

Factors contributing towards the Process of International Entrepreneurship: A Case Study of Light Engineering Units Operating in Gujranwala District

Khizra Safdar Khan*

Abstract: The objective of this paper is to explore the importance of factors contributing towards the process of internationalization. Firm level characteristics, technological capabilities, commercial capabilities and factors inhibiting export activities are considered as the major factors affecting export performance in case of Light Engineering Units of Gujranwala District. Empirical data from a survey of 868 Light engineering units in Gujranwala District is being employed for analytical purposes out of which 209 units were found to be involved in export activities. Multinomial regression logistic model has been employed to find out the probability of being involved in internationalization process. Instrumental variable approach is being employed to encompass the role of innovation in the process of internationalization. The estimated results of instrumental equation are than incorporated in the basic model to find out the final estimation results. Results from the logit model represent that the factors of firm size, firm age, manufacturing status, affiliation with area wise trade union, average firm revenue, diversification (product mix), presence of registered trade-marks, participation in promotional activities through trade fairs, personal visits and references, availability of information, fitted values of innovation in terms of innovation in new product, new process and major improvements are found to be significantly and positively correlated with the probability of being an international entrepreneur. While export restricting factors like, non-cooperative attitude on behalf of government organizations, financial problems and expensive foreign trips are found to be significantly and negatively associated with the probability of being international entrepreneur.

Keywords: Industry, SME, Logit Model, innovation, Development policy, Trade Unions.

JEL Classification: F14, O31, O21, J51

1. Introduction

The idea of international trade being the engine of the growth is very old;

* The author is affiliated with GIFT Business School, GIFT University Gujranwala-52250, Pakistan. Email: khizra.safdar@gift.edu.pk

its inception can be found back in the 18th century's industrial revolution in England which later on spread to the rest of the world in the 20th century. However, during the second half of the 20th century, the idea lost its popularity. The dominance of protectionist theories in the policy making of many developing countries persuaded industrialization policies based on a very limited degree of openness known as “import substitution industrialization (ISI)” strategies, which had their source back in the thinking of Prebisch (1962).

The policy of industrialization through import substitution met with limited success. But growth oriented strategies based on import substitution exhibited their own limitations i.e., their implementation in many countries failed to address the major problems like low income earnings, unemployment and poverty (UNIDO 1991). Therefore emphasis was laid on sectoral restructuring and policy redesigning. In early 1980s, many countries who earlier followed an ISI, began to liberalize trade and adopted EOI. In addition, debt crises in 1982 also played an important role in reshaping the policy views.

Thus, the importance of industrialization cannot be denied being an improved strategy to provide employment opportunities, its contribution towards economic growth as compared to traditional agricultural sector, more foreign exchange earnings through exports of value added products and optimal utilization of domestic resources by establishing forward and backward linkages in the economy. In case of developing countries like Pakistan, motivation behind each development policy is to provide employment opportunities to its accelerated growth of population along with a considerable increase in their living standard but establishment of large scale industrialization requires resources in abundance, therefore alternatively, emphasis should be laid on the establishment of small scale sector in order to resolve all these problems.

The extraordinary growth in Pakistan's Industry in the later part of 1950s and in 1960s suggested that Pakistan might be one of the very few countries at that time which would join the developed world. However, much of the growth that had been taken place in the first two decades soon unraveled, with growing income and regional disparities, resulting in the separation of East Pakistan.

In 1947, Pakistan inherited an undeveloped industrial base. Pakistan followed ISI initially by default. Industrialization process in Pakistan was initiated with the development of consumer goods (skill light). Very high rates of effective protection in the range of 100-200 percent or more were common in 1950 and 1960s in Pakistan, India, Argentina and Nigeria leading to negative value addition (Dollar and Art 2001). 1970's witnessed the board nationalization wave, while 1980's was a period of de-nationalization and cheap credit availability for large enterprises. In 1980s Pakistan also started EOI along with ISI. Overall industrial and related policies in Pakistan have traditionally neglected or at best remained impartial towards the development of small and medium enterprises. In spite of the indifferent attitude of successive governments in Pakistan, the SME sector has made significant gains over time. It grew at a rate in excess of 7.2 percent in capital formation growth as against the large scale capital formation growth of -5.02 percent in the 1990's (SMEDA 2004). A shift in the emphasis from large scale to small scale sector could be considered as a consequence of poor policy experiences of heavy industrialization or due to recognition of the inherent strength, vigor and potential scope of the SME sector in Pakistan.

The main objective of this article is to investigate the reasons that how some Entrepreneur experience better export performance as compared to others. For this purpose, the study has employed different factors like Firm level characteristics, technological and commercial capabilities along with the factors that restrict the export activities to examine the variations in export performance of under consideration firms. The inclusion of export inhibiting factors among the important determinants of export performance is an important contribution of the study, as limited work has been done in this respect to explore the relationship between different types of trade barriers and export performance of small industrial units.

2. Literature Review

The firm-level determinants of export performance have been investigated extensively (Chetty and Hamilton, 1993) and encompasses a variety of different factors regarding the significance of firms' demographics (Wagner, 1995) along with perception of the entrepreneurs regarding organizational activities (Bijmolt and Zwart, 1994). In the section, firm level characteristics, along with their consequent impact on process of international entrepreneurship are discussed. Within firm level characteristics, factors like firm size, firm age, manufacturing status, affiliation with trade unions along with the revenue per month and average wages have been considered along with their consequent impact on export orientation of entrepreneurs.

Among the structural factors, the firm size is considered to be the most debated in the literature. The conventional hypothesis that large firms have greater chances to compete globally is found to be significant in different studies (Chandler, 1990, Ogbuehi and Longfellow, 1994) but a number of empirical studies have established a negative or no relationship between Firm size and exports (Calof, 1993). The difference in the results can be attributed to the non-linearity of the relationship between two variables (Lefebvre et al., 1998).

The mature firms can behave more rigidly leading to competence traps, while younger firms can act in a more practical, aggressive and flexible manner (Lefebvre et.al, 2000). Some studies don't provide any empirical evidence to support any correlation between these two variables (Ong and Pearson, 1982; Reid and Rosson, 1982), some have suggested a positive correlation (Welch and Wiedersheim- Paul, 1980; Abbas and Swiercz,1991), while others have confirmed a negative relationship between age of a firm and its export potential (Kirpalani and MacIntosh, 1980; Ursic and Czinkota, 1984).

A bidirectional causal relationship is found to exist between successful export business and revenue it generates as it provides firms with more resources to invest in R&D and innovation processes (Huang et.al 2008). Empirical evidence suggest that productivity was found to be high among export-oriented SMEs as compared with non-exporting SMEs, as measured

by the total revenue per worker per SME and total profit per worker per SME (Trung et.al 2008).

Amongst technological capabilities, expenditures on R&D enables firm not only to innovate, but also facilitate them to incorporate external technological knowledge in an improved manner (Lefebvre et.al, 2000). R&D is therefore considered as one of the major factors affecting firm's export performance. Positive relationship between exports and R&D in small firms has been established (Ong and Pearson, 1984). Innovation is said to be most motivating factor driving the exports.

The direction of causation runs from innovation to export (Krugman, 1979). Empirical results from earlier studies did not provide any reliable results while investigating the relationship between innovation and export performances in case of small firms, because the process of innovation in small firms seems to have imprecise boundaries i.e., a lot of factors contribute to the process of innovation making it difficult to circumscribed (Nassimbeni, 2001).

Investment strategy of a firm involving its different dimensions as investment in capacity building, in replacing old equipment, for enhancing productivity, in improving quality of output and investment in producing new product suggested by Nguyen et.al. (2007) has been employed in the present study to find out the impact of the investment strategy adopted by a firm on its probability of being an exporter.

Differences in exporter performance can be explained by the variation in degree of difficulties faced by small firm in their international operations. Entrepreneurs while initiating a new project may face different problems, for instance, they may face credit access problems in the financial market. Market acceptance and lacking of skilled labor are also considered as major problems faced by small firms while starting up new projects, forcing them to leave the international markets (Alvarez, 2004).

Credit restriction, equity capital and lack of external debt are considered to be the main hindrance to the internationalization of SMEs (Chittenden, Hall, & Hutchinson, 1996; Friedman & Friedman, 1994; James, 1999). Small firms are found to be characterized with conservative attitude and risk adversity (Ward, 1998). According to empirical evidence the financial

institutions behave more conservatively while providing loans to SMEs. SMEs are usually charged comparatively high interest rates along with high collateral and loan guarantees (Stieglitz & Weiss, 1981).

The efficiency with which a firm sells its products and services to the foreign market determines its export growth indicating that market acceptance an important determinant of firm's export process. Firm's market intelligence helps to coordinate its internal processes to respond swiftly and efficiently to preferences of foreign customers (Hult et al., 2003; Narver & Slater, 1990). Empirical evidence suggests that *market acceptance* is significantly associated to the overall growth performance of a firm (Kohli & Jaworski, 1993).

In addition to lack of resources and capacity utilizations, a significant barrier to growth is concerned with human resource management and the conditions relating to employ and dismissal of workers (Bartlett & Bukvic, 2001). Shortage of technological skills is considered to be one of the main drawbacks of SMEs, which is deemed essential for the adoption of highly developed manufacturing technology (Lefebvre *et al.*, 1996). The number of scientists, engineers, and technicians represents firm's technological knowledge, which is expected to be strongly correlated with its export performance.

Literature based on the determinants of firm growth considers both human capital and financial resources as most important factors effecting small business growth (Wiklund et al., 2009). On the firm level, the experience, skill and knowledge of the total employees contribute more promisingly as compared to the entrepreneur alone (Chandler & Hanks, 1994, Birley & Westhead, 1990). Human capital can be measured both in terms of specific and generic terms. Generic human capital is defined in terms of different levels of educational attainment by workers. Specific human capital can be measured by employing a dummy variable indicating whether firm is offering on job training to its workers or not (Lee and Temesgen, 2005). Small firms carry out a large number of technological innovations based on their unique know-how approach in an unbalanced manner among industrialized nations (Pavitt et al., 1987, Rothwell, 1988) and also in newly industrialized countries like Korea (Lee, 1995). They play an important role in the diffusion of technology and their unique know-how is often based on

the improvements of general technologies developed by large firms. Competitive advantage based on existence of a unique product is significantly related to firm's performance (Julien et al., 1994).

Human capital was found to be positively associated with exports in a study based on samples of German firms (Wagner, 2001). Negative relationship between human capital and exports was found among large samples of Brazilian firms (Willmore, 1992). According to the neo-technology theory, exports are positively affected by human capital because the technological capabilities of the firm depend mainly on skills.

Literature suggests that firm's market intelligence and marketing capabilities are considered as basics for entrance and expansion in the process of internationalization. Small new high technology firms have capability to overcome complications with technology than with the market (Fontes and Coombs, 1997). Exporting strategy of SMEs based on diversification of products and product lines have proved to be successful in export growth (Denis and Depelteau, 1985). In the presence of diversified products, the expertise and knowledge acquired in the fields of commercial and competitiveness can be transferred from one sector to others, which are found to be associated with export success (Cafferata and Mensi, 1995).

Mandatory legal measures like trademark protection is necessary to execute at early stages of firm export process. The presence of trademarks can serve as an asset for SMEs working in foreign markets (Lefebvre et al., 2000). The study is going to analyze the impact of presence of trademarks on the firm's export performance.

The exhibitions and trade fairs organized by different government and non-government associations have proved to be very helpful in providing opportunities to small firms in order to break into international markets by bringing buyers and sellers from different parts of the world simultaneously at the same place (Vohra, 2008). These types of opportunities add to firm's export experience, which helps entrepreneur to perceive risks and opportunities in the foreign market (Cavusgil et al., 1979; Cooper, 1981; Christensen et al., 1987; Aaby & Slater, 1989; Ogbuehi and Longfellow, 1994; Moini, 1995). These trade fairs also facilitate firms to observe international market's attitude and knowledge of international affairs

significantly influencing their choices and chances of breaking into international markets..

Networks can contribute positively to firm's growth by increasing output and employment in linked enterprises, diffusion of knowledge and skills among firms in different countries, helping SMEs to enter in the international market, increasing commercial transactions between multinationals and small firms, and increasing the choice for the small firms to serve the market of their choice (Elhiraika and Nkurunziza 2006).

Strong sociability helps entrepreneurs to develop social networks resulting in stronger relationships with partners, suppliers and customers (Barringer & Greening, 1998). The ability to establish and develop networks increases the probability of success and growth of business (Baron and Markman, 2000).

As for obstacles encountered by firms in the process of internationalization, the major problem is concerned with the lack of information regarding perception of risks and opportunities prevailing in foreign markets (Nassimbeni, 2001). Imperfect information and entry barriers imposed by large enterprises and foreign governments limit the international expansion of small firms (Acs *et al.*, 1997). The availability of information concerning both international markets and management of expansion is considered as a crucial factor for the development of internationalization process (Erikson *et al.*, 1997). According to Uppsala School of thought, exports are based on a learning process enabling firms to gain information of the temperament and working of new markets. This necessary information will facilitate them to expand abroad with a minor extant of uncertainty factor (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977).

Firms entering in the export process have to face administrative and customs problems in both importing and exporting countries (Kedia and Chhokar, 1986; Madsen, 1989; Styles and Ambler, 1994). The chances of small firms' international success diminish as they have to face the fiscal imposition as well as bear infrastructural inadequacies (Nassimbeni, 2001). Small firms seems to be heavily penalized as compared with their larger counterparts both by local governments and by foreign legislative restraints (Styles and Ambler, 1994; Chetty and Hamilton, 1996). In the consequence of present wave of globalization, SMEs have to face foreign competition in

the home market, stimulating firms to explore international market along with domestic market (Etemad, 2005). Foreign competition is considered to be the highly rated problem, demonstrating that this problem is enduring and generic nature (Katsikeas and Morgan, 1994).

In the process of internationalization, small firms face financial constraints and under-capitalization (Buckley, 1997). Financial constraints correspond to the lack of financial resources. Credit restriction, equity capital and lack of external debt are considered to be the main hindrance to the growth of SMEs.

On the basis of the above mentioned review of literature, research model presented in Fig. 1 is being constructed by the author to analyze the impact of different factors on the process of International entrepreneurship.

3. Research Method

3.1 Sources of Data

In the present study, primary data collected through a detailed survey of Light Engineering sector is being utilized for analytical purposes. The survey has been conducted in the district of Gujranwala from Feb, 2009 to Feb, 2010. The format of the SMEs questionnaire, covering broad aspects of each unit's individual characteristics, commercial and technological capabilities along with a detailed profile of factors that restrict small units to enter the international market. 868 units were investigated out of which 209 units were found to be involved in exporting activities.

3.2 Logit Model for development of International Entrepreneurs

To estimate the probabilities of being an international entrepreneur, logistic regression analysis with maximum likelihood estimation is employed. In the analysis, dependent variable takes the value 1 when the entrepreneur is involved in exporting activities and 0 when it is not participating in international markets. Explanatory variables in this model can be divided into four categories as firm's characteristics, technological capabilities, commercial capabilities and export restricting factors.

Basic model can be written as

$$\text{International Entrepreneur} = a_0 + a_1X + a_2\text{Innovation} + e \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

Where

International Entrepreneur = 1 (if Entrepreneur is participating in export activities) , = 0 (if Entrepreneur is participating in export activities)

X = firm's characteristics, technological capabilities, commercial capabilities and factors inhibiting export activities. The interpretation of the model in terms of probabilities can be explained as odds ratios. Odd ratio greater than 1 indicates the increase the probability of being an international entrepreneur while less than one indicates the decrease in the probability of being an international entrepreneur. Where innovation can be measured in terms of innovation in new product, in new process and major improvements in the existing product and e is expressed as error term.

Out of the major determinants affecting firm's export performance, innovation has found to have an endogenous relationship with development of an international entrepreneur. So, the direct estimation of the eq. 1 would lead to a biased estimate of causal impact of innovation on exports.

Two approaches can be employed to deal with this problem of endogeneity. These approaches are the instrumental variable approach and simultaneous equation technique. While in the present study an instrumental variable approach has been employed. In order to utilize the instrumental variable approach, the first step is to explore those variables that are highly correlated with innovation but not with exporting activities of an entrepreneur.

Following specification is used as instrumental variable technique.

$$\text{Innovation} = b_1 + b_2Z + e \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

Where

Innovation = 1 (If an entrepreneur innovates), = 0 (If entrepreneur does not innovate)

Where Z is the instrumental variable and it comprises of Investment strategy adopted by a firm, entrepreneur’s perception in starting up new projects, on job training, presence of unique know how, number of skilled workers in the firm and use of imported raw materials in the final product. The specification expressed as eq. 2 is then utilized to find out the impact of instrumental variables on the three components of innovation as

$$\text{Product Innovation} = b_1 + b_2Z + e \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Where

Product innovation = 1 (If entrepreneur is involved in innovating a new product), =0 (If entrepreneur is not involved in innovating a new product)

$$\text{Process Innovation} = b_1 + b_2Z + e \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

Where

Process innovation = 1 (If Firm entrepreneur is involved in innovating a new process), = 0 (If entrepreneur is not involved in innovating a new process)

$$\text{Major improvements} = b_1 + b_2Z + e \dots \dots \dots (5)$$

Where

Major improvements = 1 (If entrepreneur undergoes some major improvements), = 0 (If entrepreneur has not made some major improvements)

The fitted values of new product, new process and major improvements after the estimation of the three innovation equations will be then incorporated in final export equation of 1. The variables along with their conceptual definition are being presented in Table 1.

4. Estimation Results

The results of the instrument equation 3 are being shown in Table 2. The investment strategy is found to be positively and significantly affecting the process of international entrepreneurs as four out of six components of investment strategy are found to be significant at 90 and 95 percent confidence level. Investment in capacity building has a positive impact on the innovation of new product. A unit change in the investment in capacity building increases the odds of innovation of new product by 1.470 units (the probability of innovation in new product over the probability of not experiencing any innovation in new product). Investment in replacing old equipment is found to be significant at 90 percent confidence level as one unit increase in the investment in replacing old equipment increases the odds of innovation in new product by 4.082 units. As far as entrepreneur's perception regarding new product is concerned all the three components like lacking of skilled labor, market acceptance and financial problems are found to be significant with lacked skilled labor and financial problems exerting negative influence on the probability of involving of an entrepreneur in international markets.

The results of the instrument equation 4 are being shown in Table 3. The investment strategy is found to be positively and significantly affecting the process of international entrepreneurs as three out of six components of investment strategy are found to be significant at 90 and 95 percent confidence level. Investment in replacing old equipment has a positive impact on the innovation of new process. A unit change in the investment in replacing old equipment increases the odds of innovation of new process by 1.1.166 units (the probability of innovation in new process over the probability of not experiencing any innovation in new process). Factors like investment in capacity building, investment in new product and for other purposes are found to be insignificant in the present analysis. As far as entrepreneur's perception regarding new product is concerned all the three components like lacking of skilled labor, market acceptance and financial problems are found to be significant with lacked skilled labor and financial problems exerting negative influence on the probability of involving of an entrepreneur in international markets. Determinants like on job training, unique know how and presence of skilled labor is also found to be

significantly influencing the probability of innovating of an entrepreneur in terms of new process.

The results of the instrument equation 5 are being shown in Table 4. The investment strategy is found to be positively and significantly affecting the process of international entrepreneurs as five out of six components of investment strategy are found to be significant at 90 and 95 percent confidence level. Factor of investment in enhancing productivity, is found to be insignificant in the present analysis. As far as entrepreneur's perception regarding new product is concerned all the three components like lacking of skilled labor, market acceptance and financial problems are found to be significant with lacked skilled labor and financial problems exerting negative influence on the probability of involving of an entrepreneur in international markets. Determinants like on job training and presence of skilled labor is also found to be significantly influencing the probability of innovating of an entrepreneur in terms of new process.

The estimated results of the basic export equation 1 are being presented in the Table (5). Size of a firm is found to be significantly and positively influencing the probability of being an international entrepreneur at 99 percent significance level. A unit change in firm size increases the odds of involving in export activities by 5.099 units (the probability of being an international entrepreneur over the probability of not being an international entrepreneur). Firm age is proved to be significant at 90 percent confidence level. Manufacturing status of the firm being a contractor increases the probability of being an international entrepreneur as a unit change in manufacturing status from sub-contractor to contractor increases the odds of involving in export activities by 2.940 units. Association with the area wise trade union exerts a positive influence on the attitude of an entrepreneur to participate in international activities. The factor of diversification in product line is proved to be significant in the current scenario. The existence of registered trademarks positively increase the probability of being an international entrepreneur as a unit increase in the acquisition of registered trade mark increases the odds of involving in export activities by 3.280 units (the probability of being international entrepreneur over the probability of not being international entrepreneur).

Participation in the trade fairs along with personal visits and references are found to be adding positively towards the process of international entrepreneurs.

Exposure of a firm to the information regarding export markets increases the probability of being an international entrepreneur by 2.091 units. While non-cooperation on the side of Government agencies, financial problems, competition from the foreign firms and expensive foreign visits significantly reduces the probability of being an international entrepreneur. Level of competition in foreign market negatively and significantly hampers the process of international entrepreneurship. Financial problems along with expensive foreign trips also found to reduce the probability of being an international entrepreneur in the present analysis.

All the three imputed components of innovation like innovation in new product, process and major improvements in the existing equipment are proved to be significant at 99 percent of confidence level and positively increase the probability of being an international entrepreneur.

Factors like initial investment in the start of the project, affiliation with trade unions, average wage, presence of trademarks, and cost competitive structure of the firm are proved to be insignificant in the present analysis.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The study has provided a comprehensive view of different factors that adds towards the development of international entrepreneurship. These important factors were classified into three main categories like firm level characteristics, technological capabilities and commercial capabilities. Another important dimension of the present study is that it has also focused those factors that restrict firms to be involved in exporting activities.

According to the results, firm size, firm age, manufacturing status of the firm, area wise affiliation with trade unions, natural log of the average revenue per month, diversification, registered trademarks, trade fairs, personal visits and references, availability of information regarding foreign markets along with the three imputed variables of innovation in terms of product innovation, process innovation and major improvements in existing equipment are found to be positively and significantly adds towards the

process of international entrepreneurship. The factors of non-cooperation of government agencies, financial problems and expensive foreign trips are found to be significantly hampering the growth of entrepreneurs in international markets. While, the factors like initial investment in the start of the project, affiliation with trade unions, average wage, presence of trade-marks, and cost competitive structure of the firm are proved to be insignificant in the present analysis implying no effect on export activities

There is a universal consensus that Government export assistance programs should be modified according to the requirements of SMEs. Restrictions to enter the international markets are analytically stricter for small firms as compared to their large counterparts. The problems of capital shortage and management skills, and lack of basic information are considered to be the main obstacles faced by small units in the process of internationalization imposed by government agencies. Though government has offered some support programs, they are not considered to be sufficient enough to encourage small firms to enter in the international market. Moreover, special attention should be given regarding the designing of policy options corresponding to the requirements of firms as they go through the different phases of the process of internationalization.

The estimated results imply some policy implications as it should formulate such policies that can support small firms in their process of internationalization. It can help them in with providing information regarding foreign markets, solving their financial problems, making them more cost competitive as far as their products are concerned and by subsidizing their visits to foreign markets. All these arrangements can positively help small units to enable themselves more productive in this present era of internationalization.

Table 1: Determinants of Export Performance

Determinants	Measure
Firms Characteristics	
Firm Size	Number of full-time employees
Firm Age	Number of years since the foundation of the firm
Manufacturing Status	Subcontractor or contractor
Area-Wise Trade Unions	1 if the firm is affiliated with the trade union, 0 otherwise

Product-Wise Trade Unions	1 if the firm is affiliated with the trade union, 0 otherwise
Lnrev09/Month	Log of firm's revenue in 2009
Wage/Emp09	Ratio of total wage to number of employees (Pakistan Rs.)
Technological Capabilities	
Innovation	
New product	1 if firm introduces new product(s), 0 otherwise
New process	1 if firm introduces new production process, 0 otherwise
Mod product	1 if firm makes major improvements of existing product(s) or changes specification, 0 otherwise
Investment Strategy	
Inv Capacity (Investment Strategy)	1 if firm invests in their capacity, 0 otherwise
Inv Replace (Investment Strategy)	1 if firm invests in replacing old equipment, 0 otherwise
Inv Productivity (Investment Strategy)	1 if firm invests in improving their productivity, 0 otherwise
Inv Quality (Investment Strategy)	1 if firm invests in improving their quality of output, 0 otherwise
Inv New (Investment Strategy)	1 if firm invests in producing new output, 0 otherwise
Inv Other (Investment Strategy)	1 if firm's investment is for other purposes, 0 otherwise
Owner's Perception In Starting Up New Projects	
Financial Problems	1 if firm's owner perceived the importance of lacking finance in starting up new projects, 0 otherwise
Market Acceptance	1 if firm's owner perceived the Importance of lacked market acceptance in starting up new projects, 0 otherwise
Lack Skilled Worker	1 if firm's owner perceived the importance of lacking skilled workers in starting up new projects, 0 otherwise

On Job Training	1 if firm normally trains its existing workers or new workers, 0 otherwise
Presence Of Unique Know How	1=yes 0=otherwise
Skilled Workers	Number of skill workers
1. Commercial Capabilities	
Diversification (Product Mix)	No of industrial sectors in which the firm operates
Trade Marks	Presence=1 Absence=0
Registered Trade Marks	Presence=1 Absence=0
Export Promotion Bureau Trade Fairs	Yes=1, No=0
Personal Visits And References	Yes=1, No=0
Import Activities/ Use Of Imported Raw Material	Yes=1, No=0
2. Factors Inhibiting Export Activities	
Availability Of Information	Yes=1, No=0
Non Cooperation Of Govt. Agencies	Yes=1, No=0
Increased Completion In Foreign Markets	Yes=1, No=0
Financial Problems	Yes=1, No=0
Cost Competitiveness	Yes=1, No=0
High Cost Of Visiting Foreign Markets	Yes=1, No=0

Table 2: Logistic Results New Product

New product	Coefficients	Odd Ratios
Skilled Labor	0.759**	2.135
Inv in capacity	0.385*	1.470
Inv in replacing old equipment	1.407*	4.082
Inv productivity	0.156	1.169
Inv quality	1.589**	4.901
Inv new product	3.025	20.600

Inv other	0.617**	1.854
Financial problems	-0.020*	0.980
Market acceptance	0.136	1.146
Lacking of skilled workers	-0.117*	0.889
Training on job	0.469*	1.598
Presence of unique knowhow	0.248*	1.282
Imported raw material	0.640**	1.897
Constant	-4.012	0.018
Log Likelihood= 118.498 Pseudo R-Squared = 0.0613 LR Chi2 (13)=1138.934 No. of Observations=868 Prob. > Chi2=0.000		

*** indicates that coefficients are significant at 1 percent level

**indicates that coefficients are significant at 5 percent level

* indicates that coefficients are significant at 10 percent level

Table 3: Logistic Results New Process

New process	Coefficients	Odd Ratios
Skilled Labor	0.176**	1.192
Inv in capacity	0.109	1.115
Inv in replacing old equipment	0.153**	1.166
Inv productivity	0.104**	1.109
Inv quality	0.068*	1.070
Inv new product	0.040	1.040
Inv other	0.072	1.075
Financial problems	-0.130**	0.878
Market acceptance	0.210***	1.233
Lacking of skilled workers	-0.069*	0.933
Training on job	0.148*	1.160
Presence of unique knowhow	0.047*	1.049
Imported raw material	0.011	1.011
Constant	0.993***	2.699
Log Likelihood= 1551.09 Pseudo R-Squared=0.23 LR Chi ² (13)= 85.38 No. of Observations=868 Prob. > Chi ² =0.000		

*** indicates that coefficients are significant at 1 percent level

**indicates that coefficients are significant at 5 percent level

* indicates that coefficients are significant at 10 percent level

Table 4: Logistic Results Major Improvements

Major Improvements	Coefficients	Odd Ratios
Skilled Labor	0.377**	1.457
Inv in capacity	0.790*	2.203
Inv in replacing old equipment	0.103*	1.108
Inv productivity	0.270	1.309
Inv quality	0.841**	2.319
Inv new product	0.622*	1.863
Inv other	0.052*	1.054
Financial problems	-0.076*	0.927
Market acceptance	0.162**	1.176
Lacking of skilled workers	-0.109**	0.896
Training on job	0.122**	1.130
Presence of unique knowhow	0.481	1.618
Imported raw material	0.007	1.007
Constant	-0.077	0.926
Log Likelihood= 1621.816 Pseudo R-Squared=0.24 LR Chi ² (13)=79.60 No. of Observations=868 Prob. > Chi ² =0.000		

*** indicates that coefficients are significant at 1 percent level

**indicates that coefficients are significant at 5 percent level

* indicates that coefficients are significant at 10 percent level

Table 5: Logistic results Exports


Export	Coefficients	Odd Ratios
employment	1.629***	5.099
Firm age	0.200*	1.222
Investment	0.009	1.000
Manufacturing status	1.078**	2.940
Affiliation with trade unions product wise	0.310	1.364
Area wise affiliation	1.115**	3.050
Firm revenue in month Rs	0.392*	1.480
Average wage	0.018	1.018
Diversification SIC	1.550**	4.711
Trade Marks	0.484	1.622
Trademarks registered	1.188**	3.280
Trade fairs	2.203***	9.049
Personal visits/references	2.696***	14.820
Information	0.738*	2.091
Non cop. Govt	-1.274**	0.280
Competition in foreign markets	-1.998**	0.136
Financial problems	-3.196***	0.041
Cost competitiveness	1.335	3.800
Highly priced foreign trips	-0.933**	0.393
Major Improvements	1.660***	5.261
New process	2.632***	13.897
New product	2.449***	11.574
Constant	-20.254***	
Log Likelihood= 1916.478 Pseudo R-Squared=0.068 LR Chi2 (22)=958.239 No. of Observations=868 Prob. > Chi2=0.000		

*** indicates that coefficients are significant at 1 percent level

** indicates that coefficients are significant at 5 percent level

* indicates that coefficients are significant at 10 percent level

Fig 1: Research Model of major determinants contributing towards international Entrepreneurship.



Source: Author (2012)

References

- Aaby, N. E., & Slater, S. F. (1989). Management influences on export performance: a review of the empirical literature 1978-1988. *International marketing review*, 6(4).
- Acs, Z. J., Morck, R., Shaver, J. M., & Yeung, B. (1997). The internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises: A policy perspective. *Small business economics*, 9(1), 7-20.
- Alvarez, R. (2004). Sources of export success in small-and medium-sized enterprises: the impact of public programs. *International Business Review*, 13(3), 383-400.
- Baron, R. A., & Markman, G. D. (2000). Beyond social capital: How social skills can enhance entrepreneurs' success. *The academy of management executive*, 14(1), 106-116.
- Barringer, B. R., & Greening, D. W. (1998). Small business growth through geographic expansion: A comparative case study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(6), 467-492.
- Bartlett, W., & Bukvič, V. (2001). Barriers to SME growth in Slovenia. *MOCT-MOST: Economic Policy in Transitional Economies*, 11(2), 177-195.
- Bijmolt, T. H., & Zwart, P. S. (1994). The impact of internal factors on the export success of Dutch small and medium-sized firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 32(2), 69.

- Birley, S., & Westhead, P. (1990). Growth and performance contrasts between 'types' of small firms. *Strategic management journal*, 11(7), 535-557.
- Buckley, P. J. (1997). International technology transfer by small and medium sized enterprises. *Small Business Economics*, 9(1), 67-78.
- Cafferata, R., & Mensi, R. (1995). The role of information in the internationalisation of SMEs: a typological approach. *International Small Business Journal*, 13(3), 35-46.
- Calof, J. L. (1993). The impact of size on internationalization. *Journal of small business management*, 31(4), 60.
- Cavusgil, S. T., Bilkey, W. J., & Tesar, G. (1979). A note on the export behavior of firms: exporter profiles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 10(1), 91-97.
- Chandler, A. H. (1990). The enduring logic of managerial success. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-11.
- Chandler, G. N., & Hanks, S. H. (1994). Founder competence, the environment, and venture performance. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 18(3), 77-90.
- Chetty, S. K., & Hamilton, R. T. (1993). Firm-level determinants of export performance: a meta-analysis. *International Marketing Review*, 10(3).
- Chetty, S. K., & Hamilton, R. T. (1996). The Process of Exporting in Owner-controlled Firms. *International Small Business Journal*, 14(2), 12-25.
- Chittenden, F., Hall, G., & Hutchinson, P. (1996). Small firm growth, access to capital markets and financial structure: Review of issues and an empirical investigation. *Small business economics*, 8(1), 59-67.

- Christensen, C. H., Da Rocha, A., & Gertner, R. K. (1987). An empirical investigation of the factors influencing exporting success of Brazilian firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 18(3), 61-77.
- Cooper, A. C. (1981). Strategic management: New ventures and small business. *Long range planning*, 14(5), 39-45.
- Denis, J. E., & Depelteau, D. (1985). Market knowledge, diversification and export expansion. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 16(3), 77-89.
- Doi, N., & Cowling, M. (1998). The evolution of firm size and employment share distribution in Japanese and UK manufacturing: A study of small business presence. *Small Business Economics*, 10(3), 283-292.
- Elhiraika, A. B., & Nkurunziza, J. D. (2006). *Facilitating Firm Entry, Growth, and Survival with Special Attention to SMEs*. African Trade Policy Centre.
- Ernst, D., Ganiatsos, T., & Mytelka, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Technological capabilities and export success in Asia*. Routledge.
- Etemad, H. (2005). SMEs' Internationalization Strategies Based on a Typical Subsidiary's Evolutionary Life Cycle in Three Distinct Stages. *MIR: Management International Review*, 145-186.
- Friedman, M., & Friedman, S. (1994). How to run a family business. *Cincinnati, OH: Betterway Books*.
- Government of Pakistan. (1989). District report of Punjab Government Census of Pakistan. Islamabad.

Government of Pakistan. (2005). Economic census of Pakistan. Federal Beaurue of Pakistan, Islamabad.

Huang, C., Zhang, M., Zhao, Y., & Varum, C. A. (2008). Determinants of exports in China: a microeconometric analysis. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 20(2), 299-317.

Hult, G. T. M., Snow, C. C., & Kandemir, D. (2003). The role of entrepreneurship in building cultural competitiveness in different organizational types. *Journal of management*, 29(3), 401-426.

James Jr, H. S. (1999). What can the family contribute to business? Examining contractual relationships. *Family Business Review*, 12(1), 61-71.

Johanson, J., & Vahlne, J. E. (1977). The internationalization process of the firm-a model of knowledge development and increasing foreign market commitments. *Journal of international business studies*, 23-32.

Julien, P. A., Joyal, A., & Deshaies, L. (1994). SMEs and international competition: free trade agreement or globalization?. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 32(3), 52.

Katsikeas, C. S., & Morgan, R. E. (1994). Differences in perceptions of exporting problems based on firm size and export market experience. *European Journal of Marketing*, 28(5), 17-35.

Kedia, B. L., & Chhokar, J. S. (1986). An empirical investigation of export promotion programmes.

Kirpalani, V. H., & Macintosh, N. B. (1980). International marketing effectiveness of technology-oriented small firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 11(3), 81-90.

- Kohli, A. K., Jaworski, B. J., & Kumar, A. (1993). MARKOR: a measure of market orientation. *Journal of Marketing research*, 467-477.
- Krugman, P. R. (1979). Increasing returns, monopolistic competition, and international trade. *Journal of international Economics*, 9(4), 469-479.
- Lee, J. (1995). Small firms' innovation in two technological settings. *Research Policy*, 24(3), 391-401.
- Lee, K., & Temesgen, T. (2005). Resources For. *Strategies, and Investment Climates as Determinants of Firm Growth in Developing Countries, A Dynamic Resource-based View of the Firm.*
- Lefebvre, E., Lefebvre, L. A., & Bourgault, M. (1998). R&D-related capabilities as determinants of export performance. *Small Business Economics*, 10(4), 365-377.
- Lefebvre, L. A., 2000, Canada. Industry Canada, & Industry Canada Research Publications Program. *SMEs, Exports and Job Creation [electronic Resource]: a Firm-level Analysis.* Industry Canada.
- Lefebvre, L. A., Lefebvre, E., & Harvey, J. (1996). Intangible assets as determinants of advanced manufacturing technology adoption in SME's: toward an evolutionary model. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering management*, 43(3), 307-322.
- Liu, M., & Yu, J. (2008). Financial structure, development of small and medium enterprises, and income distribution in the People's Republic of China. *Asian Development Review*, 25(1/2), 137.
- Lukács, E. (2005). The economic role of SMEs in world economy, especially in Europe. *European integration studies*, 4(1), 3-12.

- Madsen, T. (1989). Successful export marketing management: some empirical evidence. *International Marketing Review*, 6(4).
- Moini, A. H. (1995). An inquiry into successful exporting: An empirical investigation using a three-stage model. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 33(3), 9.
- Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *The Journal of marketing*, 20-35.
- Nassimbeni, G. (2001). Technology, innovation capacity, and the export attitude of small manufacturing firms: a logit/tobit model. *Research Policy*, 30(2), 245-262.
- Nguyen, N. A., Pham, Q. E., Nguyen, D. C., & Nguyen, D. N. (2007). Innovation and Export of Vietnam's SME Sector', MPRA Paper No. 3256. *Development and Policies Research Center*.
- OECD (2001). Economic Outlook. No. 65, June.
- Ogbuehi, A. O., & Longfellow, T. A. (1994). Perceptions of US manufacturing SMEs concerning exporting: A comparison based on export experience. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 32(4), 37.
- Ong, C. H., & Pearson, A. W. (1982). The impact of technical characteristics on export activity: a study of small and medium-sized UK electronics firms. *r&d Management*, 12(4), 189-196.
- Osmani, S. R. (2004). The employment nexus between growth and poverty: an Asian perspective. *A Report prepared for the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), Stockholm and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), New York.(mimeo.)*.

- Pavitt, K., Robson, M., & Townsend, J. (1987). The size distribution of innovating firms in the UK: 1945-1983. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 297-316.
- Prebisch, R. (1962). The economic development of Latin America and its principal problems. *Economic Bulletin for Latin America*.
- Reid, S. D., & Rosson, P. J. (1982). Managing export entry and expansion: An overview. *Managing export entry and expansion*, 3-20.
- SMEDA (2004). Issues in SME development Presentation to Task Force on SME Development Policy, April 6, 2004 Islamabad.
- Styles, C., & Ambler, T. (1994). Successful export practice: The UK experience. *International Marketing Review*, 11(6), 23-47.
- Trung, T. Q., Tung, N. T., Dong, T. D., & Duong, P. H. (2008). Performance of export-oriented small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises in Viet Nam. *Asia-Pacific Trade and Investment Review*, 4, 83-112.
- UNIDO. (1991). Towards Industrialization and Revitalization. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Ursic, M. L., & Czinkota, M. R. (1984). An experience curve explanation of export expansion. *Journal of Business Research*, 12(2), 159-168.
- Van Dijk, M. (2002). The determinants of export performance in developing countries: The case of Indonesian manufacturing. *Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies Working Paper*, 2(01).
- Vohra, K. (2008). *Export-Marketing Problems of SMEs: The Case of Ludhiana Apparels and Textile Industry* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nottingham).

- Wagner, J. (1995). Exports, firm size, and firm dynamics. *Small Business Economics*, 7(1), 29-39.
- Wagner, J. (2001). A note on the firm size–export relationship. *Small business economics*, 17(4), 229-237.
- Ward, J. L. (1998). Growing the family business: Special challenges and best practices. *Family Business Review*, 10(4), 323-337.
- Welch, L. S., & Wiedersheim-Paul, F. (1980). Initial exports—a marketing failure?. *Journal of Management Studies*, 17(3), 333-344.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic management journal*, 5(2), 171-180.
- Wiklund, J., Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2009). Building an integrative model of small business growth. *Small Business Economics*, 32(4), 351-374.
- Willmore, L. (1992). Tansnationals and foreign trade: Evidence from Brazil. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 28(2), 314-335.