studies are difficult to compare, leaving literature in inconsistency and confusion (Zou et al., 1998). In the literature, export performance has been measured by many dimensions such as “export sales (Ito and Pucik,1993; Kaynak and Kuan, 1993; Das,1994; Katsikeas et al., 1996; Kuivalainen et al.,2007), export growth (Knight and Cavusgil,2004; Sing,2009; Lu et al.,2010; Morgan et al., 2012), export profitability (Kaynak and Kuan, 1993; Katsikeas et al., 1996; Knight and Cavusgil,2004; Kuivalainen et al., 2007; Lu et al.,2010; Morgan et al., 2012), market share (Katsikeas et al.,1996; Knight and Cavusgil, 2004; Lu et al., 2010; Morgan et al., 2012), reaching goals (Morgan et al., 2012), export intensity (Ito and Pucik,1993; Kaynak and Kuan, 1993; Das,1994) and perceived success (Knight and Cavusgil,2004), return on investment from export (Lu et al.,2010; Morgan et al., 2012).

According to Akyol and Akehurst (2003), important advancement can be made in the relevant literature, using both subjective and objective measures to evaluate the export
performance. **Objective measures** are absolute performance measures while **subjective measures** are related with business performance compared to the major competitors or relative to firm’s expectations. However, it is difficult to obtain correct, accurate, factual and updated objective performance indicators from documentary sources because firms sometimes do not want to share such information and managers may respond the questions reluctantly or may not have the authorization to respond. Thus, Akyol and Akehurst (2003) evaluated export performance both objective (export sales, export growth) and subjective (satisfaction with export operations, overall export performance and competitive performance) measures to examine the relationship between market orientation and export performance of the firms in the Turkish textile industry.

Zou et al., (1998) argued that a major cause controversy with regard to how export performance should be measured is lack of integrative and comprehensive scale in export performance. In order to make export performance findings comparable and eliminate the inconsistencies in the literature, they developed a generalized export performance measure, the EXPERF scale that can be applied to multiple countries. This comprehensive scale integrates both objective (financial and strategic) and subjective (satisfaction with the export venture) measures. Murray et al., (2007) adapted the export performance scale of Zou et al., (1998) in their studies to figure out whether export market orientation and export performance scales differ among domestic and foreign exporter in manufacturing sector. In this study, export performance scale of Zou et al., (1998) was used and in filling out the portion of the questionnaire dealing with export performance, managers were asked to provide their own assessment of the performance of a recent venture into a foreign market. For this construct, nine items measured by using a 5 point scale, from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

**-Data Collection**

As mentioned before, in this study sample frame was Association of Exporters’ data base of 21344 exporting firms. The questionnaire was send with an e-mail to a great majority of the firms (21324). The target contact was the export marketing manager, marketing manager, chief executive officer, or employee working in other positions would know most about the firm’s exporting operations. Also in the 70 export firms that could be reached easily, the target contact was interviewed in person. 346 usable responses were returned by email. As a result, the analysis of the study was conducted with the 416 usable responses, 70 of them obtained in-person and 346 of them administered using email. 23 of the firms, the questionnaire was sent by email stated that they only performed good/services sales and marketing activities in free zone
so they didn’t do any exporting actually. Moreover, a part of the firms declared that they exported to subsidiaries in foreign markets. Thus, these firms were excluded from this research.

It is seen that a wide range of manufacturing industries responded to the survey, mostly including firms in the following subsectors: 21.2% food; 17.3% metal; 14.2% textiles; 11.1% machinery; 4.1% chemical; 3.8% furniture; 1.9% automobile. Number of employees between 50 and 249 in the firms sampled was consist of 36.3% and 5 or more exporting staff consist of 35.8%. Besides 24.6% of the firms had been exporting for 20 or more years and 43.8% of the firms’ ratio of export sales to total sales is 50% or more. In this respect, it can be said that a majority of the firms in the sample deal with exporting continuously and regularly.

Analysis and results

Assessing the reliability of the scale, Cronbach’s alpha correlation coefficients were used. It was observed that the scale of the marketing capabilities (product development 0.91, pricing 0.89, delivery management 0.85, channel management, marketing communication, sales and post-sales services 0.92) export market orientation (export intelligence generation 0.80, export intelligence dissemination 0.74, export intelligence responsiveness 0.70) and export performance (financial performance 0.84, strategic performance 0.93, satisfaction with export venture 0.90) reliability estimates range from 0.70 to 0.93 appropriate for the critical value of 0.7 recommended by Hair et al. (2006:778).

To evaluate the measurement properties of the scales, it is estimated a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). The fitness indices suggest good fit ($\chi^2=1985.39$; df=709; $\chi^2$/df=2.8; RMSEA=0.066; CFI=0.91; IFI=0.91; NNFI=0.91) for the construct model. However, some goodness of fit statistics (NFI=0.87; GFI=0.81; AGFI=0.78) indicate that the model is not acceptable. In other words, as a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, it was found out that items in the questionnaire didn’t measure or explain the latent variables sufficiently and significantly. Also, the dimensions of marketing capability (except the product development and channel management) are not significantly related to the export market orientation. At this point, it should be noted that through the eliminating “pricing, channel management, marketing communication and post-sale service” dimensions’ of marketing capability from the researched model, an alternative model was developed, dedicated to the literature (Figure 3). There is a consensus about using structural equation modeling that if goodness of fit statistics are not acceptable or the factor loadings for each individual indicator on the respective constructs are
not statistically significant, by making necessary corrections and reporting all the results, the model can be re-tested (Şimşek, 2007: 107-122). Thus, it is supposed that findings to be obtained through the alternative model would increase the contribution to literature. Hence, in this study, based on the literature, an alternative model was developed towards the mediator role of export market orientation in the relationship between the three dimensions of marketing capabilities “product development, selling and delivery management” and export performance (Figure 2).

![Alternative Model](https://example.com/image)

Figure 2. Alternative Model

It is refined the measures, assessed the reliability and then run CFA to verify the construct structures of alternative model. As a result, the Cronbach’s alpha score for the marketing capabilities and expert performance scales were above 0.85 is considered as being a good level of reliability. In terms of reliability, “export market orientation” scale range was 0.60 to 0.70 may be acceptable (Hair et al., 2006: 778). In the relevant literature, it is observed that Cronbach’s alpha value was accepted above 0.60 (Choi and Eboch, 1998; Day et al., 1998; Lonial and Raju, 2001; Shin et al., 2000; Anwar and Sohail, 2003).

The most of the fitness indices suggest good fit for the measurement model ($\chi^2$/df=1.91; RMSEA=0.047; SRMR=0.043; CFI=0.97; IFI=0.97 and NNFI=0.96). Also, some of the goodness-of-fit indicators (NFI=0.94 and GFI= 0.92) acceptable fit to the data. However AGFI=0.89 goodness of fit indicator is close to the generally accepted threshold of 0.90. The similar result also observed in study of Morgan et al., (2006), CFI=0.893 was considered as acceptable. Thus, it can be said that the model represents a good fit to the data.
It is reported the standardized solution and t-values to the correlation between latent variable and observed variable, and also explained variance (R²) regard to each of observed variables in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis: The Alternative Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimensions and Items</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha)</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>t -Values</th>
<th>Standardized Solution β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD3</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD4</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM4</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINP1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINP2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINP3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRP1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRP2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRP3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP3</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goodness of Fit Statistics:  \( \chi^2 = 442.37; \) \( df = 231; \) \( \chi^2 / df = 1.915; \) RMSEA= 0.047; SRMR = 0.043; CFI =0.97; IFI= 0.97; NNFI = 0.96; NFI=0.94; GFI= 0.92; AGFI=0.89

Standardized solution indicates each observed variable’s power to represent their latent variable (Şimşek, 2007:85). For instance, the parameter regarding the item of strategic performance “export venture strengthen our global strategic position (STRP2)” was 0.93. In this context, standardized solution exposed the items’ relative importance to the latent variables.
Also, in order the model to be accepted, all of the standardized solution values should be less than one (Hair et al., 1998:610; Şimşek 2007:85). As it can be seen in Table 1, all of the standardized solutions are below this level.

In the model, the t-values of the path defined from latent variables to the observed variables should be above 1.96, which is the critical value at 95% reliability level (Hair et al., 1998: 610; Şimşek, 2007: 86). In the analysis, the results of t-values are more than 1.96. Thus, the parameters are significant at 95% reliability level.

In this study, the explained variance values were also investigated. It is observed that financial performance was mostly explained with the item “this export venture generated a high volume of export sales (FINP3)” (R² = 0.81); and it was the least explained with the following item “exporting venture has been very profitable (FINP1)” (R² = 0.42).

Overall the results suggest that the measurement model fits the data well and the constructs exhibit sufficient measurement properties for further analyses. Thus, it is tested the hypothesized model (alternative model) using maximum likelihood estimation in a structural equation model. It is reported that the correlations in Table 2.

Table 2. Result of Structural Model: Alternative Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Suggested Alternative Model</th>
<th>Standardized Solution β</th>
<th>t-Values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product development → Export market orientation</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling → Export market orientation</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery management → Export market orientation</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.017**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export market orientation → Financial performance</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export market orientation → Strategic performance</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export market orientation → Satisfaction with export venture</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goodness of Fit Statistics: χ² = 715.88; df = 243; χ²/df = 2.95; RMSEA = 0.068; CFI = 0.94; IFI = 0.94; NNFI = 0.93; NFI = 0.91; GFI = 0.87; AGFI = 0.84

*p<0.001  
**p<0.05

The goodness of fit indices for the hypothesized full alternative model (χ²/df=2.95; RMSEA=0.068; CFI=0.94; IFI=0.94; NNFI=0.93 and NFI=0.91) suggest acceptable fit. However, some of the goodness of fit statistics (GFI=0.87 and AGFI=0.84) were found to be below the acceptable values. According to Şimşek (2007:124), researcher can decide which of the goodness of fit statistics can be used for reporting the results with a condition of stating reasons and references. When related literature is examined, it is seen that various goodness of
fit statistics were used. For instance; Morgan et al., (2012) preferred $\chi^2$/df, CFI and RMSEA and RNI etc. Thus, it can be said that the model propose an acceptable overall fit (Table 2).

As a result of the alternative model, marketing capabilities dimensions “product development ($\beta=0.34; p<0.001$), selling ($\beta=0.27; p<0.001$) and delivery management ($\beta=0.14; p<0.05$)” effect export market orientation significantly. It is crucial to state that, as it mentioned before, due to the market capabilities effects on export market orientation loses its significance when dimensions of all marketing capabilities are included in the model, alternative model has been developed. So “pricing, channel management, marketing communication and post-sale service” dimensions’ of marketing capability effects on export market orientation couldn’t be examined through the alternative model. Hence, it is found partial support for the positive effect of marketing capabilities (product development, pricing, channel management, selling, delivery management, marketing communication, post-sale service) on export market orientation, therefore H1 is partially supported.

Export market orientation has a positive and highly significant effects on the financial performance ($\beta=0.85; p=0.001$), strategic performance ($\beta=0.88; p=0.001$) and satisfaction from export venture ($\beta=0.89; p=0.001$). Therefore it is obtained strong evidence for the effects of export market orientation on the export performance, thus supporting H2. Theoretical and managerial implications will be discussed below.

**Discussion**

The most important function of export market orientation is gaining information about the present and future needs of the export customers, competitors and market pressures in the external environment (i.e. the government’s political regulations and technological changes). Thus, market oriented firms continuously generate appropriate export market intelligence, share this intelligence with the exporting staff or other decision-makers in the organization and respond to the changes in export market rapidly (Murray et al., 2011). Firms may encounter a more intense, severe and complicate competition environment in the global markets compared to domestic markets. In this respect, firms’ gaining and maintaining the sustainability of competitive advantage in foreign markets for achieving export success would be possible with export market orientation which they would develop and implement with their unique resources and capabilities that cannot obtained and imitated by their competitors.
The results indicate that marketing capabilities have a positive effect on export market orientation according to alternative model. In fact, findings reveal that among the dimensions of marketing capabilities especially “product development, selling and delivery management” have positive and significant effect on export market orientation. However, in the relevant literature, it hasn’t been observed that various dimensions of marketing capabilities direct relationship with export market orientation. For instance, Morgan et al., (2009b) examined the effect of diverse dimensions of marketing capabilities and market orientation on firm performance in common and separately, but without their effect on each other. Murray et al., (2011) found that export market orientation positively affected “new product development, pricing and marketing communication” capabilities. However, in contrast with the examinations and discussions in literature, as it seen in this research model, the effect of marketing capabilities on export market orientation was investigated. In this respect, it is believed that it has made a significant contribution to export performance literature even if the findings obtained regarding the positive effect of only the three dimensions of marketing capabilities on export market orientation.

The findings suggest that export market orientation has a strong and positive effect on export performance. In the relevant literature, it has been observed that the studies on revealing the relationships between export market orientation and export performance (Cadogan and Diamantopoulos,1995; Cadogan et al., 1999; Collins-Dodd, 2000; Cadogan et al., 2002; Cadogan et al., 2003; Caldogan and Cui,2004; Knight and Cavusgil, 2004; Dodd, 2005; Murray et al., 2007; Cadogan at al., 2009; Murray et al., 2011). However, it has been seen that a limited number of studies (Shoham et al., 2002; Akyol and Akehurst, 2003) using both subjective and objective measures to evaluate the export performance. According to Das (1994), Zou et al., (1998) and Akyol and Akehurst (2003), export performance should be considered with objective and subjective measures together in order to ensure significant improvements in the literature.

It is believed that it has been made a significant contribution by finding a strong and positive effect of export market orientation with dimensions such as “generation, dissemination, and responsiveness of export intelligence”, on both objective (financial and strategic) and subjective (satisfaction with export venture) export performance measures as a result of a comprehensive analysis made with the exporting firms which operate in any sub-branch of manufacturing sector in Turkey.
Thus, with the findings of this study, it is suggested that firms could increase their performances especially in export markets with their market orientation that they would develop and implement in line with their marketing capabilities.

**Managerial Implications**

The study also has some implications for managers who are responsible for exports or other international commercial operations.

First the results highlight that marketing capabilities “product development, selling and delivery management” are necessity for firms’ export market orientation as an important determinant of the export success. However, obtaining and developing unique, valuable, inimitable and rareness capabilities increases the firms’ requirement of information in complicated the export environment. In this respect, firms need to set up, develop and strengthen their marketing information systems rapidly and effectively.

Within the framework of product development capabilities in the export markets, firms should tend towards R&D investments that would enable them to develop and launch new and innovative products earlier and more successfully than their competitors.

Besides it is important to obtain and retain skilled and experienced sales personnel and sales managers of export venture and provide effective sales support to dealers (distributors, retailers etc.) to gain sustainable competitive advantage in foreign markets.

The quickly delivering product once they are ordered, shipping product overseas on time, facilitating product returns and meeting delivery promises to foreign customer as a firms’ delivery management capability, create superior value on customers in export markets, thus; have positive effects on increasing their exporting performances.

If firms’ export market orientation level is high, it is expected that they access more information regarding the needs and of consumers in the export market. Also, firms would noticed and respond the strategies of rivals in the export market superiorly (Dodd, 2005). Thus, export market oriented firms would continuously determine their customers’ current and future needs and preferences and could satisfy them better than their rivals and obtain superior export performance (Cadogan et al., 2002). In line with this, firms need to be export market oriented by periodically review the likely effect of changes in the export markets before they occurs and act beforehand in order to achieve superior export performance permanently.
As a result, it should be emphasized that firms should be strengthen their capabilities and export market orientation level in competitive intense foreign markets or avoid such competitive environments.

Limitations and directions for future research

This study was conducted under certain constraints in terms of sampling and methods. The hypotheses and proposed model was supposed to test with manufacturing firms which are consistently and regularly engaged in exporting. However, the lack of a sufficient number of companies engaged in export activities of these traits, a sample was selected without grouping the firms in terms of the region, industry type or the size. In the circumstances questionnaire was planned to send to Turkey Exporters' Associations. However, some of the member of this associations avoided sharing the contact information and do not support the study. Therefore, it has not been possible to reach the entire Exporters' Associations. In addition, some of the sampling companies stated that not engaged in exporting the foreign countries just selling or marketing goods/services to free zones and some of them indicated exporting to their subsidiaries outside the home country. Therefore, these companies were excluded from the sample. Some suggestions can be made within the scope of the constraints and shortcomings of this study. Export performance can be investigated by sectors, size or regions of firms. Even cross-cultural analysis can be made for the future studies examining the factors that affect export performance.
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