



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/144356/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Theoharakis, V., Angelis, Y. and Georgios, B. (2019) Architectural marketing capabilities of exporting ventures: the contingent effect of the distributor. *International Marketing Review*, 36 (6). pp. 1026-1041. ISSN: 0265-1335

<https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-02-2019-0081>

© 2019 Emerald Publishing Limited. This is an author-produced version of a paper subsequently published in *International Marketing Review*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



**Architectural marketing capabilities of exporting ventures:
the contingent effect of the distributor**

Journal:	<i>International Marketing Review</i>
Manuscript ID	IMR-02-2019-0081.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Architectural Capabilities, Resource Based Theory, Market orientation, Exports

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Architectural marketing capabilities of exporting ventures: the contingent effect of the distributor

Abstract

Purpose – The importance of architectural marketing capabilities (i.e., marketing planning and implementation) in exporting ventures has been recognised. However, extant literature has not taken into account the explicit roles and required synergy between the exporter and their foreign distributor in delivering these capabilities. Drawing from the Resource Based Theory, we examine the complementarity of distributor implementation capability and market orientation with exporter planning capability.

Design/methodology/approach – The study was carried out using a survey. Data were collected from 147 Greek exporters using a questionnaire and the hypotheses were tested using the full information maximum likelihood estimation procedure.

Findings – Our results support the hypotheses about the importance of exporter planning capability on financial performance and the complementary role of distributor market orientation. Further, we find that the distributor's implementation capability partially mediates the impact of the exporter's planning capability on financial performance.

Originality/value – This study contributes to a better understanding about the complementarity of exporter and distributor capabilities. It demonstrates the crucial role of the distributor in the deployment of architectural capabilities for the export venture: the distributor's market orientation and implementation capability have the final say in achieving higher levels of export performance.

Keywords

Architectural Capabilities, Resource Based Theory, Market Orientation, Exports

Introduction

Annual world exports reached nearly \$23 trillion in 2017 (World Bank, 2018a) representing 28.5% of the \$80.68 trillion global GDP (World Bank, 2018b) making exporting a major business activity requiring particular attention. Exporting via a distributor as a mode of entry is fairly attractive since it involves less risk and engages a knowledgeable producer and a local expert. This complementary pair consists of the exporter who is responsible for planning and producing a product that is of interest to foreign customers, and their foreign distributor who becomes the marketing implementation arm that also needs to sense competitor moves and customer requirements. The underlying strategic marketing planning processes and related implementation processes shape the export venture's architectural marketing capabilities (Morgan et al., 2003). More specifically, architectural marketing capabilities deal with higher-level processes that are put in place to formulate and implement strategic decisions which are essential for exporting organisations in order to achieve their strategic goals (Spyropoulou et al., 2018) and enhance export venture's performance (Morgan et al., 2003).

While a wide range of capabilities and their contribution to export venture performance has been presented, it is important to examine the most relevant in terms of strategic decisions' formulation and implementation that are also applicable in an exporting context. The literature identifies architectural capabilities as "they integrate, and orchestrate multiple specialised and cross-functional capabilities" (Morgan, 2012: 108) to be fundamental in achieving long-term strategic advantage (Henderson and Cockburn, 1994). Although the exporter and its foreign distributor depend on each other's capabilities, they are also separated by ownership, geography, culture and law (Albaum et al., 2008). In particular, exporting through distributors includes two disadvantages as it "limits the extent of learning" in the foreign market and offers the exporter "limited control over distributors and the marketing strategies they implement on his behalf" (Shipley et al., 1989: 79). Therefore, it appears imperative to examine the distributor's role in terms of facilitating learning through understanding local customer needs and sharing of relevant information, but also by their ability to implement the strategies planned by the exporter.

Exports involve two critical players: the exporter who formulates strategic plans about the deployment of a product or service, and their distributor who implements these plans in the foreign market. In fact, the involvement of different and distant partners increases the

1
2
3 challenge of effectively executing strategic decisions. Nonetheless, extant studies primarily
4 focus on the strategic capabilities of the exporter although the strategic complementarity of
5 the dyad is recognised (Lye and Hamilton, 2001; Aykol and Leonidou, 2018). The successful
6 execution of the intended strategy requires channel members to take into consideration
7 customer needs, and competitor actions in their day to day operations. Therefore, resources
8 that are deployed in the marketplace can benefit from the possession of a highly market-
9 oriented culture (Hooley et al., 2005; Hult et al., 2005; Kaleka, 2012). In the case of export
10 ventures, our research is motivated by the need for: i) strong alignment between distributor's
11 and exporter's contribution in shaping the export venture's architectural capabilities, and ii)
12 refinement of their idiosyncratic role. Therefore, our contribution stems from the fact that
13 extant literature has a primary focus on the exporter and to a lesser extent on the distributor or
14 examines the venture without considering the distinct capabilities of these actors.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Overall, rooted in the Resource Based Theory (RBT) tradition, this study seeks to
26 examine the capability of an export venture to develop strategic marketing plans and its
27 capability of implementing these plans. While these architectural capabilities are described as
28 core elements of theory, they are split between the exporter and their distributor. This paper
29 seeks to shed some light in the exporting process by examining how the foreign distributor's
30 market orientation and implementation capabilities complement the exporter's planning
31 capability for achieving higher levels of financial performance. In this manner, we explore in
32 more detail the crucial role of the distributor and our findings can serve as guidance for the
33 exporter when selecting distributors in new foreign markets. The next section describes the
34 conceptual framework and hypotheses, followed by a description of data sources, methods
35 and analysis. This is further followed by our empirical findings and we conclude with
36 discussion of key findings and implications for theory and practice.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Conceptual framework and hypotheses development**

49 RBT is considered one of the most widely-used, highly effective, and influential theories in
50 the broader area of management studies. RBT embarks upon the early work of Penrose (1959)
51 who defines the firm as a pool of physical and human resources which altogether determine
52 the level of firm performance. Simply put, firm performance differs because the amount,
53 quality and deployment of firm resources and capabilities is diverse among firms. Wernerfelt
54 (1984), drawing on the early work of Penrose suggests that the term resource is envisaged as
55 anything that can be considered a strength or a weakness of the firm. Indeed this initial
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 resource-based view describes firm-specific resources and capabilities as central sources of
4 competitive advantage and increased performance (Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993) and has
5 evolved into a key theoretical perspective (Barney et al., 2011). As a response to increasing
6 external environmental changes, firms need to innovate and maintain a high level of
7 competitive advantage by constantly advancing and reconfiguring their skills and capabilities
8 (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000). This need is even more pronounced for internationalising
9 firms that compete in diverse marketplaces and idiosyncratic environments.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 In the context of exporting firms, Dhanaraj and Beamish (2003) further stress the
17 importance of RBT in explaining the role of firm-specific resources and capabilities in
18 enhancing firm performance. Specifically, they argue that RBT is a key theoretical framework
19 that we need to draw upon in order to better understand the effect of a firm's unique resources
20 and capabilities in deploying an effective export strategy. In particular, the possession of
21 marketing capabilities leads to superior firm performance both in a domestic (Morgan et al.,
22 2009b) and an international context (Morgan et al., 2018). Capabilities are defined as firm-
23 specific resources that take the form of processes with the purpose of enabling and enhancing
24 the deployment of other resources (Makadok, 2001). The need to examine the
25 complementarity of various marketing capabilities is also raised, since the presence of one
26 capability may enhance the productivity of another or the presence of one capability may
27 attenuate the effectiveness of another capability (Morgan et al., 2009a). The exploration of
28 such capability complementarities is especially important in the case of exports: the
29 architectural capabilities required for achieving successful results are shared between the
30 exporter and their distributor increasing complexity and placing increased demands on the
31 complementarity of partner resources.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In general terms, an exporting firm's competitive capabilities include the acquisition
46 of export market-related information, ability to identify potential customers and sign contacts
47 in foreign markets, as well as the capability of monitoring important foreign market
48 information (Seringhaus, 1993). Among others, an exporting firm's competitive resources are
49 drawn from its operating experience in export markets, and such resources are related to
50 export market knowledge and past performance (Ganitsky, 1989). For example, Beleska-
51 Spasova et al. (2012) show that knowledge-based resources (including knowledge about the
52 distributors and information related to doing business in export markets) have a positive effect
53 on a firm's export performance. All the above stress that exporting firms are in constant need
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of developing unique skills and competences which in turn can generate value through the
4 development of a valuable, inimitable and rare organisational structure (Barney et al., 2001).
5
6
7

8 Overall, the resource-based logic proposes that sustainable competitive advantage can
9 be achieved when a firm possesses valuable resources that are rare and imperfectly imitable
10 (Barney and Hesterly, 2012). However, it is important to point out that resources are valuable
11 if they “enable a firm to develop and implement strategies that have the effect of lowering a
12 firm’s net costs and/or increase a firm’s net revenues beyond what would have been the case”
13 without possessing these resources (Barney and Arkan, 2001: 138). This implies that the
14 exporter’s planning capabilities, as part of their contribution to the venture’s architectural
15 capabilities, need to be considered in conjunction with the market knowledge and
16 implementation capabilities of their distributor; these implementation capabilities are the
17 exporter’s contribution to the venture’s architectural capabilities.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Despite the fact that RBT is an effective and diverse theory with numerous
27 applications in the wider area of management studies, at the same time its applicability in the
28 field of marketing, and in particular its ability to integrate a diverse range of resources in
29 order to explain contingencies and synergistic effects on performance, remains underutilised
30 (Kozlenkova et al., 2014). Our study responds to calls for a more systematic application of
31 RBT in international marketing studies (Wernerfelt, 2014; Kozlenkova et al., 2014). As
32 already mentioned, RBT is a valuable theoretical tool in terms of enhancing our
33 understanding on pinpointing the firm’s relative strengths and competitive advantage over its
34 rivals (Wernerfelt, 2014). We thus draw on important components of the RBT and its
35 competitive advantage in the context of export strategy.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In light of these considerations, the present study draws on the RBT literature to
46 examine the internal process through which architectural marketing capabilities of exporting
47 ventures influence performance in export markets.
48
49
50

51 **Exporter – distributor alignment**

52 From an RBT perspective, we argue that when exporter planning is aligned with the
53 distributor’s implementation capability (i.e. the components of the venture’s architectural
54 capabilities) then export performance will increase. The logic behind this argument is that
55 exporter investments when tailored to a distributor’s needs and idiosyncrasies are more likely
56 to lead to a greater competitive advantage as compared to general assets being held and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 deployed by the exporter. Katsikeas et al. (2009) find evidence on the aforementioned
4 argument. Specifically, they empirically show that an exporter's transaction-specific
5 (idiosyncratic) investment in its foreign distributor diminishes the possibility of exporter
6 opportunism and increases the level of importer trust in the exporter, which altogether infer
7 higher efficiency in this dyadic process.
8
9
10
11
12

13 In the same vein, Zou and Stan (1998), review export performance antecedents and
14 argue that the ownership of firm-specific resources and capabilities, including the presence of
15 a competent distribution network, is of crucial importance for maintaining a sustainable
16 competitive advantage in foreign markets. Along the same lines, other empirical studies
17 reinforce this view suggesting that alignment in the strategic planning between exporter and
18 distributor can lead to higher financial performance in foreign markets (Leonidou et al., 2002;
19 Nes et al., 2007). Further, idiosyncratic investments made by exporters towards specific
20 distributors enhance the skills and capabilities of the latter (Skarmeas and Robson, 2008).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Architectural capabilities integrate planning and implementation capabilities, and are
30 considered for some time "as a source of enduring competitive advantage" and lead to
31 increased levels of firm performance (Henderson and Cockburn, 1994). In our context,
32 architectural capabilities are in the core of firms that seek to internationalise as they allow the
33 incorporation of new capabilities in an efficient manner (Tallman and Fladmoe-Lindquist,
34 2002). Further, firms that are globally mature focus on improving and refining their
35 architectural capabilities (Morgan et al., 2018). Nonetheless, strategic planning primarily
36 depends on the exporter while implementation is the responsibility of their foreign distributor.
37 In a domestic context, strategic planning has been found to have a significant direct effect on
38 performance even in the presence of marketing implementation (Vorhies and Morgan, 2005).
39 These findings demonstrate how these capabilities contribute individually and indicate the
40 importance of strategic planning as a marketing capability which enables the deployment of
41 marketing resources. In fact, in export markets, the lack of strategic planning is the main
42 factor for poor export market performance (Cavusgil and Zou, 1994). Similarly, marketing
43 planning is a key element of the marketing competence required to succeed in the
44 internationalisation process (Knight et al., 2004). We therefore hypothesise that higher levels
45 of exporter marketing planning capabilities will lead to superior export venture financial
46 results:
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 H1. There is a positive relationship between exporter marketing planning capabilities
4 and export venture financial performance.
5
6
7

8 A frequently ignored element in the export marketing literature is that of the import
9 function, i.e., the foreign distributor who can “seriously undermine [the] implementation of
10 effective export marketing programs” (Katsikeas and Dalgic, 1995: 51). This is also echoed
11 by Chryssochoidis and Theoharakis (2004) who find that besides exporter controlled factors,
12 strategic factors of the foreign distributor need to be considered as they are critical for
13 achieving higher levels of performance. However, examining the effectiveness of
14 implementation processes that transform intended strategy to market execution is crucial for
15 achieving a sustainable competitive advantage (Vorhies and Morgan, 2005). While the need
16 to examine the implementation effectiveness in export marketing strategy is recognised, it
17 either examines the internal effectiveness of the exporter, or the manner in which the
18 exporter’s marketing strategy was externally received (Morgan et al., 2012). In other words,
19 the implementation marketing capability of the distributor as a complementary resource in the
20 execution of the exporter’s planned strategy is not explicitly examined.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 More recently, implementation capability is presented as an important moderator for
33 the exporter to achieve its strategic goals; namely, it enables exporters to execute their
34 differentiation or cost strategy (Spyropoulou et al., 2018). Therefore, we similarly expect that
35 the strategic marketing plan developed by the exporter will be enhanced by the marketing
36 implementation capability of the distributor. Consequently, a distributor’s inability to
37 adequately implement a marketing strategy will have detrimental effects on the plan. On the
38 contrary, a distributor with competent implementation skills and processes has the potential to
39 enhance the exporter’s plan. We therefore hypothesise that:
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 H2. The positive relationship between exporter marketing planning capabilities and
49 export venture financial performance is stronger when the distributor has higher levels
50 of marketing implementation capability.
51
52
53
54

55 Market orientation is a strategic resource of the firm (Ketchen et al., 2007) which is
56 part of its culture (Deshpande and Webster, 1989; Narver and Slater, 1990) and is empirically
57 shown to have a significant positive effect on firm performance (Kirca et al., 2005). The
58 concept of market orientation is heavily influenced by the marketing concept and makes a
59
60

1
2
3 significant contribution to marketing management and marketing strategy fields (Cano et al.,
4 2004). The three main conceptualisations of market orientation are the behavioural
5 perspective (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990), the cultural perspective (Narver and Slater, 1990),
6 and the combined perspective (Deshpande et al., 1993). While there are some conceptual
7 differences between the two constructs of Narver and Slater (1990) and Kohli and Jaworski
8 (1990), their operationalisations have a high degree of overlap (Cadogan and
9 Diamantopoulos, 1995). Further, by taking an exporter's perspective, export market
10 orientation is a key construct examining the market orientation of the exporter with regards to
11 their export markets (Cadogan et al., 1999).

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 The manner in which market orientation contributes to performance is a source of
22 debate, but there is consensus that it "allow[s] the firm to enact better actions" (Hult et al.,
23 2005: 1174). Market orientation is complementary with a wide range of capabilities,
24 positively enhancing the effect of marketing capabilities (Morgan et al., 2009b) and dynamic
25 capabilities (Hernández-Linares et al., 2018) on firm performance. Overall, there is evidence
26 that the effect of market orientation is strengthened when bundled together with a
27 complementary resource (Menguc and Auh, 2006). The export marketing literature provides
28 substantial support with respect to market orientation and its application in exporting
29 operations. More specifically, export market orientation plays an important moderating role
30 providing an explanation for the non-significant findings from a number of studies (Cadogan
31 et al., 2012; Boso et al., 2013).

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Given the increased organisational complexity of exporting firms, the effective utilisation
42 of company resources requires greater coordination and planning capabilities (Cadogan and
43 Diamantopoulos, 1995). The exporting firm relies on its distributor for communicating
44 customer and competitor information and for effectively responding to it. This is a weakness
45 of the exporting model (Shipley et al., 1989) as it suggests an export performance dependency
46 on the market orientation of the distributor who is serving on the customer frontline.
47 Nonetheless, the exporting literature in general does not explicitly examine how the market
48 orientation of the distributor may enhance its exporter's planning capabilities. The synergistic
49 effect produced by having a market-oriented distributor is materialised through the blurring of
50 organizational boundaries, which increases the presence of interfirm knowledge-sharing
51 routines (Dyer and Singh, 1998). We therefore hypothesise that the market orientation of the
52 distributor is complementary with the exporter's planning capabilities:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Since the effect of exporter planning capability on financial performance becomes
6 insignificant in the presence of distributor implementation capabilities, we examine the
7 mediation effect of distributor implementation capabilities. In other words, we test whether
8 exporter planning capability leads to improved levels of distributor implementation capability
9 which then results to improved performance as hypothesised by Morgan et al. (2003). For this
10 purpose, we include the direct effect of exporter planning capability on distributor
11 implementation capability in our full model (Table III – model 5). Our results indicate that
12 exporter planning capability does indeed facilitate distributor implementation capability.
13 Thus, distributor implementation capability partially mediates the relationship between
14 exporter planning capability and venture financial performance, since export planning
15 capability when distributor marketing orientation is considered does directly influence
16 performance.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Discussion**

28
29 This study is motivated by the fact that extant literature has not sufficiently addressed the
30 need for better and stronger alignment between the export venture architectural capabilities
31 held by the exporter and their distributor, and the need for providing further clarification on
32 the role of each actor's idiosyncratic capabilities in the exporting process. To address the
33 aforementioned imperfection in the extant literature, we employ RBT as a theoretical
34 framework and examine the contingent effect of the capabilities held by the distributor on the
35 relationship between exporter marketing capabilities and export venture financial
36 performance.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In hypothesis 1, we argue that there is a positive relationship between exporter
46 marketing planning capabilities and export venture financial performance. Our findings
47 support the aforementioned hypothesis and confirm the significance of strategic planning as a
48 key architectural marketing capability in the process of successfully exporting (Knight et al.,
49 2004). Further, extant research provides evidence showing that lack of strategic planning in
50 export markets is the main reason why exporters perform poorly (Cavusgil and Zou, 1994).
51 While our findings support this argument, there is an interesting empirical insight drawn from
52 our analysis which provides an additional layer of information; when distributor
53 implementation capability is taken into consideration, the positive and significant effect of
54 exporter marketing planning capability ceases to exist unless distributor market orientation is
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 considered. Although our findings confirm the view that export venture financial performance
4 is based on exporter's skills and capabilities, distributor market orientation and
5 implementation capability have the final say in achieving higher levels of export performance.
6
7
8
9

10 In hypothesis 2, we argue that the distributor's marketing implementation capability
11 complements the exporter's marketing planning capability. In other words, the distributor's
12 marketing implementation capability plays a moderating role (Spyropoulou et al., 2018) on
13 the exporter's marketing planning capability. However, while our results refute this
14 hypothesis, our analysis demonstrates that the distributor's implementation capabilities
15 partially mediate the exporter's planning capabilities. This is in line with previous findings
16 which examine capabilities at the venture level that find distributor implementation capability
17 to have a full mediation effect (Morgan et al., 2003). However, since the moderating effect of
18 distributor market orientation on exporter planning capability remains significant, we
19 conclude that the mediation effect should be treated as partial rather than full. Further, our
20 results offer the additional refinement of explicitly examining the source of these capabilities;
21 exporter planning capabilities drive the distributor's implementation capability which in turn
22 are partially responsible for driving performance. This is consistent with the reasoning that
23 exporter marketing capability needs to target the specific distributor resources and
24 capabilities, thus requiring idiosyncratic investments which improve distributor-specific
25 capabilities (Skarmeas and Robson, 2008).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In hypothesis 3, we argue that the distributor's market orientation complements the
40 exporter's marketing planning capability. This hypothesis is confirmed and provides evidence
41 that the distributor's market orientation strengthens key exporter resources (Cadogan et al.,
42 2012; Boso et al., 2013). Further, the direct effect of distributor market orientation on
43 financial performance is also found to be significant. This demonstrates the important role of
44 distributor market orientation, which does not only provide the necessary market intelligence
45 for making exporter planning more effective, but also has a significant effect on its own.
46 When viewed in conjunction with the rest of our findings (Table III – model 4), one observes
47 that distributor capabilities play a pivoting role in terms of the ability of the dyad to deliver
48 higher levels of performance.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Implications for theory and practice**

59
60

1
2
3 While marketing capabilities and their influence on international performance are the subject
4 of sizeable empirical research (Morgan et al., 2018), our empirical testing demonstrates that
5 our conceptual framework (Figure 1) provides some further insights, which are of interest to
6 both academics and practitioners. Firstly, an exporter's planning capability when examined on
7 its own, is positively linked with the export venture's financial performance. Secondly, the
8 distributor's implementation capability partially mediates the exporter's planning capability
9 but does not moderate it as originally hypothesised. Thirdly, the distributor's market
10 orientation while it has direct impact on performance, it also positively moderates the
11 exporter's planning capability. Overall, based on the exporter's own evaluation, our results
12 clearly indicate the dependency of the exporter on its distributor.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In terms of contribution to theory, our study demonstrates that theoretical frameworks
23 relating to export strategy need to jointly consider both the exporter's and distributor's
24 capabilities. From an RBT perspective, exporter firm-specific capabilities need to be aligned
25 with distributor-specific capabilities in order to reap the benefits of export strategy. From a
26 practitioner perspective, our study indicates the crucial role of the distributor in the exporter-
27 distributor dyad that appears to have the final say no matter what strategic planning the
28 exporter may have undertaken. This has implications for the distributor selection process
29 where particular emphasis needs to be placed by exporters in examining the potential
30 distributor's marketing orientation and implementation capabilities. In order for the exporter
31 to maximise the benefits of this dyadic relationship, they need to continuously support and
32 invest in the venture in a manner which will enhance the implementation capabilities of their
33 distributor.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In light of these findings, future research should emphasise even more the distinct set
46 of skills the exporter and their distributor bring in the export venture. More specifically,
47 examining exporter capabilities without considering the complementarity of distributor
48 capabilities, may lead to biased findings. Our findings indicate the joined-up nature of export
49 ventures, and the need for firms to pick and choose their partners carefully which needs to be
50 more fully explored. More specifically, export venture performance is determined by the
51 dyadic nature of the exporting process, which requires that export venture member
52 capabilities are aligned with each other. This suggests that in terms of methodology,
53 researchers need to consider collecting data from both sides of the dyad. Future research
54 needs to explore in more detail the criteria used by exporters in selecting their distributors,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 since export venture success depends on distributor intelligence and capabilities. Finally,
4 future research could also draw from more diverse data and a wider geographical range,
5 which would enhance our understanding on the potential impact of cultural and institutional
6 variability on the relationship between export venture's architectural capabilities and export
7 venture financial performance.
8
9
10
11
12

13 **References**

- 14
15 Albaum GS, Albaum G and Duerr E. (2008) *International marketing and export management*:
16 Pearson Education.
17 Aykol B and Leonidou LC. (2018) Exporter-importer business relationships: Past empirical
18 research and future directions. *International Business Review* 27: 1007-1021.
19 Barney J, Wright M and Ketchen Jr DJ. (2001) The resource-based view of the firm: Ten
20 years after 1991. *Journal of Management* 27: 625-641.
21 Barney JB. (1991) Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of*
22 *Management* 17: 99-120.
23 Barney JB and Arikan AM. (2001) The resource-based view: Origins and implications. In: M.
24 A. Hitt REF, & and Harrison JS (eds) *Handbook of strategic management*. Oxford:
25 Blackwell.
26 Barney JB and Hesterly WS. (2012) *Strategic Management and Competitive Advantage*.
27 Pearson Prentice Hall.
28 Barney JB, Ketchen Jr DJ and Wright M. (2011) The future of resource-based theory:
29 revitalization or decline? *Journal of Management* 37: 1299-1315.
30 Beleska-Spasova E, Glaister KW and Stride C. (2012) Resource determinants of strategy and
31 performance: The case of British exporters. *Journal of World Business* 47: 635-647.
32 Bello DC and Gilliland DI. (1997) The effect of output controls, process controls, and
33 flexibility on export channel performance. *Journal of Marketing* 61: 22-38.
34 Boso N, Cadogan JW and Story VM. (2013) Entrepreneurial orientation and market
35 orientation as drivers of product innovation success: A study of exporters from a
36 developing economy. *International Small Business Journal* 31: 57-81.
37 Cadogan JW and Diamantopoulos A. (1995) Narver and Slater, Kohli and Jaworski and the
38 market orientation construct: integration and internationalization. *Journal of strategic*
39 *marketing* 3: 41-60.
40 Cadogan JW, Diamantopoulos A and De Mortanges CP. (1999) A measure of export market
41 orientation: scale development and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of International*
42 *Business Studies* 30: 689-707.
43 Cadogan JW, Sundqvist S, Puumalainen K, et al. (2012) Strategic flexibilities and export
44 performance: The moderating roles of export market-oriented behavior and the export
45 environment. *European journal of marketing* 46: 1418-1452.
46 Cano CR, Carrillat FA and Jaramillo F. (2004) A meta-analysis of the relationship between
47 market orientation and business performance: evidence from five continents.
48 *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 21: 179-200.
49 Cavusgil TS and Zou S. (1994) Marketing strategy performance relationship: An investigation
50 of the empirical link in export market ventures. *Journal of Marketing* 58: 1-21.
51 Chryssochoidis G and Theoharakis V. (2004) Attainment of competitive advantage by the
52 exporter-importer dyad: The role of export offering and import objectives. *Journal of*
53 *Business Research* 57: 329-337.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Deshpande R, Farley JU and Webster FE. (1993) Corporate Culture, Customer Orientation,
4 and Innovativeness in Japanese Firms: A Quadrad Analysis. *Journal of Marketing* 57:
5 23-38.
6 Deshpande R and Webster FE. (1989) Organizational culture and marketing: defining the
7 research agenda. *Journal of Marketing* 53: 3-15.
8 Dhanaraj C and Beamish PW. (2003) A resource-based approach to the study of export
9 performance. *Journal of Small Business Management* 41: 242-261.
10 Diamantopoulos A and Cadogan JW. (1996) Internationalizing the market orientation
11 construct: an in-depth interview approach. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 4: 23-52.
12 Dillman DA. (2000) *Mail and Internet Surveys, the Tailored Design Method*, New York: John
13 Wiley & Sons, Inc.
14 Dyer JH and Singh H. (1998) The Relational View: Cooperative Strategy and Sources of
15 Interorganizational Competitive Advantage. *The Academy of Management Review* 23:
16 660-679.
17 Eisenhardt KM and Martin JA. (2000) Dynamic capabilities: what are they? *Strategic*
18 *Management Journal* 21: 1105-1121.
19 Enders CK. (2001) The performance of the full information maximum likelihood estimator in
20 multiple regression models with missing data. *Educational and Psychological*
21 *Measurement* 61: 713-740.
22 Ganitsky J. (1989) Strategies for innate and adoptive exporters: lessons from Israel' s case.
23 *International Marketing Review* 6: 50-65.
24 Hayes AF. (2018) *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis,*
25 *Second Edition: A Regression-Based Approach*: Guilford Publications.
26 Henderson R and Cockburn I. (1994) Measuring competence? Exploring firm effects in
27 pharmaceutical research. *Strategic Management Journal* 15: 63-84.
28 Hernández-Linares R, Kellermanns FW and López-Fernández MC. (2018) Dynamic
29 Capabilities and SME Performance: The Moderating Effect of Market Orientation.
30 *Journal of Small Business Management*.
31 Hooley GJ, Greenley GE, Cadogan JW, et al. (2005) The performance impact of marketing
32 resources. *Journal of Business Research* 58: 18-27.
33 Hult GTM, Ketchen DJ and Slater SF. (2005) Market orientation and performance: an
34 integration of disparate approaches. *Strategic Management Journal* 26: 1173-1181.
35 Jaworski BJ and Kohli AK. (1993) Market orientation: antecedents and consequences. *The*
36 *Journal of marketing*: 53-70.
37 Kaleka A. (2012) Studying resource and capability effects on export venture performance.
38 *Journal of World Business* 47: 93-105.
39 Katsikeas CS and Dalgic T. (1995) Importing problems experienced by distributors: The
40 importance of level-of-import development. *Journal of International Marketing* 3: 51-
41 70.
42 Katsikeas CS, Skarmeas D and Bello DC. (2009) Developing successful trust-based
43 international exchange relationships. *Journal of International Business Studies* 40:
44 132-155.
45 Ketchen DJ, Hult GTM and Slater SF. (2007) Toward greater understanding of market
46 orientation and the resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal* 28: 961-964.
47 Kirca AH, Jayachandran S and Bearden WO. (2005) Market orientation: A meta-analytic
48 review and assessment of its antecedents and impact on performance. *Journal of*
49 *Marketing* 69: 24-41.
50 Knight G, Koed Madsen T and Servais P. (2004) An inquiry into born-global firms in Europe
51 and the USA. *International Marketing Review* 21: 645-665.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kock N. (2015) Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach.
4 *International Journal of e-Collaboration (IJeC)* 11: 1-10.
- 5 Kohli AK and Jaworski BJ. (1990) Market Orientation: the construct research propositions,
6 and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing* 54: 1-18.
- 7 Kozlenkova IV, Samaha SA and Palmatier RW. (2014) Resource-based theory in marketing.
8 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 42: 1-21.
- 9 Leonidou LC, Katsikeas CS and Hadjimarcou J. (2002) Building successful export business
10 relationships: a behavioral perspective. *Journal of International Marketing* 10: 96-
11 115.
- 12 Lye A and Hamilton RT. (2001) Importer perspectives on international exchange
13 relationships. *International Business Review* 10: 109-128.
- 14 Makadok R. (2001) Toward a synthesis of the resource-based and dynamic-capability views
15 of rent creation. *Strategic Management Journal* 22: 387-401.
- 16 Menguc B and Auh S. (2006) Creating a firm-level dynamic capability through capitalizing
17 on market orientation and innovativeness. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing
18 Science* 34: 63-73.
- 19 Morgan NA. (2012) Marketing and business performance. *Journal of the Academy of
20 Marketing Science* 40: 102-119.
- 21 Morgan NA, Feng H and Whitley KA. (2018) Marketing Capabilities in International
22 Marketing. *Journal of International Marketing* 26: 61-95.
- 23 Morgan NA, Kaleka A and Katsikeas CS. (2004) Antecedents of export venture performance:
24 a theoretical model and empirical assessment. *Journal of Marketing* 68: 90-108.
- 25 Morgan NA, Katsikeas CS and Vorhies DW. (2012) Export marketing strategy
26 implementation, export marketing capabilities, and export venture performance.
27 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 40: 271-289.
- 28 Morgan NA, Slotegraaf RJ and Vorhies DW. (2009a) Linking marketing capabilities with
29 profit growth. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 26: 284-293.
- 30 Morgan NA, Vorhies DW and Mason CH. (2009b) Market orientation, marketing capabilities,
31 and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal* 30: 909-920.
- 32 Morgan NA, Zou S, Vorhies DW, et al. (2003) Experiential and informational knowledge,
33 architectural marketing capabilities, and the adaptive performance of export ventures:
34 A cross-national study. *Decision Sciences* 34: 287-321.
- 35 Narver JC and Slater SF. (1990) The effect of a market orientation on business profitability.
36 *Journal of Marketing* 54: 20-35.
- 37 Nes EB, Solberg CA and Silkoset R. (2007) The impact of national culture and
38 communication on exporter–distributor relations and on export performance.
39 *International Business Review* 16: 405-424.
- 40 Pavlou PA, Liang H and Xue Y. (2007) Understanding and mitigating uncertainty in online
41 exchange relationships: A principal-agent perspective. *MIS quarterly*: 105-136.
- 42 Penrose E. (1959) *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*, New York: Wiley.
- 43 Peteraf MA. (1993) The cornerstones of competitive advantage: a resource-based view.
44 *Strategic Management Journal* 14: 179-191.
- 45 Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee J-Y, et al. (2003) Common method biases in behavioral
46 research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of
47 Applied Psychology* 88: 879.
- 48 Seringhaus FHR. (1993) Comparative marketing behaviour of Canadian and Austrian high-
49 tech exporters. *MIR: Management International Review*: 247-269.
- 50 Shipley D, Cook D and Barnett E. (1989) Recruitment, motivation, training and evaluation of
51 overseas distributors. *European journal of marketing* 23: 79-93.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Skarneas D and Robson MJ. (2008) Determinants of relationship quality in importer–
4 exporter relationships. *British Journal of Management* 19: 171-184.
5 Spyropoulou S, Katsikeas CS, Skarneas D, et al. (2018) Strategic goal accomplishment in
6 export ventures: the role of capabilities, knowledge, and environment. *Journal of the*
7 *Academy of Marketing Science* 46: 109-129.
8 Tallman S and Fladmoe-Lindquist K. (2002) Internationalization, globalization, and
9 capability-based strategy. *California Management Review* 45: 116-135.
10 Vorhies DW and Morgan NA. (2005) Benchmarking marketing capabilities for sustainable
11 competitive advantage. *Journal of Marketing* 69: 80-94.
12 Wernerfelt B. (1984) A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal* 5:
13 171-180.
14 Wernerfelt B. (2014) On the role of the RBV in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of*
15 *Marketing Science* 42: 22-23.
16 World Bank. (2018a) *Exports of goods and services (current US\$)*. Available at:
17 https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NE.EXP.GNFS.CD?year_high_desc=true.
18 World Bank. (2018b) *GDP (current US\$)*. Available at:
19 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>.
20 Zou S and Stan S. (1998) The determinants of export performance: a review of the empirical
21 literature between 1987 and 1997. *International Marketing Review* 15: 333-356.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework




Figure 2. The moderating effect of Distributor Market Orientation on the relationship between Exporter Marketing Planning and Financial Performance




Table I. Measurement model

Construct and item wording	Standardised Loading
Exporter Planning Capability (CR = 0.95, AVE = 0.79); Vorhies and Morgan (2005)	
<i>Rate your capabilities relative to your export competitors in this export venture:</i>	
Our marketing planning skills	0.87
Our ability to effectively segment and target markets	0.80
Our marketing management skills and processes	0.93
Developing creative marketing strategies	0.91
Thoroughness of marketing planning processes	0.93
Distributor Market Orientation (CR = 0.89, AVE = 0.62); adapted from Narver and Slater (1990)	
<i>To what extent do these statements apply to your distributor in this export market</i>	
Our distributor's sales people share information about export competitors	0.71
Our distributor's objectives and strategies are driven by the creation of export customer satisfaction	0.71
Information about export customers is freely communicated throughout our distributor	0.74
Our distributor competitive strategies are based on understanding export customer needs	0.91
Our distributor related business functions are integrated to serve export market needs	0.84
Distributor Implementation Capability (CR = 0.95, AVE = 0.78); adapted from Vorhies and Morgan (2005)	
<i>Rate this distributor relative to other major distributors in the same market</i>	
Our distributor's ability to allocate marketing resources effectively	0.91
Our distributor's ability to deliver marketing programs effectively	0.97
Our distributor's ability to translate marketing strategies into action	0.87
Our distributor's ability to execute marketing strategies quickly	0.77
Our distributor's ability to monitor marketing performance	0.88
Financial Performance (CR = 0.86, AVE = 0.60); Hooley et al. (2005)	
<i>How did your venture perform compared with your main competitors?</i>	
Overall profit levels achieved	0.71
Profit margins achieved	0.71
Return on investment	0.87
Return on sales achieved	0.80
<i>Indicate how far you agree with each of the following statements about this particular market</i>	
Competitive Intensity (CR = 0.84, AVE = 0.65); Jaworski and Kohli (1993)	
Competition in this export market is "cut-throat"	0.98
There are many promotion wars in this export market	0.78
Price competition is a hallmark of this export market	0.61
Technological Turbulence (CR = 0.89, AVE = 0.72); Jaworski and Kohli (1993)	
The technology in our industry is changing rapidly	0.76
Technological changes provide big opportunities in our industry	0.90
A large number of new product ideas have been made possible through technological breakthroughs	0.88

Notes: CR, composite reliability. AVE, average variance extracted

Table II. Correlation table and descriptive statistics

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Financial Performance	<i>0.78</i>							
2 Exporter Planning Capability	0.36	<i>0.89</i>						
3 Distributor Market Orientation	0.40	0.38	<i>0.79</i>					
4 Distributor Implementation Capability	0.42	0.60	0.50	<i>0.88</i>				
5 Competitive intensity	-0.05	0.23	0.20	0.17	<i>0.80</i>			
6 Technological Turbulence	0.23	0.18	0.39	0.01	0.17	<i>0.85</i>		
7 Company age	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.25	-0.11	-0.14	<i>NA</i>	
8 No of exporting countries	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	<i>NA</i>
Mean	4.69	4.81	5.30	4.86	5.47	3.90	42.45	13.10
Std. Dev.	0.86	1.09	0.83	1.00	1.06	1.22	29.74	12.52

Notes: Pairwise correlations above |0.13| are significant at the 5% level (two-tailed tests). The diagonal in italics shows the square root of AVE.

Table III. Full Information Maximum Likelihood estimates predicting financial performance

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	Unstandardized / Standardized				
EPC (H1)	0.27/0.35* (4.02)	0.09/0.12 (1.11)	0.18/0.22* (2.59)	0.05/0.06 (0.56)	0.03/0.03 (0.33)
DIC		0.35/0.41* (4.08)		0.26/0.30* (2.81)	0.28/0.33* (3.15)
DMO			0.35/0.33* (3.62)	0.24/0.23* (2.22)	0.26/0.25* (2.49)
EPC x DIC (H2)		0.09/0.12 (1.41)		-0.05/-0.06 (-0.58)	-0.05/-0.07 (-0.64)
EPC x DMO (H3)			0.23/0.27* (3.07)	0.23/0.28* (2.53)	0.24/0.28* (2.60)
EPC → DIC					0.545* (7.64)
Competitive Intensity	-0.12/-0.15* (-1.83)	-0.18/-0.22* (-2.76)	-0.14/-0.17* (-2.18)	-0.17/-0.20* (-2.61)	-0.16/-0.20* (-2.60)
Technological turbulence	0.16/0.22* (2.60)	0.18/0.25* (3.16)	0.09/0.13 (1.55)	0.12/0.17* (2.06)	0.13/0.18* (2.16)
Company age	0.003/0.091 (1.15)	0.001/0.047 (0.62)	0.002/0.080 (1.07)	0.001/0.047 (0.64)	0.001/0.048 (0.65)
No of exporting countries	0.004/0.053 (0.69)	0.004/0.055 (0.76)	0.004/0.062 (0.82)	0.005/0.074 (1.03)	0.004/0.054 (0.73)
Constant	3.30/3.84* (7.07)	4.83/5.60* (11.09)	4.89/5.66* (10.75)	4.97/5.75* (11.19)	4.96/5.84* (11.30)
R-squared	0.201	0.310	0.334	0.368	0.354
Observations	147	147	147	147	147

Notes: t-test in parenthesis. * $p < 0.05$, one-tailed tests. EPC = Exporter Planning Capability, DIC = Distributor Implementation Capability, DMO = Distributor Market Orientation, EPC → DIC effect of EPC on DIC