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# 1. Introduction

Since the steady enhancements in business offerings, it is undeniable that most of the markets are dynamic in nature (Hurley & Hult, 1998). Therefore, it is crucial for firms to be market-oriented and appropriately adapt to consumers’ demands and rivals’ initiative policies (Liñán, Paul, & Fayolle, 2019). This occurrence has been significantly recommended in utilizing the company’s strength and gaining consumers’ insight, which engenders noticeable results compared with competitors (Slater & Narver, 1994). However, an extraordinary performance accomplished in the local situation is unable to be transformed into an abroad market (Murray, Gao, Kotabe, & Zhou, 2007).

It is undeniable that the intricate export business, tensity in gaining pertinent abroad data, or overseas rivalry environment have a significant impact in transferring goods globally, although the application maintains the fundamental basis of the market orientation concept (Cadogan, Diamantopoulos, & de Mortanges, 1999). Global situations are far more different than domestic ones, so it is necessary for firms to enhance Export Market Orientation (EMO) to deal with overseas markets (Cadogan & Diamantopoulos, 1995). Besides, as the information from local markets affects the market orientation significantly, the difference between the business’s EMO and its direction has emerged (Cadogan, Diamantopoulos, & Siguaw, 2002). As those testimonies suggested, altering the terminology to be more international is not enough; extra items may be anticipated to indicate operations that are numerically distinct from local markets; similarly, there is a chance that some items may not be appropriate in an international context yet in domestic counterparts. Exploratory research has found that some features of EMO are unique, which drew the same result as the fact that market orientation for exchanging goods overseas is crucial (Cadogan & Diamantopoulos, 1995). With the development of e-commerce and globalization, companies are liable for addressing much more chances in overseas markets, emphasizing the need of establishing EMO once again ([Murray et al., 2007](https://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.15.4.41)). In the nearest decade, there has been a surge in scholarly interest in the fast-expanding phenomena of market orientation in export markets, particularly in terms of its significance and function in the field of initiative management ([Makri, Theodosiou, & Katsikea, 2017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2016.12.004)). Consequently, the chief goal of this research is to administer a methodical review of existing empirical research on EMO published from 2015 to 2021, with the goal of identifying trends relating to theoretical and methodological peculiarities of the existing studies. In detail, numerous objectives are indicated in this research: (1) assessing the relevant papers regarding academic foundations, theoretical methods, and interrelations between the origin, result, and characteristics of EMO; (2) examining the background of the study about the EMO concept; (3) providing the procedural features of field investigations; and (4) identifying research gaps and pointing in the right path for future empirical investigations In this regard, this study significantly strengthens the existing literature by providing a methodical assessment of EMO and concentrating on current trends and patterns in the related domain of topic based on the TCCM framework by [Paul and Rosado-Serrano (2019)](https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-10-2018-0280).

# 2. Theoretical basis

As exemplified as the most concerning domain of marketing; in summary, the purpose of marketing term is indicated by the conceptualization of market orientation (Kohli & Jaworski, 1990). Besides, organizational behavior, culture, capability, and resources consist of this market orientation also. Furthermore, this term is familiar with market learning also ([Özsomer & Gençtürk, 2003](https://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.11.3.1.20157)). Such that, some information about stakeholders regularly is acquired and transformed into products with a higher value for consumers by these market-oriented businesses (Slater & Narver, 1994). Furthermore, strong market orientation businesses have excellent market insight, consumer relationships, or some specific channel abilities with a powerful management team. Besides, the empirical paper from Narver and Slater (1990) has helped Day (1994) come up with insights that market-oriented businesses are those that acquire information about the market environment and use those to make strategic decisions and satisfy stakeholders’ expectations. Furthermore, He, Brouchers, and Filatotchev (2013) have wondered that EMO proficiency is important for exporting entities because these firms can collect veracious data about the target market, consumer demands, and superior initiative among competitors. Some EMO companies immediately meet the alternations in the exchange market because they advocate continual research throughout the organization. Market-oriented tactics developed by a company in the field of exporting are referred to as “export market-oriented behavior” and are defined as “export intelligence generation, distribution, and responsiveness” from a behavioral standpoint (Cadogan et al., 1999; Cadogan, Kuivalainen, & Sundqvist, 2009). The fierce rivalry accompanied by the market instability has engendered a great significance in overseas operations ([Rose & Shoham, 2002](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00139-9); [Sousa, Martínez-López, & Coelho, 2008](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2008.00232.x)). As a result, companies should develop effective approaches in foreign markets, particularly export market-oriented strategies to achieve greater export results (Cavusgil & Zou, 1994; Murray et al., 2007). Consequently, EMO has shown its dominance in the market, as numerous empirical research has also indicated its efficiency in understanding consumers’ needs, exterior forces, and sustaining rival’s strategies.

# 3. Research method

The bibliometric analysis has been immersed in business studies (Donthu, Kumar, Pattnaik, & Lim, 2021) by assessing the reliable scientific databases. This current study synthesizes articles investigating EMO practices. Thus, these papers are written in English and published from 2015 to 2021. Forcedly, some criteria for these papers are required, including (1) all of the researchers examine the market orientation in the export context; (2) they are published in academic journals which requires a certain number of H-index, Scopus Q1 or Q2, and being assessed in Institute for Scientific Information (ISI); (3) papers are published in journals related to business fields. By searching in the “Google Scholar” database with the keyword “export market orientation”, 20 relevant studies are collected and identified. They are listed in 18 different journals, which are classified into 06 distinctive fields of business (Appendix Table 1). The largest portion of articles (40%) is disclosed in the journal field of marketing, specifically two of them are published in International Marketing Review. Besides, the field of international business and area studies accounts for 20% of articles, followed by entrepreneurship and small business management in the field of 15% of papers. There is just a minority of studies published in the field of general management, ethics, and social responsibility (10%), econometrics (5%), and computer and social science (5%).

Table 1

Number of journal studies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Journal field and name** | **Total (2015 - 2021)**  **n = 20** |
| **Marketing** | **8** |
| International Marketing Review | 2 |
| Journal of Global Marketing | 1 |
| Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice | 1 |
| Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing | 1 |
| Journal of Strategic Marketing | 1 |
| Journal of Business Research | 1 |
| Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing | 1 |
| **International business and area studies** | **5** |
| International Business Review | 2 |
| Journal of Emerging Markets | 1 |
| International Journal of Emerging Markets | 1 |
| Thunderbird International Business Review | 1 |
| **Entrepreneurship and small business management** | **3** |
| Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship | 1 |
| Journal of Small Business Management | 1 |
| International Small Business Journal | 1 |
| **General management, ethics, and social responsibility** | **2** |
| European Business Review | 1 |
| International Journal of Productivity and  Performance Management | 1 |
| **Econometrics** | **1** |
| Applied Economics | 1 |
| **Computer and social science** | **1** |
| International Journal of Data and Network Science | 1 |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

After collecting these articles, the identification and analysis of them are conducted in four parts: (1) Theory (T), concentrating on the theoretical background of studies; (2) Context (C), including statistics of research context in countries involved, their region, the number of firm’s industries, size, and unit of analysis; (3) Characteristics (C), which is the conceptual approach, key findings, and conceptual frameworks of all relevant studies consisting of antecedents, consequences, mediators, and moderators in EMO’s relation; and (4) Methodology (M), consisting of sample size, methods for collecting data, rate of response, key informant, and some analytical approaches.

# 4. Findings

As stated above, the TCCM approach (Paul & Rosado-Serrano, 2019), will be used in this literature review paper to clarify the findings of 20 collected articles.

## 4.1. Theory (T)

Theory in business research is viewed as the central concept, consisting of logical models or frameworks, used to explain a proposed series of inferences or ideas, and can be explained through experiment (Lee & Lings, 2008). In this part, features of theories in 20 studies, as well as research streams, are scrutinized. There are 09 theoretical perspectives in order of being applied from most to least: resource-based view (70%), institutional theory (15%), organizational learning theory (10%), resource-advantage theory (5%), relationship marketing (5%), behavioral paradigm approach (5%), contingency theory (5%), dynamic managerial capability theory (5%), the structure conduct performance paradigm (5%). Table 2 summarizes the theories applied in the 20 selected papers.

Table 2

Theory (T) - Theoretical perspectives and streams in EMO research

| **Theoretical perspectives** | **Total (2015 -2021)** | **Research streams** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage (%)** |
| Resource-Based View (RBV) | 70 | The correlation between EMO and export performance (Alotaibi & Zhang, 2017; He et al., 2018; Imran, Aziz, & Hamid, 2017; Lengler, Sousa, Perin, Sampaio, & Martínez-López, 2016; Olabode, Adeola, & Assadinia, 2018; Pascucci, Bartoloni, & Gregori, 2016)  The interrelationships of EMO, marketing effectiveness, marketing capabilities, and export performance (Kayabasi & Mtetwa, 2016)  The impact of EMO on export performance through innovation-related resources (Zhang & Zhu, 2016)  The impact of market orientation on performance through resources (knowledge) or approach to resources and alliances as a mediator (İpek & Bıçakcıoğlu-Peynirci, 2020; Nakos, Dimitratos, & Elbanna, 2019)  The impact of strategic orientation (i.e., EMO, international, and entrepreneurship orientation) in a role of firm capability on export performance (Birru, Runhaar, Zaalberg, Lans, & Mulder, 2019; Boso, Annan, Adeleye, Iheanachor, & Narteh, 2018; Cadogan, Boso, Story, & Adeola, 2016; Faroque, Mostafiz, Faruq, & Bashar, 2020; Mac & Evangelista, 2016)  The interrelationships of EMO, human capital readiness and export performance (Tjahjadi, Soewarno, Nadyaningrum, & Aminy, 2020) |
| Dynamic Managerial Capability (DMC) theory | 5 | The moderating role of export assistants on the relationship between EMO and firm performance is high (Mostafiz, Sambasivan, & Goh, 2020) |
| Resource Advantage (R-A) theory | 5 | EMO, marketing capabilities as antecedents of export performance (Acikdilli, Mintu-Wimsatt, Kara, & Spillan, 2020) |
| Relationship marketing | 5 | Interorganizational degree as a moderator of the relationship between EMO and export performance (Chang & Fang, 2015) |
| Behavioral paradigm | 5 | Behavior aspects (i.e., commitment, trust, social interaction, power) as antecedents of EMO (Chang & Fang, 2015) |
| Contingency theory | 5 | EMO, strategic factors, environmental factors, and organizational factors as determinants of innovativeness in export (Makri et al., 2017) |
| Institutional theory | 15 | Alliances as a mediator of the link between EMO and performance (Nakos et al., 2019)  The impact of institutional elements on EMO, in turn, modify export performance outcomes (İpek & Bıçakcıoğlu-Peynirci, 2020)  Institutional differences between home and host country as a moderator in the relationship between EMO and export performance (He et al., 2018) |
| Organizational learning theory | 10 | The impact of EMO on organizational learning (Mac & Evangelista, 2016)  The moderating role of export learning capability on the link between EMO and export performance (Olabode et al., 2018) |
| The Structure Conduct Performance (SCP) paradigm | 5 | Internal/external factors and EMO as antecedents of export performance (Lengler et al., 2016) |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

*Resource-Based View (RBV)* holds that to maximize sustainable competitive advantage, firms need to make full use of their internal resources (Barney, 2000; Collis & Montgomery, 1995). Particularly in the field of EMO, Marketing Orientation (MO) is situationally considered a kind of firm resource (He et al., 2018). In recent years, beyond the term resource-based view, a significant quantity of EMO researchers tends to Resource-Based Theory (RBT) (He et al., 2018). This indicates the verity that resource-based studies have reached a certain level of maturity and detail, and should be viewed as a theory rather than a view as in the past (Barney, Ketchen, & Wright, 2011). Barney et al. (2011) also emphasized certain branch views developed from RBT, two of which appear in studies compiled in this critical review: the knowledge-based view (Grant, 1996) and dynamic capabilities (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997).

*Knowledge-Based View (KBV)* was employed in some EMO research, especially when the stream of the article is geared toward knowledge as an intangible property of the company (İpek & Tanyeri, 2020; Nakos et al., 2019). Dynamic Capabilities (DC) theory, propounded by Teece et al. (1997), encourages companies to prepare and build a model to build and regulate the company resource structure so that it can be optimized. On that basis, Dynamic Managerial Capability (DMC) theory was developed by Adner and Helfat (2003). But instead of focusing on firm-level and incorporate-level, DMC points out the importance of individual-level (Mostafiz et al., 2020).

*Resource-Advantage (R-A) theory* is another approach related to or based on RBV, which focuses on the linkage between resource heterogeneity and business performance. Notwithstanding the fact that a company’s capabilities do not directly bring competitive advantage, it does contribute to creating a distinct value, by enhancing the value of the company (Hunt & Morgan, 1995). Companies need to know how to use resources and optimize them to be most effective in many aspects (Song, Benedetto, & Nason, 2007). In the area being studied in this paper - EMO, the R-A theory can be used to relate firm capability and export performance (e.g., Acikdilli et al., 2020). As soon as marketing research had reached a certain maturity, relationship marketing theory was put forward with the main idea that building strong and long-term relationships with partners is an indispensable part of doing business (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). By implementing relationship marketing activities such as forecasting demand, improving customer service performance, companies will have a stable relationship with customers (Svendsen, Haugland, Grønhaug, & Hammervoll, 2011). Chang and Fang (2015) applied relationship marketing theory in the line EMO area to dig deeper into the inter-organizational degree as a moderator of the relationship between EMO and export performance. In the behavioral paradigm approach, companies or organizations are viewed as a coalition of individuals, while also referring to the sub-alliance surrounding them, with the aim of emphasizing the importance of inter-organizational behavior in understanding corporate activities (Anderson, 1982). Studies in previous years have shown the interrelationships of behavioral’s different aspects (e.g., power, communication, trust, commitment, attraction, distance) and MO (Lin, Huang, & Peng, 2014). In the case of EMO, the behavioral model is used to consider behavior as a moderator in the relationship between exporters and partners, thereby better shaping the EMO of export-oriented companies (Chang & Fang, 2015; Lin et al., 2014; Morgan & Hunt, 1994).

*Contingency theory* indicates that there is no fixed way for an organization to achieve its goals (Lages & Montgomery, 2004; Scott, 2003). On the authority of Katsikeas, Samiee, and Theodosiou (2006), the key is to find the most appropriate option and strategy in each case to achieve brilliant business goals. This theory can be applied when researchers consider the exporting export environment as a moderator while learning about the role of EMO in the export industry ([Makri et al., 2017](https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-06-2017-0402)).

*Institutional theory* suggests that organizational regulations and institutions greatly influence aspects of corporate performance (Scott, 2003). Therefore, it is exploited vastly in the fields related to exporting or internationalization, especially when considering the distance between countries (İpek & Tanyeri, 2020; He et al., 2018; Nakos et al., 2019). Fiol and Lyles (1985) declared that enterprises have always had organizational learning. It is defined as the process of intensifying enterprise-wide knowledge and work processes through formal learning activities or practical experience, then strengthening competitive value. When applied to EMO, this theory often revolves around the interrelationship of business learning ability, EMO, innovation needs and export performance (Mac & Evangelista, 2016; Olabode et al., 2018). According to Morgan and Hunt (1994), the Structure Conduct Performance (SCP) paradigm shows that external factors, namely the company’s market structure, greatly influence firm performance. As such, the SCP will focus on external conditions, and can be used in conjunction with the RBV to avoid tracing only internal resources (Lengler et al., 2016).

## 4.2. Context (C)

Table 3 synthesizes the context of the EMO studies found. For a general overview of research papers covering the period 2015 - 2021, five aspects are considered, including countries involved, region, industrial sector, firm size, and unit of analysis. Compared to the literature review of İpek and Bıçakcıoğlu-Peynirci (2020), as the selected time period (2015 - 2021) is quite short and the number of articles reviewed is quite small (20 articles), the diversity of contexts is still limited. Specifically, the articles only focus on one or two countries, there are no countries in North America and the Pacific, the firm size mostly focuses on SMEs, and none of them use the export market as a unit of analysis. One particular point that can be noticed is that there is an article that has focused on MSMEs (Tjahjadi et al., 2020).

Table 3

Context of the research

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research context** | **Total (n = 20)**  **%** |
| ***Countries involved*** |  |
| One | 95 |
| Two | 5 |
| ***Region*** |  |
| Asia | 65 |
| Europe | 20 |
| Africa | 15 |
| Latin America | 5 |
| ***Industrial sector*** |  |
| Multiple | 55 |
| Single | 15 |
| Not clear | 30 |
| ***Firm size*** |  |
| Small, medium, and large | 5 |
| SMEs | 40 |
| MSMEs (Micro & SMEs) | 5 |
| Not clear | 50 |
| ***Unit of analysis*** |  |
| Firm | 90 |
| Export venture | 10 |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

## 4.3. Characteristics (C)

With a focus on accessing to the main features of EMO, different from the approach used by İpek and Bıçakcıoğlu-Peynirci (2020) (mentioning direct and indirect relationships), (1) antecedents and (2) outcomes are the characteristics of EMO that are summarized and analyzed in detail. In addition, mediators and moderators will also be mentioned as important components when studying antecedents/outcomes. Figure 1 summarizes the relationships surrounding EMO, which will be discussed explicitly below.
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**Figure 1.** EMO antecedents and outcomes

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

## 4.4. Antecedents of EMO

Out of a total of 20 articles, only 09 mentioned EMO antecedents. Twenty-one variables were used, divided into three broad groups: environmental factors, inter-organizational factors, and intra-organizational factors. These variables have been reported according to the paper (percentage of articles using that variable). It should be noted that sometimes there will be more than one type of variable in a given article.

*Intra-organizational* is the first group of elements and includes many different sub-aspects: organizational factors, firm characteristics, and managerial factors. Due to the small number of articles, some factors mentioned in previous years such as export behavior and export performance (e.g., Cadogan et al., 2002; Navarro, Acedo, Losada, & Ruzo, 2011) were not found. Among the variables listed, the firm capability was the most used factor in most articles (44.4% of the aforesaid articles). The remaining factors are used in only 01 lesson out of a total of 09 lessons (accounting for 11.1% of articles for each factor).

Table 4

Characteristics (C) - Antecedents of EMO

| **Antecedent of Export Market Orientation** | **Total (2015 - 2021)** |
| --- | --- |
| **n = 9 (%)** |
| ***Intra-organizational factors*** |  |
| **Organizational factors** |  |
| Strategic orientation  (Export entrepreneur orientation) | 11.1 |
| **Firm characteristics** |  |
| Firm capability  (Intelligence generation, Intelligence dissemination, Responsiveness, Entrepreneurial capability, Human capital readiness, Technology intensity) | 44.4 |
| Export experience | 11.1 |
| Export department | 11.1 |
| **Managerial factors** |  |
| Managerial human capital | 11.1 |
| Managerial cognition | 11.1 |
| Managerial social capital | 11.1 |
| Managerial experience | 11.1 |
| ***Inter-organizational factors*** |  |
| Power | 11.1 |
| Commitment | 11.1 |
| Trust | 11.1 |
| Social interaction | 11.1 |
| ***Environmental factors*** |  |
| Economic environment | 11.1 |
| Regulatory environment | 11.1 |
| Social-cultural environment | 11.1 |
| Competitive intensity | 11.1 |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

The first aspect of the intra-organizational factor is the organizational factor, including only one main element, strategic orientation, more specifically, the export entrepreneur orientation, used by Boso et al. (2018). According to Shane and Venkatraman (2000), the need for innovation, creativity, and development of entrepreneurial-oriented exporters is extremely large, and it promotes the increase of company value as well as sales revenue. In addition, these enterprises will also actively seek out markets and customer needs, offering highly competitive products/services (Zahra & Garvis, 2000). Regarding firm characteristics, 03 smaller factors need to be considered. The first is firm, which is a measure of a company’s internal capacity, including intelligence generation, intelligence distribution, responsiveness (Acikdilli et al., 2020), entrepreneurial capability (Faroque et al., 2020), human capital readiness (Tjahjadi et al., 2020), technology intensity (Lengler et al., 2016). The other two factors can be explained as the fact that a company with more experience in exporting will have access to a larger amount of information needed, and similarly having an export department (Cadogan et al., 2016; Kwon & Hu, 2000). Notably, according to Pascucci et al. (2016), EMO can be viewed as consisting of three subdivisions: EIG (Export Intelligence Generation), EID (Export Intelligence Dissemination), and EIR (Export Intelligence Responsiveness). Export experience and export department will affect EIG and EID first, in turn enhancing EIR.

Another important group of factors determining EMO revolves around management issues, in which the aspect of awareness and management resources is mentioned the most. Managerial human capital, managerial cognition, and managerial social capital is a set of 03 elements that build on dynamic managerial capital theory, which positively improves EMO (Mostafiz et al., 2020). Managerial experience is a relatively minor issue in the marketing literature, but it has also been shown to play an important role in promoting EMO (Lengler et al., 2016). The inter-organizational factor is the second category of EMO antecedents and is investigated by only one article. Regarding Chang and Fang (2015), in terms of behavior between businesses, the higher the relationship between exporters and partners, the better EMO will be. These behaviors are concretized into four main factors: power, commitment, trust, and social interaction, of which only power has a negative impact on EMO.

The last segment of the antecedents’ system, the environmental factors, has also attracted little attention. Environmental factors, market structure, industry structure, and differences between countries are often mentioned in this segment. It is therefore not surprising that İpek and Tanyeri (2020) use the economic environment, regulatory environment, and socio-cultural environment as key features of home country institutions to study their influence on host company EMO. Competitive intensity is a market structure factor developed by Lengler et al. (2016) used to model the factors affecting customer orientation (another approach of EMO in this case), besides inter-organization factors.

*Moderators on EMO and its antecedents*

In parallel with the study of antecedents, mediators and moderators in relationships are interesting issues. Surprisingly, no mediator was mentioned in 20 articles. In relation to moderators, İpek and Tanyeri (2020) used intra-organizational factors when looking at the relationship between the home country institutions and EMO, more specifically the knowledge-based resource (firm characteristic) and managerial resource (managerial factor). As mentioned in the Theory section, based on RBV, it is obvious that the company’s resources play a huge role. Knowledge-based resources are seen as an amalgamation of “know-what” knowledge and “know-how” capabilities, and the more accumulated knowledge sources, the better the company will be able to improve EMO. Concerning managerial resources, senior management resources act as a mechanism to facilitate, and strengthen linkages between domestic institutions and EMO. Table 5 clearly illustrates the previous ideas.

Table 5

Characteristics (C) - Moderators on EMO and its antecedents

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Moderators** | **Total (2015 - 2021)**  **n = 1 (%)** |
| ***Intra-organizational factors*** |  |
| **Firm characteristics** |  |
| Firm capability  (Knowledge-based resource) | 100 |
| **Managerial factor** |  |
| Managerial resource | 100 |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

## 4.5. Outcomes of EMO

In relation to the outcomes of EMO, there are 17 articles that have found that EMO also can impact many aspects and performance of the firms. Thus, six distinctive kinds of results were analyzed from 2015 to 2021 in many countries of the world. Regarding these consequences, most papers focused on the export performance (68.4%) which is the main impact of EMO. Besides that, the other outcomes are also indicated such as innovation (10.5%), financial performance (10.5%), strategic performance (5.3%), and marketing capabilities (5.3%).

Table 6

Characteristics (C) - Outcomes of EMO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome of Export Market Orientation** | **Total (2015 - 2021)** |
| **n = 17 (%)** |
| **Export performance** | **68.4** |
| **Others:** | **31.6** |
| Innovation | 10.5 |
| Financial performance | 10.5 |
| Strategic performance | 5.3 |
| Marketing capabilities | 5.3 |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

In terms of export performance, the relationship between it and EMO has been emphasized by most of the articles in the past. For example, there is a strong positive direct impact of EMO on SMEs’ export performance in Turkish; hence, by many aspects of EMO, Turkish exporters are easier to understand customers’ demands to quickly adapt or respond to them, which provide for higher export performance (Acikdilli et al., 2020). In detail, an important inference of this positive association is that each investment related to the market-oriented activities in the export context always provides better performance (Alotaibi & Zhang, 2017). However, evidence also suggested that there is no significant direct relationship between EMO and export performance (Imran et al., 2017). In a detailed way, as a result of the least interest toward SME export performance, EMO insignificantly impacts export performance in the context of Pakistan (Imran et al., 2017). Concerning export context, one of three main components of market orientation is customer orientation ([Frösén et al., 2016](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1509/jm.15.0153); [Narver & Slater, 1990](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/002224299005400403)). In addition, there is a U-shaped relationship between the customer orientation and SMEs’ export performance in the Brazil context, which means that SMEs with low customer orientation also can give better performance in the international market (Lengler et al., 2016). It supports that the impact of EMO on export performance can come from various significant determinants of EMO, which should be further analyzed.

As regards other outcomes, there exist some articles supporting the impacts of EMO on innovation terms (Zhang & Zhu, 2016). EMO is considered a strategic factor that positively influences export innovativeness. On the other hand, instead of being an outcome of EMO, product innovation is supported as a mediation of the relationship between EMO and business performance (Zhang & Zhu, 2016). Besides that, there is a direct relationship between focusing on export-market activities and better financial performance (Birru et al., 2019; Mac & Evangelista, 2016). Market orientation can also mediate the linkage of dynamic managerial capability and financial performance in the export context (Mostafiz et al., 2020). Similar to financial performance, strategic export performance is one of EMO’s outcomes (Birru et al., 2019). Apart from these, EMO also has a positive effect on the marketing capabilities that provide a foundation for the behavior of organizations depending on the information in the market as a marketing resource for strategies of firms (Kayabasi & Mtetwa, 2016).

Besides much effort on investigating the interplay between EMO and its consequences, many studies review and explore many mediators and moderators which connect or affect the interrelation between EMO and export performance. These mediators include export innovativeness (14.8%), and the rest factors weigh equal at 7.1% as export strategy, marketing effectiveness, export learning capabilities, resource transformation capabilities, alliances, and international corporate entrepreneurship. Similarly, the relationship linkage of EMO and export performance is impacted by these moderators, coordination flexibility, competitive intensity, internationalization degree, hierarchical export channels, and regulatory and normal distance*.* In addition, there is an impact of export assistance on the association of EMO and financial performance.

In the scope of mediation, there is support for the impact of EMO upon export performance indirectly through the importance of innovation in organizational culture (Makri et al., 2017; Zhang & Zhu, 2016). Besides that, the export strategy also partially mediates these positive effects (Alotaibi et al., 2016). An export firm can improve its performance by developing marketing effectiveness in supporting export-oriented behaviors (Kayabasi & Mtetwa, 2016). Specifically, export performance is beneficial with a high level of export learning capability (Olabode et al., 2018). Moreover, there is evidence that export resource transformation capabilities provide a linkage for two variations which are EMO and firms’ performance (Boso et al., 2018). Participating in a higher number of international alliances, firms that focus on the export market tend to have higher performance (Nakos et al., 2019). Finally, international corporate entrepreneurship is a significant mediator connecting market orientation to export performance (Mac & Evangelista, 2016).

Among mediators, a range of moderators is intensively investigated as the impact on the connection of EMO and its outcomes. For instance, [Cadogan et al. (2016)](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.078) supported that association between EMO and sales performance is strengthened if there are high levels of coordination flexibility, whereas Acikdilli et al. (2020) found a negative moderating impact of competitive intensity, which minimize the positive effect of EMO on performance. Further, another article reports firms with high internationalization degree increase the positive impact of EMO on firm performance (Chang & Fang, 2015), while there is an indication that EMO supports firms in improving business performance when using hierarchical export or providing greater institutional distance (He et al., 2018). Additionally, by being supported by more export assistants, export-oriented firms would financially perform better in the international market (Mostafiz et al., 2020). In general, there are many investigations on mediating and moderating roles of many variables on EMO and its outcomes. Table 7 is the summary of the above analysis.

**Table 7**

Characteristics (C) - Mediators/moderators on EMO and its outcomes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mediators/moderators** | **Total (2015 - 2021)**  **n = 13 (%)** |
| **Mediators** |  |
| Innovation | 14.8 |
| Export strategy | 7.1 |
| Marketing effectiveness | 7.1 |
| Export learning capabilities | 7.1 |
| Resource Transformation Capabilities (RTC) | 7.1 |
| Alliances | 7.1 |
| International Corporate Entrepreneurship (ICE) | 7.1 |
| **Moderators** |  |
| Coordination flexibility | 7.1 |
| Competitive intensity (-) | 7.1 |
| Internationalization degree | 7.1 |
| Hierarchical export channels | 7.1 |
| Regulatory and normal distance | 7.1 |
| Export assistant | 7.1 |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

## 4.6. Methodology (M)

In the methodology assessment, there is an investigation in five main parts in a total of 20 studies, which are listed in Table 8*.*

Table 8

Methodology (M)

| **Research methodology** | **Total (2015 - 2021)**  **n = 20 (%)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Sample size** |  |
| 99 or less | 5 |
| 100 - 249 | 25 |
| 250 - 499 | 30 |
| 500 or more | 40 |
| **Data collection method** |  |
| Survey | 95 |
| Interview | 20 |
| **Response rate** |  |
| 19% or less | 20 |
| 20% or 29% | 25 |
| 30% or 39% | 10 |
| 40% or more | 40 |
| Not clear | 10 |
| **Key informant** |  |
| Export Executive | 35 |
| CEO/President | 15 |
| Owner | 15 |
| Others | 30 |
| Not clear | 25 |
| **Analytical approach** |  |
| Structural equation modeling | 75 |
| Regression Analysis | 35 |
| Others | 25 |

Source: Compiled by authors (2021)

First, regarding the sample size, there is just a minority of articles (5%) employing 90 units or less, while 40% of studies indicated that their sample sizes are more than 500 units. It can be seen that there is a trend of increasing the number of samples in the updated studies since it significantly improves the validity and reliability of the findings ([Sekaran & Bougie, 2019](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Research%20methods%20for%20business%3A%20A%20skill%20building%20approach&author=U.%20Sekaran&publication_year=2013)). In relation to data collection methods, the vast majority of data is collected by survey (95%). However, the interview method (20%) is more often applied, especially the combination of survey and interview. As for response rate, there is one-fifth of papers (20%) reporting lower than 19% of respondents, while 40% or more is the response rate of exactly 40% of articles. In general, most studies experienced an increase in the rate of response; however, there are 10% of researchers that did not report their response rate for many reasons. In terms of key informants, the most experienced and skilled employees in the export context, export executives are people from who most studies (35%) collected data. Apart from that, there is only 15% of papers indicate that their key informant is the CEO, as well as the owners of the firms. On the other hand, some of the researchers (25%) did not inform their key informants, and 30% left of the studies had some distinctive key informants, such as marketing manager, financial manager, operational manager, or another senior manager, which is more appropriate for their investigation. Finally, in the scope of the analytical approach, the most frequent is 75% for the use of structural equation modeling to check and test the relationships between many variables. Followed by it, some studies (35%) indicated the application of regression analysis, while other statistical analysis such as disaggregated approach or analysis of variance accounts for 25% of papers. It can be observed that there also exist some combinations of many analytical approaches.

# 5. Conclusion

In the significant trend of customer preference in the international markets, market orientation has an important impact on business performance ([Jaworski & Kohli, 1996](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/002224299305700304)). Especially, in the exporting context, there are several articles focused on its antecedents and outcomes. Therefore, based on the TCCM framework, this review collects and identifies these relevant studies between 2015 and 2021 in order to give the general observations of EMO. Although there are some researches that give extant findings, it can be seen that the analysis of EMO still can be improved and developed further. For instance, the relationship between EMO and export performance can be explained deeper in the main components of EMO, which can create a new linkage between them and firm performance. Moreover, there exist some contradictory indications, which require more effort in developing the analysis of this term.
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