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Purpose: In spite of the considerable research interests particularly devoted to meta-analyze the empirical findings on market orientation in the domestic context, much little attention has been assigned to the role of market orientation in the field of exporting. Due to the progress in the momentum of the empirical articles pertaining to export market orientation, this meta-analytic research attempts to quantitatively synthesize all empirical research on the export market orientation’s linkage with performance-related consequences, firm capabilities, and strategy-related consequences. Besides, this meta-analysis endeavors to examine the impact of potential contextual and measurement moderators on export market orientation and its consequences through following a meta-analysis perspective.

Design/methodology/approach: The quantitative evidence was drawn from a meta-analysis of 89 total effects \(N = 8,652\).

Findings: The meta-analysis results reveal that export market orientation has a major impact on both innovation performance and firm capabilities. Moreover, the meta-analytic evidence also indicates that the strength of the association between export market orientation and capability building/strategy-related consequences is greater for firms operating in high collectivist cultures, whereas the magnitude of the correlation between export market orientation and performance-related consequences is stronger for least developed countries.

Originality/value: On the basis of the findings, this study considerably contributes to the related body of research by aggregating fragmented empirical evidence in the extant literature and providing beneficial insights for both researchers and practitioners.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Since being market-oriented strongly requires a regular involvement in accumulating, disseminating, and interpreting market intelligence, information chain in export markets is relatively less developed compared to domestic settings; a firm’s market orientation in a domestic market therefore does not mirror its market-oriented strategy in exporting (Cadogan et al., 2002). In this regard, export market orientation has been widely recognized as firm’s attempts to apply the marketing concept to the export field (Cadogan et al., 2009), with a special emphasis placed on export markets rather than on domestic markets (Cadogan et al., 2003). Market orientation competency is of great significance notably for exporting firms owing to the fact that it provides opportunity to collect the up-to-date information about target markets, to comprehend the essentials of consumer demands, and to formulate a strategy to successfully stand out among competitors in overseas markets (He et al., 2013; Katsikea et al., 2019; Yayla et al., 2018).

In line with the importance attributed to the export market orientation phenomenon, market orientation in the export context has been identified as a promising area of investigation (Leonidou et al., 2010), and following this, the body of research on export market orientation has recorded a burgeoning interest specifically in recent decades, with the purpose of throwing light on the determinant factors and consequences of the phenomenon. In this sense, substantial number of articles have examined the consequences of export market orientation, finding export market orientation to be associated with performance-related consequences (e.g., Birru et al., 2019; Cadogan et al., 2009), firm capabilities (e.g., Hortinha et al., 2011; Murray et al., 2011), strategy-related consequences (e.g., He et al., 2013; Navarro-García et al., 2013), and relational consequences (e.g., Alteren and Tudoran, 2016; Racela et al., 2007), among other consequences.
However, in spite of the considerable amount of research on the consequences of export market orientation, previous empirical evidence has generally reported inconsistent findings. For instance, whereas the great majority of the studies have demonstrated a significant positive linkage between export market orientation and export performance (e.g., Cadogan et al., 2012; Chang and Fang, 2015; Lin et al., 2014), studies not adding support or finding a negative correlation for this link also exist in the extant export marketing literature (e.g., Lengler et al., 2013; Mac and Evangelista, 2016; Rose and Shoham, 2002). In addition, although the positive relationship between market orientation of exporting firms and innovation performance has been largely indicated (e.g., Boso et al., 2012; Murray et al., 2011), a few studies have concluded that export market orientation does not serve as an antecedent of innovation performance (e.g., Zhang and Zhu, 2016). The same is also true for the impact of export market orientation on business performance, such that the existing literature has revealed both significant (e.g., Beaujanot et al., 2004; Kropp et al., 2006) and non-significant associations (e.g., Ellis et al., 2011) between these theoretical constructs.

In terms of the interrelationship between export market orientation and firm capabilities, the empirical findings are also diverse. In this respect, while export market orientation has been found to be an essential determinant of innovation capabilities (e.g., Hortinha et al., 2011), marketing capabilities (e.g., Kayabasi and Mtetwa, 2016; Murray et al., 2011), and resource transformation capability (e.g., Boso et al., 2018), a non-significant link between competitor orientation and product development and market-related explorative capabilities (e.g., Lisboa et al., 2011) and a negative correlation between customer orientation and marketing innovation capability (e.g., Naidoo, 2010) have been also proved in the body of research on export market orientation. As for the relevance of being market-oriented in strategic decisions of exporting firms, a substantial number of studies have noted that export market orientation plays a significant role in strategic export-related decisions such as export channel selection.
(e.g., He et al., 2013), marketing mix adaptation strategy (e.g., Navarro-García et al., 2013), and strategic orientation (i.e., innovation and learning orientation) (e.g., Mac and Evangelista, 2016; Zhang and Zhu, 2016). On the other hand, empirical evidence has also shown a non-significant association between export market orientation and adaptation of the marketing mix components to export markets (e.g., Navarro-García et al., 2014).

Previously, various research attempts have been devoted to conduct meta-analyses to consolidate the empirical research on market orientation, offering worthwhile insights. However, the scope of these meta-analytic studies has been confined to the domestic context; most of which have intensified on the market orientation-performance relationship in general (e.g., Cano et al., 2004; Ellis, 2006; Kirca et al., 2005; Shoham et al., 2005; Shoham et al., 2006), while a few have concentrated on the interrelationship between market orientation and either innovation consequences (e.g., Chang et al., 2014; Grinstein, 2008a) or strategic orientations (e.g., Grinstein, 2008b) in particular. In light of these meta-analytic studies, both contextual and measurement moderators have been identified as significant considerations that may influence the strength of the export market orientation-its consequences association.

With regard to the former, either the cultural orientation or the economic development level of a country has been suggested to determine the value of market orientation for a firm (e.g., Ellis, 2006; Grinstein, 2008a; Kirca et al., 2005). Concerning the latter, the measurement factors have been supported to be of great importance in terms of explaining the role of various well-established scales of market orientation in different theoretical relationships (e.g., Cano et al., 2004; Shoham et al., 2006). Building on the aforementioned issues, a need emerges to aggregate empirical findings in relation to the market orientation literature in the export context.

In order to fulfil this research gap, this study endeavours to quantitatively synthesize the association between export market orientation and its consequences through a meta-analytic
procedure. In line with this, this meta-analytic study was aimed to respond the following research questions: (a) Are the relationships between export market orientation and its consequences prevalent across diverse environment and country settings? (b) Are the relationships between export market orientation and its consequences influenced by contextual and measurement matters? (c) Which theoretical and managerial implications does export market orientation offer with regard to its consequences and boundary factors? More specifically, the purposes addressed in this study are threefold: (1) to meta-analyze prior empirical research about the influence of export market orientation on performance-related consequences, firm capabilities, and strategy-related consequences, and to report an estimate of the correlation between export market orientation and the constructs of interest; (2) to unveil the contextual and measurement factors which moderate the export market orientation’s association with its consequences; and (3) to offer theoretical and managerial implications in an effort to improve the stream of research on export market orientation.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

The phenomenon of market orientation, which has been identified as one of the essential backbones of the marketing area, refers to the utilization of the marketing concept in fact (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990) and is consistent with the marketing concept (Aaby and Discenza, 1993). In the pertinent literature, market orientation is regarded as a set of organizational culture (Deshpandé et al., 1993; Narver and Slater, 1990), or a part of organizational behavior (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990), or a firm resource (Hunt and Morgan, 1995), or a firm capability (e.g., Atuahene-Gima et al., 2005; Lamore et al., 2013). Further, market orientation is closely associated with the process of market learning (Özsomer and Gençtürk, 2003), since firms with higher market orientation have a stronger competency in gathering recent information about stakeholders and utilize this knowledge in achieving superior customer satisfaction and developing value-added products (Slater and Narver, 1995). Besides, there exists two various
approaches related to the conceptualization of market orientation: (a) behavioral and (b) cultural approach (Homburg and Pflessner, 2000). While the former acknowledges market orientation as an organizational activity that concentrates on the generation and dissemination of market knowledge (e.g., Kohli and Jaworski, 1990), the latter deals with the market orientation, referring to a set of organizational culture that comprises a bundle of norms, values, and beliefs making the customer value creation process easier (e.g., Deshpandé et al., 1993; Narver and Slater, 1990).

On the other hand, export market orientation is primarily related with firms’ attempts to engage marketing concept in exporting operations (Cadogan et al., 2009) and it pays much more attention to export markets rather than domestic ones (Cadogan et al., 2003). Being export market-oriented is particularly critical for firms operating in export markets, as it enables firms to gather market knowledge related to target customers, to meet the foreign customers’ expectations, and to determine suitable strategy in international markets (He et al., 2013; Katsikea et al., 2019). Firms with greater export market orientation tend to foster market research within the firm with intent to adapt their strategies and address with the different customers’ needs in export markets (Murray et al., 2011; Olabode et al., 2018). Owing to the equalizer role of export market orientation in international markets, which have been characterized by intense competition and uncertainty (Matanda and Freeman, 2009), obtaining foreign market knowledge has great importance (Sousa et al., 2008) and helps to achieve superior export performance in overseas markets (Murray et al., 2007). In the export market orientation research, the resource-based view (RBV) and dynamic capabilities theory stand out as the most frequently used theories (e.g., Birru et al., 2019; Boso et al., 2018; Cadogan et al., 2016). While the RBV is grounded upon the idea that a firm must be equipped with valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and imperfectly substitutable resources with an aim to get sustainable competitive advantage (Barney, 1991), dynamic capabilities
theory incorporates the transformative nature of resources and capabilities, which emerged as an extension form of the RBV (Teece et al., 1997; Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000).

2.1. Export Market Orientation and Performance-Related Consequences

The pertinent literature has taken great interest in identifying market orientation construct as a crucial driver of export success (Cadogan et al., 2009), as there is an evidence that accumulated foreign market knowledge plays a decisive role in enhancing and enduring favorable gains from export operations by the help of building strong relationships with suppliers and distributors in export markets (Cadogan et al., 1999; Racela et al., 2007; Theoharakis et al., 2019). The logic is that market-oriented companies are regarded as better in anticipating their customers’ local expectations and understanding competitors’ actions, which results in better adaptation of appropriate strategies and satisfaction with export performance (Cadogan et al., 2012; Chang and Fang, 2015; Rose and Shoham, 2002). In this context, a large body of literature examining the relations between market orientation and export performance has produced strong and positive findings in consideration with various measures of export performance (i.e., sales, profitability, market share) (e.g., Birru et al., 2019; Cadogan et al., 2012; Chang and Fang, 2015; Chung, 2012; Lin et al., 2014).

H1: Export market orientation is positively related to export performance.

Research in marketing indicates that market orientation has been ensued as a critical determinant of innovation performance (Ashrafi and Ravasan, 2018; Hurley et al., 2005), since market orientation stimulates all of the members within a corporation to collaborate their works via following the latest developments in foreign markets and sharing them among the members (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990). A company with higher level of export market orientation is more likely to concentrate on addressing customers’ latent needs with the power of gathered knowledge on market information through the implementation of new
ideas, processes, and products (Grinstein, 2008a; Kirca et al., 2005; Wei and Atuahene-Gima, 2009), which leads them to engage in greater innovative activities (Langerak et al., 2004). A vast majority of the extant literature has also found supportive evidence for the positive association between export market orientation and innovation performance (Boso et al., 2012; Murray et al., 2011).

H2: Export market orientation is positively related to innovation performance.

The notion that export market orientation has a substantial impact on business performance is a matter of widespread research, and it serves as a catalyst for business performance (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Lim et al., 2017; Narver and Slater, 1990). To the extent that export market-oriented companies identify customers’ changing needs regarding to the ever-evolving market trends and take responsive actions towards rivals, export market orientation enables the company to enhance customer satisfaction, decrease competitor threats, and finally, improve business performance via delivering customized products relying upon market intelligence and dissemination among distinct functional units (Kirca et al., 2005; Rose and Shoham, 2002). In this context, a rich body of research in international marketing has examined the relationship between export market orientation and business performance and reported mostly a significant and positive correlation between these theoretical constructs (e.g., Beaujanot et al., 2004; Ellis et al., 2011; Kropp et al., 2006).

H3: Export market orientation is positively related to business performance.

2.2. Export Market Orientation and Firm Capabilities

Empirical evidence demonstrates that export market orientation has a critical role in export ventures and constitutes as an important contributor to the capability building (Chung and Kim, 2002; Murray et al., 2011). As export market orientation generates information about
foreign markets and disseminates this knowledge among different departments within the firm, which both lead to the improvements in the responsiveness of the firm to the rapid shifts in international markets (Cadogan et al., 2003), it has long been regarded as one of the primary resources (Knight and Cavusgil, 2004; Lu et al., 2010). Export market orientation assists firms in capturing unexplored customer needs, design new solutions and sustain customer value creation by the help of building new capabilities at the firm level (He and Wei, 2011; Lichtenthaler, 2016) such as marketing capabilities (e.g., Kayabasi and Mtetwa, 2016; Murray et al., 2011; Naidoo, 2010), exploitative and exploratory innovation capabilities (e.g., Hortinha et al., 2011; Lisboa et al., 2011), and resource transformation capability (e.g., Boso et al., 2018).

H4: Export market orientation is positively related to firm capabilities.

2.3. Export Market Orientation and Strategy-Related Consequences

The literature advocates that company success depends upon to the extent of strategic orientation, which is obtained via market orientation (Navarro et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2005). In this sense, market orientation is predicated on its major role in strategic behaviors and decision-making processes of export companies (Cadogan et al., 2009; Navarro-García et al., 2014). Widely employed in the field of marketing, the concept of market orientation has also emerged as a dominant driver of corporate marketing strategy for over the years (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Narver and Slater, 1990), with the advantage of having high degree of market orientation, which encourages firms to take advantage of opportunities and conduct better strategically-taken decisions in foreign markets based on market intelligence through their predictions and modifications concerning to the changes in international markets (Navarro et al., 2010; Wu, 2011; Katsikea et al., 2019). In the stream of research on export market orientation, export market orientation has been found to have a significant role in such
strategic decisions as adaptation of the marketing mix strategy in export markets (e.g., Navarro-Garcia et al., 2013) and export channel selection (e.g., He et al., 2013).

H5: Export market orientation is positively related to strategy-related consequences.

Table 1 presents selected empirical contributions on the association between export market orientation and its consequences.
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2.4. Moderators of Export Market Orientation and Its Consequences

The moderators of the association between export market orientation and its consequences are evaluated in light of contextual (i.e., cultural context and economic development level of countries) and measurement factors (i.e., measurement scale), which have been identified as critical concerns in a meta-analysis (e.g., Cano et al., 2004; Ellis, 2006).

2.4.1. Cultural context: Cultural beliefs and norms determine the way firms make sense of and exploit the marketing concept, constituting the essence of market orientation (Nakata and Sivakumar, 2001). Thus, export market orientation has been considered being closely intertwined with national culture (Cadogan et al., 2006). Building on these, the relationship between export market orientation and its consequences are likely to be peculiar to a country or region (e.g., Ellis, 2006; Grinstein, 2008a; Kirca et al., 2005), which can be explained through the lenses of the Hofstede’s (1997) cultural dimensions (i.e., individualism and masculinity).

The effectiveness of export market orientation is firmly attached to the degree of synergy and collaboration within an organization, since interconnected individuals are more inclined to enhance the flow of market information across departments; which in turn, cultivates market responsiveness (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Narver and Slater, 1990). These idiosyncrasies are
embedded in collectivist cultures; hence, a stronger association between export market orientation and its consequences is anticipated in countries with low individualism scores. As for masculinity, due to the fact that individuals give more importance to assertiveness and material success in masculine cultures, being market-oriented is assumed to be more efficacious in those countries (Hofstede, 1997; Kirca et al., 2005). Relying on this, the correlation between export market orientation and its consequences is predicted to be higher in masculine countries. Therefore, it was posited that:

H6: The magnitude of the association between export market orientation and its consequences ((a) performance-related consequences, (b) firm capabilities, and (c) strategy-related consequences) is greater in countries with high collectivism scores.

H7: The magnitude of the association between export market orientation and its consequences ((a) performance-related consequences, (b) firm capabilities, and (c) strategy-related consequences) is greater in countries with high masculinity scores.

2.4.2. Economic development: In the extant export marketing literature, the positive relationship between export market orientation and its outcomes has been overwhelmingly acknowledged in the context of developed economies (e.g., Cadogan et al., 2002; Makri et al., 2017). The extensive empirical evidence on this matter of interest is attributed to the fact that compared to developing markets, developed countries are surrounded by more turbulent market and technological environments (Hooley et al., 2000), which require a greater concentration on market sensing to struggle with environmental ambiguities (Cadogan et al., 2002; Cadogan et al., 2012). Accordingly, regarding export market orientation, critical differences are supposed to appear between developing and developed countries (Murray et al., 2007), and in advanced economies being export market-oriented is probably to offer more rewards and result in higher returns (Ellis, 2005; Ellis, 2006). Hence,
H8: The magnitude of the association between export market orientation and its consequences ((a) performance-related consequences, (b) firm capabilities, and (c) strategy-related consequences) is greater in developed countries.

2.4.3. Measurement scale: Along with the variations in the definitions of the concept, various measurement scales were developed to assess the market orientation phenomenon; among these, the MKTOR scale (Narver and Slater, 1990) and the MARKOR scale (Kohli et al., 1993) have been recognized as the most broadly adopted measures (Van Raaij and Stoelhorst, 2008). However, albeit the theoretical stability of both scales, different criticisms in relation to these measures were voiced; one of these directly appeals to the context of application (Cadogan and Diamantopoulos, 1995). It has been advocated that as international markets are comparatively more complicated than domestic markets, the essentials of information are unique in an international setting, the evaluation of the market orientation construct on the basis domestic operations therefore becomes limited (Cadogan and Diamantopoulos, 1995; Diamantopoulos and Cadogan, 1996). In this sense, the market orientation scale specifically established for the export context may be more able to pinpoint the linkage between market orientation and its outcomes (Cadogan et al., 1999). As a result,

H9: The magnitude of the association between export market orientation and its consequences ((a) performance-related consequences, (b) firm capabilities, and (c) strategy-related consequences) is greater when export market orientation is measured through the export market orientation scale of Cadogan et al. (1999).

Figure 1 illustrates the theoretical framework of the present study.
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3. METHOD

3.1. Database Development

As the identification of relevant studies has a straight impact upon the findings drawn from the meta-analytic study, it is crucial to set the right inclusion criteria for the purpose of retaining eligible studies in a specific research domain (Grewal et al., 2018; Hunter and Schmidt, 2004). In line with the eligibility criteria of the previous meta-analytic studies on the subject (e.g., Cano et al., 2004; Ellis, 2006; Kirca et al., 2005), the inclusion criteria of the present study were determined as follows: (a) studies concentrating on the linkage between export market orientation and its consequences; (b) studies measuring export market orientation by the help of well-established scales consisting of the MKTOR scale (Narver and Slater, 1990), the MARKOR scale (Kohli et al., 1993), the export market orientation scale (Cadogan et al., 1999), and the market orientation scale of Depshandé et al. (1993); (c) studies approaching export performance construct with both objective and/or subjective measures; (d) empirical research collecting the data through both primary and/or secondary sources and reporting the Pearson’s correlation coefficients or r-family values that can be convertible to correlation coefficients (Rosenthal, 1979).

Electronic-based and manual search were performed to identify the relevant articles for the present study. While the electronic-based search was conducted using the keyword of “market orient*”, “customer orientation”, “competitor orientation”, “inter-functional coordination”, “intelligence generation”, “intelligence dissemination”, and “responsiveness” in combination with “export” through online databases (i.e., EBSCO, Elsevier, JSTOR, Emerald, Sage, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley), the manual search was employed by means of reviewing the references part of selected journal articles in order to ensure that all consistent studies were recognized in this study. Furthermore, when a study can be split into
conceptually indistinguishable parts but provides separate statistical iterations, each finding was imputed independently in the analysis (Grewal et al., 2018). On the completion of search process, 61 studies examining the association between export market orientation and its consequences were gathered, whereas 25 of these, failing to meet with the decision rules in the inclusion criteria, were excluded from the further analyses. Conclusively, the inclusion rate of the present study was calculated as 59.0%, which is akin to prior meta-analytic studies on the specific subject (e.g., Ellis, 2006; Grinstein, 2008a). In total, the final sample comprises 89 effects from 36 studies which were based upon more than 8,000 companies ($N = 8,652$), demonstrating a strong empirical foundation for a meta-analytic study (Brinckmann et al., 2010).

With respect to the quality of the studies obtained, all relevant articles were evaluated regarding to the academic guide of Association of Business Schools (ABS). In sum, 36 papers appearing during period from 1998 to 2018 were coded for the meta-analytic study. In this sense, a coding protocol was established, which consists of five facets: (1) the key study characteristics and methodological characteristics; (2) the classification of export market orientation measures (i.e., the MKTOR scale (Narver and Slater, 1990), the MARKOR scale (Kohli et al., 1993), the export market orientation scale (Cadogan et al., 1999), and the market orientation scale of Depshandé et al. (1993)); (3) the consequences of export market orientation (i.e., export performance, innovation performance, business performance, firm capabilities, and strategy-related consequences); (4) the categorization of national culture characteristics (i.e., individualism and masculinity) on the basis of Hofstede’s (1997) national culture dimensions and relying upon Kirca et al.’s (2005) approach which recommends the usage of median splits to group the sampled countries as low or high on each dimension; and (5) the coding of the sampled countries in terms of economic development levels (i.e.,
developed, developing, and least developed) in compliance with the United Nation’s classification (United Nations, 2018).

Two researchers, with competence and sufficient knowledge of the subject, independently coded all relevant studies with an aim to decrease coding errors (Lipsey and Wilson, 2001), after a rigorous training on the general research objective and the coding protocol, regarding specifically the details about the constructs and the items to be coded. Subsequent to the independent coding process, all information provided in the coding scheme by the coders was compared. Accordingly, all discrepancies were resolved through discussions; and thus, satisfactory inter-coder reliability was achieved, varying from 90% to 95% (Szymanski and Henard, 2001).

3.2. Meta-Analytic Procedure

In the present study, almost half of the studies were in position to measure export market orientation with regard to its distinct components (48.5%). In this sense, when a study reports the statistics of export market orientation construct considering its separate dimensions (i.e., customer orientation, export market intelligence generation, etc.), the arithmetic means of effect sizes among these different dimensions were calculated in order to get an overall score of export market orientation (e.g., Ellis, 2006; Grinstein, 2008a). The Appendix provides detailed information about the phases followed in the meta-analytic procedure. With respect to measurement error, corrected correlations estimated by the help of dividing all individual effect sizes by the square root of the reliabilities (Hunter and Schmidt, 2004). However, the mean reliabilities were replaced by the construct reliabilities contingency upon their presence (e.g., Ellis, 2006; Kirca et al., 2005). The mean reliabilities were calculated as 0.813 for the MKTOR (Narver and Slater, 1990), 0.881 for the export market orientation scale (Cadogan et al., 1999), and 0.890 for the market orientation scale of Depshandé et al. (1993), respectively.
(The mean reliability for the MARKOR scale (Kohli et al., 1993) could not be computed since in the set of eligible articles there was only one study using the MARKOR scale, which had to be excluded due to limited effect size coverage). Afterwards, the reliability-corrected correlations were transformed into Fisher’s z-coefficients, which were averaged, and then reconverted back to the correlation coefficients to evaluate (e.g., Grinstein, 2008a; Kirca et al., 2005).

To check for the robustness of the meta-analysis, initially, publication bias, referring to a crucial consideration related to meta-analysis that requires researchers to be addressed of missing studies (Pigott, 2012), was estimated on the basis of the three most frequently used statistical approaches (Geyskens et al., 2009; Grewal et al., 2018): (a) Rosenthal’s (1979) ‘file drawer’ method (the file drawer N number (7,140)), (b) Orwin’s (1983) ‘failsafe N’ (set to 0.05), and (c) the ‘trim-and-fill’ method of Duval and Tweedie (2000), all of which verified that publication bias does not constitute a problem for this meta-analytic research. Additionally, sensitivity analysis, which is important to exhibit the robustness of the study results and assist to comprehend whether the results change with the effect of adjustments in inclusion criteria or assumptions of the studies (Borenstein et al., 2009), was carried out through the ‘one study removed’ option and forest plot analysis, which imply the precision of the meta-analysis (Borenstein et al., 2009). In an attempt to select the appropriate model for the investigation, heterogeneity test was also performed. The results revealed that the ratios of variance across the studies are significantly and heterogeneously distributed ($Q$-value ($df = 88$) = 1223.878 ($p = 0.000$), $I^2$-squared = 92.810) (Cooper et al., 2009); and thus, the random-effects meta-analysis model, assuming the presence of variation in effect sizes variation among studies (Pigott, 2012), was employed, which matches the data better with the assumption that effect sizes are distinctive in various studies (Borenstein et al., 2009; Grewal...
et al., 2018). The significance of the heterogeneity test also points the existence of possible moderators for the meta-analysis (Geyskens et al., 2009; Hunter and Schmidt, 2004).

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Main Impacts

Table 2 provides the findings of meta-analytic study on the association between export market orientation and various consequences with a total of 89 effects. The results pertaining to H1 verify the positive impact of export market orientation on export performance ($r = 0.298$, CI95% 0.254 to 0.340). This confirms that firms with greater levels of export market orientation are better placed to sense customer preferences in foreign markets and take responsive actions, which will enhance their export performances (Javalgi et al., 2011; Murray et al., 2007). Further, export market-oriented firms are inclined to modify their products better in line with the customer expectations in foreign markets, which in turn, enhance their export performance (Birru et al., 2019; Cadogan et al., 2003; Sundqvist et al., 2000).

In the case of H2, the positive effect of export market orientation on innovation performance was also validated ($r = 0.509$, CI95% 0.399 to 0.604). Although there exist some negative findings related to the link between export market orientation and innovation performance in the pertinent literature (e.g., Zhang and Zhu, 2016), accumulated findings of this meta-analytic study highlight the importance of integrating the knowledge gathered via market orientation with the innovative developments in a company. In other words, the original findings of this study reveal that export-market oriented firms are initially better in improving innovation performance, which consequently will enhance export performance in the long term (Boso et al., 2012; Murray et al., 2011). In this sense, the current finding is consistent with those of prior studies that stressed the instrumental role of market intelligence in
creating an openness atmosphere to generate new ideas, processes and products via integration of distinct organizational functions (e.g., Grinstein, 2008a; Hult et al., 2004; Wei and Atuahene-Gima, 2009).
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In accord with H3, export market orientation was found to have a positive influence on business performance ($r = 0.343$, CI95% 0.235 to 0.443). This could be attributed to the fact that export market orientation allows companies to increase satisfaction level of customers and minimize competitor threats in international markets, which result in improved business performance (Kirca et al., 2005). Moreover, the meta-findings of this study also reveal how marketing know-how plays a crucial role in enhancing overall business performance, which is in line with previous empirical research (Beaujanot et al., 2004; Ellis et al., 2011; Kropp et al., 2006).

In support of H4, the results indicate that there is a significant and strong relationship between export market orientation and firm capabilities ($r = 0.509$, CI95% 0.457 to 0.558). This finding gives credibility to earlier research in the marketing literature, which showed that export market orientation is a crucial contributor to capability-building by the help of capturing customer and competitor information from foreign markets (e.g., Boso et al., 2018; Hortinha et al., 2011; Kayabasi and Mtetwa, 2016). In this sense, the original findings of this meta-analytic study acknowledge that export market-oriented firms are more successful in developing capability-building in the short period, which in turn, influence their export performance in the long run (Murray et al., 2011). In particular, firms with higher export market orientation are better in developing marketing capabilities in the sense of exploiting from customer related knowledge, determining for market segmentation and pricing (Kayabasi and Mtetwa, 2016).
As hypothesized in H5, export market orientation has a significant influence on strategy-related consequences ($r = 0.448$, CI95% 0.330 to 0.551), which in harmony with prior studies (e.g., He et al., 2013; Navarro-García et al., 2013; Zhang and Zhu, 2016). This current finding suggests that export market orientation plays a pivotal role in encouraging strategically taken decisions within a corporation (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990). Specifically, as firms gather more information related to customers and competitors in foreign markets, firms tend to meet customers’ expectations better via adapting the elements of marketing mix (e.g., Navarro et al., 2010).

4.2. Moderator Impacts

Apart from the examination of the direct associations among the theoretical constructs, in this meta-analytic study moderator analyses were also performed to test the moderator effects of the contextual (i.e., cultural context and economic development level of countries) and measurement factors (i.e., measurement scale) on the linkage between export market orientation and its outcomes. On the contrary to H6a, the magnitude of the relationship between export market orientation and performance-related consequences does not differ across high versus low collectivist cultures ($Q$-value (df = 1) = 0.059 ($p = 0.808$)). However, the collectivism dimension of culture causes variations in the effect of export market orientation on both firm capabilities ($Q$-value (df = 1) = 8.998 ($p = 0.003$)) and strategy-related consequences ($Q$-value (df = 1) = 10.552 ($p = 0.001$)). In support of H6b and H6c, the more the country is collectivist, the stronger the correlation between export market orientation and firm capabilities ($r = 0.529$, CI95% 0.480 to 0.575) and between export market orientation and strategy-related consequences ($r = 0.544$, CI95% 0.469 to 0.611). This confirms the notion that a harmonious and cooperative organizational environment encouraging information sharing across departments leverages export market orientation; which in turn, creates greater returns (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Narver and Slater, 1990). In
addition, the findings of this meta-analytic study underpin that different national cultural characteristics play an influential role in developing capabilities and evaluating different strategy choices, which is consistent with the previous studies (e.g., McGrath and O’Toole, 2014; Ross, 1999).

“In Insert Table 3 about here”

In respect of the moderating impact of masculinity, significant variations in the influence of export market orientation on all consequences - performance-related consequences, firm capabilities, and strategy-related consequences - were validated across masculine versus feminine cultures ($Q$-value ($df = 1$) = 3.838 ($p = 0.050$); $Q$-value ($df = 1$) = 10.601 ($p = 0.001$); $Q$-value ($df = 1$) = 4.329 ($p = 0.037$)). In line with H$_7$a and H$_7$c, in high masculine countries, export market orientation registered more favourable effects on performance-related ($r = 0.346$, CI$_{95\%}$ 0.292 to 0.398) and strategy-related consequences ($r = 0.574$, CI$_{95\%}$ 0.418 to 0.697). Coupled with the values of assertiveness and material success, high masculine cultures are supposed to be more capable of being export market-oriented in an effective way (Hofstede, 1997; Kirca et al., 2005); in this manner both performance outputs and strategic actions can be strengthened. On the other side, as opposed to H$_7$b, the export market orientation-firm capabilities correlation is higher in more feminine societies than in more masculine societies ($r = 0.557$, CI$_{95\%}$ 0.493 to 0.615). The reason behind this result may be attributed to the argument that aside from the vital act of masculinity in improving export market orientation, feminine cultures are more inclined to cooperate and coordinate with other members; and thus, market intelligence dissemination is more welcomed in those nations (Dwairi et al., 2007; Ellis, 2006). Accordingly, in feminine countries firm capabilities might be reinforced through strong export market orientation, since feminine cultures are characterized with the norms of cooperation and solidarity which enable suitable conditions for capability-building (Doney et al., 1998).
Concerning economic development, the findings show that the magnitude of the interrelationship of export market orientation, performance-related consequences, and strategy-related consequences changes on the basis of whether the country is developed, developing, or least developed \((Q\text{-value (df }=2) = 6.762 \, (p = 0.034); Q\text{-value (df }= 1) = 10.552 \, (p = 0.001))\). However, inconsistent with \(H_8a\) and \(H_8c\), effect sizes symbolizing the export market orientation-performance-related consequences association were found to be greater in least developed countries \((r = 0.621, \ CI_{95\%} 0.341 \text{ to } 0.800)\), and effect sizes recorded stronger impact for the linkage between export market orientation and strategy-related consequences in developing countries rather than in developed countries \((r = 0.544, \ CI_{95\%} 0.469 \text{ to } 0.611)\). This finding varies from the meta-analytic research of Ellis (2006), concluding that market orientation has a bigger impact on performance in mature economies.

On the other hand, it has been also defended that since firms operating in emerging and developing markets mostly encounter challenges in obtaining tangible resources, they need to be strictly dependent on export market orientation to generate outstanding performance, to leverage firm capabilities, and to support strategic considerations in overseas markets (Birru \textit{et al.}, 2019; Boso \textit{et al.}, 2012). Further, no significant variation in the effect of export market orientation on firm capabilities was observed across developed and developing economies \((Q\text{-value (df }= 1) = 0.835 \, (p = 0.361))\), which means \(H_{8b}\) also was not corroborated. In this respect, the accumulated findings of this meta-analytic study emphasize the significant role of export market orientation particularly in emerging and developing countries in opposite with the expectations (i.e., developed countries) in the pertinent literature.

As for the measurement factor, the estimates of measurement scale as moderators of the relationship between export market orientation and all of its consequences were identified as statistically insignificant. In harmony with the meta-analysis of Shoham \textit{et al.} (2005), this reveals that export market orientation has a similar influence on performance-related
consequences ($Q$-value $df = 2) = 3.962 (p = 0.138))$, firm capabilities ($Q$-value $df = 1) = 0.640 (p = 0.424)$), and strategy-related consequences ($Q$-value $df = 1) = 0.774 (p = 0.379)$), whether measured through the export market orientation scale (Cadogan et al., 1999), the MKTOR scale (Narver and Slater, 1990) or the market orientation scale of Deshpandé et al. (1993). $H_{9a}, H_{9b},$ and $H_{9c}$ were therefore rejected.

5. RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Theoretical Implications

Since a large body of research has been accumulated to examine the relationship between export market orientation and its outcomes, this study aimed to conduct a meta-analysis to aggregate and synthesize all empirical findings via summarizing results for the link between export orientation and its consequences and identifying possible variables that moderate these relationships. First, the findings provide an important insight into the effect of export market orientation as a critical precursor on both innovation performance and capability building, even though a wide variety of studies has investigated its impact on export performance in the pertinent literature (e.g., Chang and Fang, 2015; Chung, 2012; Lin et al., 2014; Olabode et al., 2018). In other words, when examining export market orientation-performance linkage, it is imperative to consider that export market-oriented behaviors lead initially to the development of capability-building and innovation outcomes within a company, which finally will attempt to enhance export performance in the long run (Murray et al., 2011). This aggregate result of meta-analysis exhibits distinctive findings via emphasizing the promising role of export market orientation on capability-building and innovation performance in opposite to its expected result on export performance.

Second, the cumulative evidence suggests that a culture with higher collectivism is inclined to serve as a catalyst role in the export market orientation’s association with capability-
building and strategy-related consequences; however, the collectivism dimension of culture does not impact the magnitude of the association between export market orientation and export performance. This is in harmony with the previous research on market orientation, which supports that the impact of market orientation on business performance is not peculiar to culture (e.g., Cano et al., 2004; Desphandé et al., 2000). On the other side, masculinity characteristics of a country produce distinguishing results, such that in high masculine cultures the strength of the export market orientation’s link with export performance and strategy-related consequences is greater, which differs from the prior meta-analytic findings on market orientation in the domestic context, concluding that masculinity does not serve as a moderator in the market orientation-performance relationship (e.g., Grinstein, 2008a; Kirca et al., 2005).

A third set of findings found supportive evidences to show how developing and least-developed countries are effective in the exploitation of market intelligence and fostering their export market-oriented consequences, which relies upon the premise that as companies operating in developing and least-developed countries take the precedence of generating foreign market knowledge in order to boost performance outcomes and set foundations for their strategic decisions (Birru et al., 2019; Boso et al., 2012). This cumulative result of the meta-analysis departs from the previous meta-analytic reviews with its remarkable finding elaborating the importance of export market orientation particularly in emerging and developing countries in contrast with the extant literature supporting its principal role in mature economies (e.g., Ellis, 2006).

This meta-analytic research considerably contributes to the international marketing literature in four ways. First, it consolidates and quantitatively synthesizes the extant empirical findings on export market orientation and its consequences in a holistic fashion. Second, it provides useful insights into the magnitude of the association between export market orientation and
its consequences, among which innovation performance and firm capabilities stand out. Third, it demonstrates how the impact of export market orientation on its consequences differs depending upon the dimensions of national culture. And fourth, it uncovers in what way the economic development of country affects the strength of the relationship between export market orientation and its consequences.

5.2. Managerial Implications

The findings of this study are of particular importance to managers, since market orientation gives fruitful advantages to companies in terms of sensing future market opportunities, making reliable predictions on customer’s expectations and competitor moves, and giving realistic strategic decisions about the export markets (Day, 1999). In this sense, this study reveals two important routes through which market orientation influences export performance. First, managers should be cognizant of the vital impact of market orientation, which is one of the strong sources of sustainable competitive advantage (Pelham, 1997), on firm innovativeness and capability building, which gain a competitive edge over rivals in international markets (Frambach et al., 2003). Even though high degree of innovativeness can be scrutinized as costly for companies, managers should be aware that higher level of export market orientation enable firms to develop firm capabilities which will reduce these costs via generating and sharing of market intelligence among the departments (Geroski et al., 1993; McGrath et al., 1996). In this sense, managers should be aware that being export-market oriented firms have initially the advantage of capability building in the short run, while they turn this advantage on enhancing export performance in the long term.

Second, managers should also note that the relationship between export market orientation and its consequences varied across the individualism and masculinity dimensions of national culture. In this context, managers should be aware of local cultural sensitivities when
implementing export market-oriented activities in international markets, as local culture and practices have a significant decisive role in consumer behavior (Birgelen et al., 2002; Redding, 1982). For instance, managers should pay heightened attention to gather information in collectivist and feminine cultures, since feminine and collectivist cultures are characterized by more cooperative and coordinative environments (Dwairi et al., 2007; Jaworski and Kohli, 1993), which enable firms a suitable atmosphere to share and obtain market knowledge.

Third, this study provides also crucial insights into the effect of economic development on the relationship between export market orientation and its outcomes. This result is noteworthy because there appears to be limited research investigated the moderating role of country contexts in the pertinent literature. However, this finding should not be interpreted that export market orientation should receive greater interest in merely developing and least-developed countries. This should be attributed to the higher strength of the export market orientation-its consequences in developing and least developing economies rather than in developed countries. Managers should assume that export market orientation plays a failure-prevention role in developed countries, whereas it has a pivotal place as success-inducing in developing countries (Varadarajan, 1985).

5.3. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Even though this study offers important and novel contributions to the export marketing literature, this research suffers from several limitations that should be kept in mind when evaluating the findings. First, this study could not cover all empirical studies in the export market orientation literature due to the lack of required statistics that could not be converted into correlation coefficients for the estimation of effect sizes and constrained by the conceptualization and scope of original studies (Hunter and Schmidt, 2004). Second,
present study has also limited number of moderators that could be coded from the current research, which gives narrower definitions related to the constructs. Another important concern could be the oversampling of some companies, as several studies may conduct with successful firms in the same country. Additionally, in this study export market orientation measured with four distinct operationalizations (i.e., the MKTOR scale (Narver and Slater, 1990), the export market orientation scale (Cadogan et al., 1999), the MARKOR scale (Kohli et al., 1993), and the market orientation scale of Depshandé et al. (1993)) were taken into account which constitutes as another limitation; it should also be evaluated as a future research direction.

This study suggests important avenues for further research areas, which are expected to improve the understanding of the market orientation phenomenon in the export context. First, researchers should clearly make distinctions among export market orientation dimensions (i.e., customer orientation, export market intelligence generation, etc.), which would throw light on the interrelationships between different dimensions of export market orientation and its antecedents/outcomes. Second, future research needs to address more the antecedents of the export market orientation construct, since the number of articles concentrating on the determinant factors of export market orientation is limited in the pertinent literature. Moreover, further research is warranted in examining which theoretical perspective to conceptualize export market orientation (i.e., behavioral or cultural) is more influential on its consequences. Also, future line of research should focus on relational outcomes of export market orientation, as very few studies made an examination on this association. Furthermore, researchers are suggested to investigate the effects of some additional moderator variables that influence export market orientation-consequences linkages such as firm size, industry type, objective/subjective performance measures or revenue-based/cost-based indicators, etc., which all are expected to produce fruitful insights for future research.
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Appendix

The phases followed in the meta-analytic procedure

(1) Problem formulation
(a) reading seminal works
(b) defining crucial variables and operationalization
(c) recognizing inconsistent results
(d) determining the main aim of the study

(2) Literature search
(a) recognizing the eligible studies
(b) setting the inclusion criteria
(c) concerning about unpublished studies

(3) Data assessment
(a) evaluating the quality of research
(b) coding all of the studies
(c) assessing inter-coder reliability
(d) examining solutions for the missing data

(4) Robustness test
(a) evaluation of publication bias
(b) conducting sensitivity analysis

(5) Data analysis
(a) calculating the effect size
(b) conducting heterogeneity tests
(c) performing outlier analysis
(d) correcting for measurement and sampling error
(e) examining the potential moderators

Sources: Adapted from Borenstein et al. (2009); Cooper et al. (2009); Hunter and Schmidt (2004)
Table 1: Selected empirical contributions on the relationship between Export Market Orientation and its consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Selected empirical studies</th>
<th>Research setting</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Key empirical findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cadogan et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Hong Kong based manufacturing exporters</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Exporters’ degree of market-oriented behavior in their export operations is positively correlated with their export growth performance but not with export sales efficiency performance or export profit performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chang and Fang (2015)</td>
<td>Exporting firms in Taiwan</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Export performance is positively influenced by exporting firm export market orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chang (2012)</td>
<td>New Zealand based exporting firms</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>There is a favorable association between export market orientation intelligence responsiveness and strategic export performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kayabasi and Mte (2016)</td>
<td>Export firms operating in Turkey</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>Export market orientation does not significantly affect export performance of exporting firms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lengler et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Brazilian export firms</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>While no linear positive relationship exists between customer orientation and either export profit or export sales, competitor orientation has a positive linear effect on export profit but not on export sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Chinese and non-Chinese export ventures in China</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Export intelligence responsiveness gives rise to financial export performance of Chinese firms, whereas export information generation has a significant impact on financial export performance of non-Chinese firms. On the other hand, export intelligence dissemination has no statistically significant link with export performance for both Chinese and non-Chinese firms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sørensen and Madsen (2012)</td>
<td>Danish small and medium-sized exporting manufacturing firms</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>The link between firms’ market orientation and export market success is non-linear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sundqvist et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Finnish exporters</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>Firm’s level of export market orientation is conducive to high export performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Export ventures based in China</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Market orientation is positively and significantly correlated with product export performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang and Zhu (2016)</td>
<td>Chinese manufacturing exporters</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Market orientation does not directly lead to higher product innovation performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Selected empirical contributions on the relationship between Export Market Orientation and its consequences cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Selected empirical studies</th>
<th>Research setting</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Key empirical findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hortinha <em>et al.</em> (2011)</td>
<td>Portuguese manufacturer exporters in technological industries</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Customer orientation gives rise to innovation capabilities, including both exploratory and exploitative innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisboa <em>et al.</em> (2011)</td>
<td>Exporting firms in Portugal</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Both customer and competitor orientation have a direct positive effect on innovative capabilities - product development and market-related exploitative capabilities. However, product development and market-related explorative capabilities are only significantly associated with customer orientation not with competitor orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray <em>et al.</em> (2011)</td>
<td>Export ventures based in China</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Positive and significant relationships exist between market orientation and marketing capabilities, covering pricing, new product development, and marketing communication capability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naidoo (2010)</td>
<td>Export-oriented Chinese SMEs</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Competitor orientation and inter-functional coordination are conducive to greater marketing innovation capability, which is negatively linked with customer orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO → Strategy-related consequences</td>
<td>He <em>et al.</em> (2013)</td>
<td>Chinese exporting firms</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Export market orientation is an essential determinant of export channel selection (i.e., hierarchical vs. hybrid channels of exporting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navarro-Garcia <em>et al.</em> (2013)</td>
<td>Exporting firms in Spain</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Export market orientation plays a significant role in adapting the marketing mix components to the conditions of the overseas markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navarro-Garcia <em>et al.</em> (2014)</td>
<td>Spanish exporting firms</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>There is no significant linkage between export market orientation and the adaptation of the marketing mix strategy in export markets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2:** Summary of the meta-analytic results for the main relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>The links</th>
<th># of effects</th>
<th>Total N*</th>
<th>Corrected r</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>-95% LCL</th>
<th>+95% UCL</th>
<th>Q-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$</td>
<td>EMO → Export performance</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>439.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$</td>
<td>EMO → Innovation performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>16.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$</td>
<td>EMO → Business performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>34.804*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$</td>
<td>EMO → Firm capabilities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>139.431*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_5$</td>
<td>EMO → Strategy-related consequences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>171.149*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at $p < 0.05$.  
*Total sample size
Table 3: Summary of the meta-analytic results for the moderator sub-groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>The links</th>
<th># of effects</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Corrected r</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>-95% LCL</th>
<th>+95% UCL</th>
<th>Q-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextual moderators</td>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>Collectivism x EMO → performance-related consequences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4,474</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High collectivism</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low collectivism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>8.998*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High collectivism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Cultural context</td>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>Collectivism x EMO → firm capabilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>3.838*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High masculinity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low masculinity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>10.601*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High masculinity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low masculinity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>4.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High masculinity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H6c</td>
<td>Collectivism x EMO → strategy-related consequences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>6.762*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High collectivism</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low collectivism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H8a</td>
<td>Country’s economic development level x EMO → performance-related consequences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Least developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H8b</td>
<td>Country’s economic development level x EMO → firm capabilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>10.552*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Least developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H8c</td>
<td>Country’s economic development level x EMO → strategy-related consequences</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>3.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Least developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement moderator</td>
<td>H9a</td>
<td>Measurement scale x EMO → performance-related consequences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The EMO scale</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The MKTOR scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement scale</td>
<td>H9b</td>
<td>Measurement scale x EMO x export market orientation → firm capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0</td>
<td>Measurement scale x EMO x export market orientation → strategy-related consequences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The EMO scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The MKTOR scale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The MO scale of Depshandé et al. (1993)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at $p < 0.05$.

aTotal sample size
Figure 1: Theoretical Framework of Meta-Analysis
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