THE EXPORT BEHAVIOUR AND DEVELOPMENT OF FIRMS MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIAL GOODS BASED ON THEIR EXPORT EXPERIENCE

BY

SEMRA PEKMEZ

Business Administration, Boğaziçi University, 1982

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Business Administration Department of Business Administration Institute of Social Sciences

Boğaziçi University
1985

ABSTRACT

EXPORT BEHAVIOUR AND DEVELOPMENT OF FIRMS MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIAL GOODS BASED ON THEIR EXPORT EXPERIENCE

In this thesis, export development and behaviour of manufacturing firms exporting industrial goods will be studied. Export development process is analyzed in two experience groups based on the length of time of their exposure to export experience and their relation between organizational characteristics and the export behaviour of firms are investigated. The differences and similarities between the two identified experience groups are analyzed.

The study includes the literature review and the field study which is conducted through a questionnaire. The interpretation of the computer analyzed data is done and the implications for marketers and academicians are presented.

Ö Z E T

SANAYİ ÜRÜNLERİ İMALATÇI-İHRACATÇI FİRMALARIN DIŞSATIM YAPTIKLARI YILLAR SÜRESİNCE EDİNDİKLERİ TECRÜBE İTİBARİ İLE DIŞSATIM GELİŞME VE DAVRANIŞ BİÇİMLERİ

Bu tezde, sanayi ürünleri imal eden ihracatçı firmaların dışsatım gelişme süreçleri ve dışsatımda davranış biçimleri incelenmektedir. Dışsatım gelişme süreci, firmaların dışsatım faaliyetlerini sürdürdükleri yıllar itibari ile dışsatımdaki deneyimleri açısından iki sınıfta analiz edilmektedir. Bu iki deneyim grubundaki firmaların yapısal özellikleri, dışsatım davranış biçimleri karşılaştırmalı olarak araştırılmakta ve gruplar arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıklar analiz edilmektedir.

Çalışma, bu konuda yazılmış olan makaleleri ve anket aracılığı ile yapılmış olan bir saha çalışmasını kapsayacaktır. Kompüter aracılığı ile analiz edilmiş veriler yorumlanacak ve akademisyenler ile pazarlamacılara olan katkıları sunulacaktır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

INTRODUCTION

The internationalization of a firm can be seen as a continuous process with firm gradually increasing its level of international involvement and commitment. This commitment is time phased function of the experience gathered. Exporting is the first step in the process of internationalization. With the experience gained in exporting, and with the beneficial participation of firm in international marketing, internationalization process may continue to develop in the form of direct or indirect investments in foreign markets.

In the earlier studies conducted on international marketing, researchers emphasized the macro factors in the economy and tried to explain export marketing within the framework of macro and economic variables. The main explanations was primarily based on the theory of Comparative Advantage expounded by Ricardo and Factor Endowment Theory of Hecksher and Ohlin (Canon, 1980).

The inherent limitation of macro studies in explaining variations in strategies and policies at the firm level justifies micro orientation - the search for explanatory variables that can be found at the firm level. The improving power of methods of investigation has lead to a growing number of empirical studies of these theories.

With regard to export marketing, clearly, the micro level of research offers greatest attraction to decision makers and marketing specialists, since it is more accessible and certainly more relevant to the day-to-day policy decisions of exporter. Empirical and conceptual investigations and studies regarding exporting as a firm strategey and organizational behaviour had started to gain importance after the 1960's.

A through understanding of export policies at the organizational level is required for at least two reasons. First, an assessment needs to be made of the problems and opportunities for managements in accomplishing growth through exporting. Secondly, the formulation of an effective policy for stimulating exports, an acute need for many nations, calls for a basic understanding of the characteristics associated with export activity at the firm level. There is an increasing evidence that behavioural variables internal to the firm have a definite impact on firms export activity (Çavusgil and Nevin, 1981, Johanson and Vahlne, 1977).

The study is designed to analyze the situation in Turkey; where the subject of exporting has started to acquire great importance after the year 1980, with the implementation of a new economic policy called new "stabilization programm".

This study will attempt to provide more insight into the approach in which the internationalization theory is seen as the most effective one in differentiating firms. The internalization theory sees the internalization of the firm as a continous process with the firm gradually increasing its level of international involvement and commitment (Czinkota, 1981). The recognition of foreign market opportunities, the desire to explore them, the understanding of them and willingness to commit resources to international

activities are seen as a time phased function of the experiences gathered. More conclusive proof would result if research could show that firms change their export policies and attitudes over time. Instead of observing the development of firms in a longitudinal fashion which takes a long period to search, such gradual internationalization stages can be discernable when grouping firms based on the length of time of their exposure to export experience. Observed changes would not only confirm the gradual internationalization theory but could also give an indication of the time span within such changes occur.

The first part of the study is a literature survey on the factors effecting the export behaviour of firms. A genera description of international marketing and the trends in Turkey will be presented which will be succeeded with emprica studies established on the export performance of firms

In the second part, a field study which is conducted via a questionnaire will be introduced. Randomly chosen thirty firms which have less than five years of export experience and with more than five years of export experience were contacted for this field study. Among the manufacturing firms, the ones exporting industrial goods are included in the survey. The field study aims to support the approach that firms change their export policies over time. The data will be analyzed through computer programs. The interpretations will be done in such a way as to provide recommendations for future studies and marketers.

The organization of the chapters is as cited here in under:

In Chapter I, a general review of international marketing and exporting trends in Turkey will be presented;

In chapter II, Empirical studies established regarding export behaviour of firms will be introduced.

In chapter III, research design and findings will be submitted.

In chapter IV, implications and interpretations will be reviewed and discussed.

I. INTERNATIONAL MARKETING

In this chapter, definition of International Marketing and reasons of firms for entering to international business will be discussed.

In order to have an insight of Turkey's foreign trade for the understanding of the field survey conducted among turkish firms exporting industrial goods, developments in exports regarding its composition and distribution will be studied.

1.1. WHAT IS INTERNATIONAL MARKETING AND WHY DO FIRMS ENTER INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

International marketing is an extention of domestic marketing which can be defined as in general, determining the needs and wants of consumer groups and use of company sources, their planning and organization and control to satisfy these needs. Both of them take place between individuals and corporations. Although various elaborate definitions have been offered, the basic characteristic which distinguishes international business from domestic business is that it involves two or more nations.

Two types of operational processes are central to international business. First, there is the tranmission of

various resources (goods, funds, technology, managerial skills and so forth) among nations. Second, there is the interface of the firm with other societies (made of consumers middleman, suppliers, political bodies and so on) Due to the nature of these processes, the environment of a firm which is engaged in business transactions across national boundaries become quite complex. There are additional dimensions to be considered such as tariffs, quatos and other trade barriers, exchange risk and a variety of legal restrictions, and also management has to be concerned with the impact of a host of environmental variables on their operations since firm interacts with more than one market. These environmental variables include income, population, climate, language, religion, life styles, politics, technology, law and others. Consequently, one of the major challenges awaiting the international marketer, is to cope with complicated and risky ventures taking place in an environment of increased uncertainty (Çavusgil and Nevin, 1981). Despite the difficulties, however, companies do engage in various forms of international business activities in order to fulfill their profit, growth and market development objectives.

Balance of payments problem have became a matter of critical national concern in most (non-OPEC) countries in part because of the widening gap between domestic needs and domestically available resources and in part because of the rapid increases in price for critical imports, most notably crude oil. In some less developed countries this balance of payment problem has began to approach the dimensions of a national economic disasters. In many other countries the concern is no less real, particularly for those whose economies are heavily dependent on international trade and/or those who look to surpluses on current account as a major source of economic development financing (Ayal, 1982). Expended exports (and/or import substitution) are clearly assuming major importance as national gools.

Internationalization process as the process by which firms adapt international business activities has two distinct but interrelated areas (Cannon, 1980).

(1) International or multinational marketing: Giving weight to the development of business in a number of countries or regions, within a framework capable of incorporating the establishment of local manufacturing distribution and marketing system.

(2) Export marketing: With its emphasis on the successful marketing of goods produced in one or more countries in other overseas markets.

The distinction between the areas is not real. The exporter is differentiated from the international marketer by the foreign or alien nature of this products in the market he seeks, while the international marketer can eliminate this in many circumstances.

The fundamental decision for the firm is whether to enter the international arena at all. As its most basic level this interacts with the basic issue of why international trade, with its problems of conflicting interests, tariffs, logistic difficulties, marketing and communication problems emerged and persists. The economist's explanation is based on the theory of comparative advantage (Cannon, 1980). This theory, first fully expanded by Ricardo, focuses on the wide diversity in conditions across the parts and countries of the world. These differences, in turn, create significant variations in the production capabilities of countries.

Besides the important and widely recognized benefits of export expansion and its contribution to a nation's balance of payments, there is as well the macro and micro level

benefits associated with a strong and dynamic export sector.

Macro level benefits: It is generally agreed that exports speed up technological and marketing innovations and encourage specialization and efficiency. In addition, exports create more employment and serve as a countercyclical influence during periods of domestic recession. Micro level benefits: Exporting often offers an attactive alternative strategy for growth. It is an outlet for exploiting its comparative advantages and/or overcoming certain unfavorable circumstances such as excess production capacity or maturing sales in the home market.

1.2. TURKEY'S FOREIGN TRADE AND DEVELOPMENTS IN THE EXPORT OF INDDUSTRIAL GOODS

The volume of foreign trade has shown a substantial rise in recent years and this resulted in a significant increase in Turkey's share of total world trade. However, the increase in the volume of trade resulted mainly from the rise in exports and the rise in imports was relatively much less marked.

Even so, imports which amounted to 11.13 percent of gross Domestic Products over the period 1975-79, jumped to 16.5 percent in 1982. As apercentage of the GDP, exports amounted to 4 percent in the 1975 period and with an explosive increase, exports amounted to 10.8 percent in 1982 (Tüsiad 1984).

The relative increase in the exports/GNP ratio between 1969 and 1973 resulted from the devaluation of the lira in 1970, from the relatively prosperity in the western world and from prices which were either clearly below world levels or close to them.

On the other hand, several factors were responsible for the relative decrease in exports during the period 1973-79; domestic price increases had reduced Turkey's competitiveness and a high domestic demand had compated with exports and thus limited the exportable surplus of a number of goods. Parallel to increasing prices, over-valuation of the lira had again attained dangerous dimensions and last, but not least, Turkey's principal trading partners faced a recession. There was, however, a distinct improvement in most of these factors during 1980 and 1984 period (Tüsiad, 1984).

TABLE 1.1. TURKISH EXPORTS AS A: Percentage of world exports.

Years	%
1950-1954	0.47
1955-1959	0.34
1960-1964	0.29
1965-1969	0.25
1970-1974	0.22
1975-1979	0.18
1980	0.16
1981	0.26
1982	0.30

1.2.1. Composition of Turkish Exports

With the end of 1984, Turkey has completed the fifth year of Tight Money Policy which had been laid down as part of the January 1980 Economic Stabilization Programme. The implementation of the stabilization programme, decreased inflation, increased export and GNP during 1981 and 1982. In the year of 1983, because of reoccurance of economic problems, exports did not increased hence a slowdown in the export rate was seen in comparison to 1982 figures. During these years, with the increase in total exports, the agricultural based

Turkish Economy, together with its exports have no more continued to be considered as agricultural based.

The share of industrial goods in total export was used to be quite low as 27.2 % in 1978, 34.7 % in 1979 and 36 % in 1980. This situation changed drastically as from 1981 and increased to 48.8 % in 1981 and 59.7 % in 1982 (Ist. Chamber of Commerce 84).

The above figures clearly show that the important developments in our total exports have been encouraged by industrial goods exports. In 1983 compared to 1982, exports had shown a dolar decrease of 0.3 % because of the reoccurrance of economic problems as mentioned above. So, it is noteworthy to see an increase in the share of industrial goods up to 63.9 %, during this general slowdown of exports.

Besides the structural changes in the exports, 1984 is interpreted as a very successful year regarding the export figures of Turkey: 7.2 billion U.S. dollars export target is realized. The share of industrial products go up to 74 % and the share of agricultural products decreases to 23 %. The mining and guarrying products make up the 3.5 % of total exports (Osman Özbek; Speach at the Conference of Problems in Exporting 1985, Sheraton Hotel). In 1984, when compared to the previous year, export of industrial goods had showed a rise of 49.6 % where as, imports only increased at a rate of 10.3 %. Exports of industrial goods reached a state where it started to finance 77.4 % import of industrial goods although the rate was only 52.3 % in 1983.

1.2.2. Geographical Distribution of Exports in 1984

Examination of 1984 export figures regarding geographical distributions, gives clues as to the certain

changes accuring, in comparison to 1983. Exports to OECD countries constitute 53.8 %; exports to Free Exchange Agreement countries; 41.2 % (35.8 % of 41.2 % belongs to Middle East and North Africa Countries) and exports to other countries constitute 2.9 % of total exports (Table 1.3).

When we compare the above figures with the previous years, we see an increase in the OECD countries share of exports which used to be 41.8 % in 1982 and 48.6 % in 1983. Exports to Free exchange Agreement Islamic Countries fell from 52.8 % to 46.3 % of total exports in 1983 which only reached a share of 41.2 % in 1984.

The country with the highest share of exports is West Germany having a share of 18.1 %. Iran having a share of 19.4 % in 1983, became the second biggest exported country with a rate of 12.7 % in the year of 1984.

TABLE 1.2. SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION OF EXPORTS

Years	Agriculture	Mining	Industry
1970	74.9	6.7	18.4
1975	50.6	7.5	35.9
1980	57.4	6.6	36.0
1983	32.8	3.3	63.9
1984 (10 months)	22.8	3.5	73.6

SOURCE: Conference held by Export Union on the topic of "Problems in Exporting" 1985, Sheraton Hotel.

TABLE 1.3. GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF EXPORTS (January-June)

	1983		1984	
	(000 $)	(%)	(000 $)	(%)
1. OECD Countries	1.299.961	48.62	1.901.718	53.89
A. EEC Countries	978.043	36.58	1.316.677	37.31
- West Germany	369.177	13.81	642.021	18.19
- Belqium-Luxemburg	50.181	1.88	84.936	2.41
- Denmark	5.987	0.22	9.599	0.27
- France	92.151	3.07	80.559	2.28
- Holland	59.184	2.21	82.335	2.33
- United Kingdom	146.792	5.49	121.547	3.44
- Ireland	1.611	0.06	1.823	0.05
- Italy	220.839	8.26	267.989	7.59
- Greece	42.121	1.58	25.868	0.73
B. Other OECD Countries	321.918	12.04	585.041	16.58
- Austria	37.334	1.40	39.777	1.13
- U.S.A.	106.124	3.97	187.790	5.32
- Switzerland	122.474	4.58	282.426	8.00
- Japan	14.677	0.55	18.278	0.52
- Others	41.309	1.54	56.770	1.61
2. FREE EXCHANGE AGGREEMENT COUNTRIES	1.241.593	46.43	1.455.771	41.25
A. East Europanne Countries	138.470	5.18	136.154	3.86
B. Middle East and North Africa Countries	1.074.363	40.18	1.265.393	35.85
- Algebra	65.627	2.45	56.245	1.59
- Iraq	98.261	3.67	390.838	11.07
- Iran	520.832	19.48	448.277	12.70
- Libya	111.030	4.15	87.850	2.49
- Egypt	41.086	1.54	79.604	2.26
- Sudan	2.255	0.08	2.193	0.06
- Syria	34.899	1.31	17.842	0.51
- Saudi Arabia	134.508	5.03	140.140	4.97
- Tunusia	27.494	1.03	7.430	0.21
- Jordan	38.371	1.44	34.974	0.99
C. OTHERS	28.760	1.08	54.224	1.54
3. OTHER COUNTRIES				
A. Middle East Countries	108.984	4.08	104.206	2.95
- Abudabi	1.784	0.07	1.372	0.04
- Bahrain	9.9	0.03	384	0.01
- Qatar	3.140	0.12	2.703	0.08
- Umman	47	0.00	388	0.01
- Dubai	7.218	0.27	6.976	0.20
- Kuveyt	34.311	1.28	37.280	1.06
- Lebanon	61.565	2.30	55.103	1.56
B. Others				
- Nigeria	1.203	0.04	5.170	0.15
- Others	22.170	0.83	62.273	1.76
TOTAL	.2673.911	100.00	3.529.238	100.00

SOURCE: Istanbul Chamber of Commerce (September, 1984). The results of 1984 Export Questionnaire.

Firms in industrialized and developing countries are increasingly being affected by the international business, although these operations can be quite complex and involving unfamiliar parameters. These problems which some are internal to the firm like attitudinal constraints, lack of knowledge and financial and managerial limitations or problems arising from governmental interventions in the market place as bureaucratic procedures or tariff and nontariff trade barriers erected by the trading partners stay in the way of individual firms in exporting.

However, as a result of benefits associated with strong and dynamic export sector described in the chapter, firms through the rapid growth of international business have acquired experience and knowledge in operating in foreign markets. With the implementation of 1980 Economic Stabilization Programme, Turkey has started to engage in export activities more and increased her export figures. Support and further justification for increased export activities in Turkey are derived from the micro, macro and balance of trade benefits, as well. The increase in figures was mostly remarkable in the exports figures of industrial goods. In the year of 1984, industrial products constituted the 74 % of total exports thus created a very important and dynamic sector of our exports.

Keeping this point in mind, here in this study, the export behaviour of firms only exporting industrial goods are analyzed.

II. THEORATICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

A substantial amount of research has been conducted on the export marketing behaviour of firms in the past two decades, since many firms in developed and developing countries find exporting as an attractive way of tapping foreign market opportunities.

International marketing refers to the marketing related decisions and activities of firms engaged in international business. Admittedly, international marketing decisions and operations vary greatly in nature and complexity among firms. The studies reviewed in this section will include empirical contributions which attempt to explain and describe export marketing behaviour at the individual firm level. M.Bodur's Thesis and Bilkey's review paper are taken as a basis for this review of empirical studies.

Most empirical studies have identified multiple considerations relating to the export behavior of firms. Such studies will be referred to under each of the topics to which they apply.

2.1. REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL STUDIES EXPLAINING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF EXPORTING FIRMS

2.1.1. Export Initiation

Analysts concerned with the initiation of the export process have tended to focus on the effects of change agents, both external and internal. External change agents include Chamber of Commerce, Industrial Associations, banks, government agencies and other firms (Çavusgil, 1980). The last appear to be overhelmingly the most important; they include corporations that buy-out smaller firms and then pressure them to export. Foreign firms are interested in buying machinery for their own use, foreign importers and export agents. In the five U.S. studies (Snavely, et al., 1964; Tesar, 1975; Sınai, 1970; Simpson and Kujawa, 1974; Povard and Bogart, 1975) for the source of initiative of exporting, respectively, 40 %, 60 %, 69 %, 82 % and 83 % of firms responded that their firms initial export order was received unsolicited (Bilkey, 1978).

The important internal change agent tends to be a member of the firm's top management who is interested in and enthusiastic about exporting (Bilkey, 1978). The determinants of whether or not management takes the initiative in exporting appear to be the following:

1) Management's diffuse impression of the attractiveness of exporting as an abstract ideal, independently of whatever particular contribution exporting might make to its own firm (Simpson, 1973). The contribution cannot be known by management until he or she explores the feasibility of exporting or gains export experience.

2) Degree of the firm's internal orientation

(Wiedersheim-Paul, Welch and Olson, 1975); (Cunningham and Spigel's, 1971). United Kingdom findings suggest that this is determined by the firm's background and traditions and by the foreign attitudes of its top management.

3) Management confidence in the firm's competitive advantage (Tesar, 1975) indicated this by: management's perception of whether or not a) the firms product has unique qualities; b) the firm has technological marketing, financial or price advantages; c) the firm possesses exclusive information about a foreign market or customer; d) the firm has a patented product and e) the firm has an efficient distribution network.

4) Adverse home market conditions causing management to explore exporting as a means for the firm's survival (Poward and Bogart, 1975). These conditions can be stated as overproduction, declining domestic sales, competive pressures, excess capacity, saturated domestic market. And the relationship of this initative to general economic conditions Varies greatly among firms because of the differential impacts that a country's economic condition has at any given time on its various industries (Rao, 1977).

2.1.2. Motivation For Exporting

Motivation for exporting is different from though often related to the initiation of exporting. Two United Kingdom studies concluded that short term profit was not the motive for exporting, rather it was long-term profitability secured through market diversification and long-term growth (Cooper, Hartley and Harvey, 1970). Another study indicated that the primary motive for exporting was to avoid losses from a saturated home market and declining domestic sales (Povard and Bogart, 1975).

It was found that managers in smaller business tend to believe that only large enterprises can successfully handle the details of exporting (Czinkota, 1981). Another study (Johnston and Czinkota, 1980) found that firms of various size categories did not differ from each other in terms of their export activities and attitudes.

Two studies, however, concluded that very small firms tend not to export and beyond some point exporting is not correlated with firm size. Between these two points exporting is correlated with size (Hirsch, 1971; Çavusgil, 1976). This conclusion seems to explain the other analysts's divergent findings. However, the relationship between firm size and exporting is often complicated by a possible intercorrelation of firm size with the quality of management.

2.1.4. Export Risk

Portfolio theory suggests that an exporting firm probably faces less total market risk than a nonexporting firm (Hirsch and Lev, 1971). The first group faces less total risk because of market diversification. Firms selling to several markets can cancel the risk of one market by selling to another market thus, reducing the total risk. In a study done in 1971, export risk perceptions of Danish, Dutch and Israeli firms were searched. The analyst concluded that foreign entry is more hazardous than domestic selling (Hirsh, 1971).

Perception of risk in exporting depends upon the economic and political structure of the market to which the firm has an access. Also, the development stage of firms in exporting may influence their perception of risk. A study found that less experienced firms in regarding to their time of exposure to export activities perceive more risk than did

heavy exporters (Tesar, 1975).

In the scope of international marketing, export marketing is by far the most typical type of involvement by firms. It represents a less risky form of involvement and it requires lesser commitment of resources than foreign direct investment. Consequently many firms find exporting as an attractive way of tapping foreign market opportunities (Çavuşgil and Nevin, 1981).

2.1.5. Export Destination

Uppsale School argues that exporting tends to begin with the psychologically closest country, and then extends to countries that are psychologically more and more distant (Johanson and Vahlne, 1977). Psychologically closer countries concept indicates physically closer countries which have the similar economic and socio-cultural characteristics. A new exporter without much insight about the foreign markets, tends to export to such countries to gain experience in internatioanl business and then exports to various new markets. Sinai's study of 139 Oregan firms in the U.S.A. support this theory (Sınai, 1970). He found that most of the exports were forwarded to Canada, and then to Europe and Latin America. In another study, 80 % of 720 Minnesota firms exported to Canada (Bilkey, 1978).

In a study conducted among 423 Wisconsin firms, it was found that light exporters tended to derive most of their export earnings from Canada, whereas heavy exporters tended to derive most of their export earnings from West Europe (Tesar, 1985). On the basis of Swedish studies, (Carlson, 1975), concluded that small firms are more influenced by psychological distance than are large firms. Also firms producing technology-intensive products are more influenced

by psychological distance than producers of other products.

2.1.6. Management

Simpson found that 69 % of the nonexporters although admitted that they could export, did not export because of management apathy (Simpson, 1973). Another study found a tendency among nonexporting firms to believe that someone outside the firm should be responsible for proving that exporting would be successful for them (Doyle and Schommer, 1976). These kinds of observations lead to a conclusion that quality of management is an important determinant of exporting.

In a study conducted, (Perkett, 1963) exporting firms tend to be evaluated more highly than nonexporting firms regarding their product planning, advertising, research and sales administration functions. Another study indicated that exporters tended to rate their managements as being more aggressive than did nonexporters (Doyle and Schommer, 1976). As a measurement of the quality of management, managers' attitudes and activities and the firm's functions and organizational structure are compared with the accepted good management practices. Studies using this approach found that exporting firms tended to have better management than did the nonexporting firms (Tesar, 1975; Cunningham and Spiegel, 1978; Bilkey and Tesar, 1978).

2.1.7. Export Pricing Policies

Pricing policies play a major part in determining returns from the market. E.Mustafa studied the planning and implementing a pricing strategy for export activity.

His study rejects the use of the full costing method

for export pricing in developing nations. The formula for full cost pricing is to determine the direct cost of manufacturing the product and to add a mark up to cover an appropriate share of overhead costs plus a fair margin that will yield an adequate return on investment. He argues that the use of direct costing combined with the differential cost approach will help to establish a floor price which will lead to profit maximization.

In the method of direct costing, variable costs seem to establish a floor price for any export pricing decision in the short run. Any amount received above the floor price, would contribute toward covering fixed costs and the realization of profit. The maximum price is not a matter of cost but a matter of competition and extent of demand.

In differential (incremental) cost method, income statement is prepared by comparing firm operations with exports, with firm operations without exports (M.Mustafa, 1978). Revenues that emerge from export decisions should be matched against additional (incremental) costs which are necessary to produce that revenue, if the decision maker is to evaluate the profitability of export decisions.

Regarding export pricing methods, emphasis is on the demand determination of prices rather than relying only on cost concepts. On market oriented prices, the importance of detailed investigation of the market is emphasized. In some markets the product may be recently introduced, in others it can be well established but may be facing severe competition.

T.Cannon (1980) indicates that the variety of circumstances suggests that some degree of price differentiation by market rather than global price structure modified solely

by cost factors, will earn the greatest returns. In the survey done by Nigel Piercy (1981) group of exporters used cost plus pricing methods accounted for 51 % of the total, but this was almost equalled in size by the group of companies pricing primarily to market, customer and competitive requirements.

2.1.8. Market Concentration v.s. Diversification

Market concentration is characterized by a slow and gradual rate of growth in the number of markets served. Market diversification is characterized by a fast rate of growth in the number of markets served at the early stages of expansion. A product market analysis and the determination of goals and resources of firm are thought to be useful in the selection of a competitive market expansion strategy. Hirsch and Lev (1971) found that market concentration was more suitable to risk averters.

Diversification, although it requires a higher risk, was associated with higher profitability. In a study it was found that the 40 % of the British companies interviewed sold to more than one hundred markets compared with 32 % in France and only 20 % in Germany (Cannon, 1980). In his study, Piercy (1981) found that majority of exporters deal with as many markets as they can and thus do not limit market numbers but they concentrated efforts and attention on a small number. This implies that number of markets is partly invalid as a criterian for assessing export strategy. In his effort to find a rationale for market spreading based on the perceptions of export managers, he found the dual existence of concentration and large market numbers. Other arguments that emerged as a logic for market spreading were: "market factor. including the existence of specialized product markets, and the cultivation of small markets for the future, volume

factors; including the practical need to deal with many markets to gain adequate sales volume, company factors; including the aim of safety and stability and difficulties of control and marketing factors; including low incremental costs of dealing with additional markets and the cheapness of gaining low market shares" (N.Piercy, 1981).

2.1.9. Distribution Channels

The interdependence of manufacturer and middlemen is necessary for the efficient movement of goods in many markets. The distance and alien nature of many overseas markets has created a situation in which firms selling abroad often rely more heavily on independent distributors or agents. A number of highly specialized channel members have emerged to handle the special problems of international trade. Export houses, foreign buyers resident in the country, import/export agents, export brokers, confirming houses and distributors provide a wide variety of services. In a study conducted in the U.S.A., 52 % of 330 exporting firms tended to export to their own affiliates in foreign markets (Bradshow, 1969).

The U.S.A. originated multinational firms exported 44 % of their total export sales to their affiliates in 1966. This ratio has increased to 55 % in 1970 (Barker, 1972). The interesting point here is that about half of the importers are not their own companies.

The distance involved, the lags in flow of goods, documentation and payment and the high cost of storage place physical distribution management at the centre of effective export management.

For many firms the decision to establish a direct sales presence, in a market, occurs at a relatively late

stage, after the market has been opened up by home-based sales staff (Cannon, 1980). The home-based salesmen are faced with recurrent problems of culture shock besides the particular difficulties of building up his business in the target market (Dawidson, 1970).

2.1.10. Experience in Exporting

Stage theory of gradual internationalization of a firm sees exporting as a time phased function of the experience gathered where the firm gradually increases its level of international involvement and commitment (Czinkota, 1981). Stage theory of internationalization indicates that perception differs in each stage and the experience gathered in one stage provides a basis for the next step.

Empirical evidence found by the authors, tended to confirm this incremental internationalization view (Kahn, 1978) after investigating 165 Swedish export ventures suggested seven different grouping of firms:

1. New exporters market ventures
2. Byuer initiated export market ventures
3. Carelessly planned export market ventures
4. Carefully planned export market ventures
5. Experienced export market ventures
6. Export through own sales subsidiaries
7. Export ventures located in Communist countries

Joyner and Lurie, suggested three different stages of the firm:

1. Firms selling only to firms located in the U.S.
2. Firms responding directly to inquiries or leads from abroad and making occasional shipments to foreign customers

He also found that there is a decrease in the perception of exporting problems over time and this becomes less noticeable once the firm has had more than two years of export experience. The most important problems perceived by less than two years experienced firms were communication, market information gathering and sales effort, respectively.

Beginning exporters were more motivated to export by factors like over production or declining domestic sales, whereas experienced firm, claimed that they had been motivated by planned factors like managerial urge. The study shows that changes in the exporting attitudes, motivations and perceived exporting problems are associated with the length of exporting experience.

2.2. SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL STUDIES

In this section, empirical studies regarding the variables of export initiation, motivation, firm size, export risk, export destination, pricing, management market concentration v.s. diversification, distribution channels and experience in exporting are summarized.

These factors will also be analyzed and interpreted in the field study conducted among 30 firms exporting industrial goods. The variable of export experience is taken as the main factor effecting these variables.

The firms classified in two groups regarding their export experience in terms of years, will be compared to find out the similarities and differences among them related to the variables mentioned in this chapter.

Bilkey and Tesar's research effort resulted in the finding that, when using the stages of Bilkey and Tesar, the

theory of gradual internationalization process was the most effective one in differentiating groups of firms (Czinkota and Johanson, 1981).

In the field study conducted, effectiveness of the internationalization theory will be studied defining the similarities and differences between the firms with five years of export experience and the firms having more than five years of export experience. Short of observing the development of firms in a longitudinal fashion, such internationalization stages can be discernable when grouping firms based on the length of time of their exposure to export experience.

III. FIELD STUDY ON THE EXPORT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND EXPORT BEHAVIOUR OF FIRMS

3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODTHOLOGY

In this section of the study, objectives, content and the research methodology of the field study conducted among the manufacturer of industrial export goods with a sample of 30 firms, will be presented. In the proceeding parts, the findings obtained through the field study will be described.

3.1.1. Objectives and Scope of the Research

Export policies of firms and whether gradual internationalization stages could be discernable when grouping the firms based on the length of time of their exposure to export experience constitutes the main purpose of the study.

In the light of this main objective, the topics aimed to be investigated to compare the two groups of firms which have five years of export experience and more than five years of export experience are:

1. Organizational characteristics of exporting firms
2. Motivations initiated firms to start exporting, the export development plans of firms in the near future, and the attitudes of managers regarding exporting.

3. Marketing tools applied for exporting; i.e: production, pricinig, promotion, distribution channels and communication.

4. Firm's use of market-based research; the sources they utilize and the problems firms face during their export activities; and

5. Policies regarding export behaviour. i.e. Investment, marketing export adaption and pricinig policies.

3.1.2. Data Collection Procedure and Sampling Plan

This study can be considered as a descriptive research because it aims to describe certain characteristics of less experienced and experienced exporters. It also can be regarded as a descriptive study because the objective is to determine the similarities and differences between the firms regarding their export policies thus classifying them into certain groupings.

The study was done for once without repeated measurements. It is a cross-sectional study measuring the sample of elements from the population of interest at a single point of time.

As a sampling procedure a non-probability sampling method was used where sample elements are selected on basis of judgement and non-random sampling was applied. In the non-probability design, quato and convenience sampling was utilized together. As a main data collection instrument a structured questionnaire was used which has been instructed to be answered by either export managers or other top executives as assistant general managers or general managers. Among the 38 distributed questionnaires, 30 have been returned and 30

them were totally utilized in the data analysis, indicating a response rate of 79 %. The list of firms included in the field study is given in Table 3.1.

The data was collected from the manufacturer firms of industrial export goods. Firms from other sectors have been excluded from the research in an attempt to provide a relatively homogeneous group.

The firms manufacturing and exporting industrial goods were classified in two export experience groups: Firms exporting for five or less than five years and firms exporting more than five years which were stated as less experienced and experienced firms, respectively.

The balance in the number of firms in two export experience groups has been maintained as a major aim of the sampling. Thus, firms having five or less years of experience constituted 56.7 percent and firms having more than five years of experience 43.3 percent of the total number of firms.

As it was mentioned in the previous sections, the share of agricultural products in total exports have been 57.4 % in 1980. This figure clearly shows us the importance the agricultural products have played in our total exports and structure of our export policy where agricultural products constitute more than half of the total export value. This situation changed drastically throughout the years of 1981, 1982 and 1983. The share of industrial goods in total exports increased to 48.8 %, 59.7 % and 63.9 % respectively. According to the figures of 1984, the share of industrial goods to total exports have reached a value of 74 % (1st. Chamber of Commerce, 1984). This figure confirms the importance of industrial goods in our exports. Because of this importance, only the export behaviour of the manufacturers of industrial

goods which export their products to foreign markets are examined. The type of goods manufactured and the goods exported by the firms included in the field study are as follows:

TABLE 3.1. THE PRODUCTS MANUFACTURED AND EXPORTED BY THE FIRMS CONTACTED IN THE FIELD SURVEY

NAME OF FIRM	MANUFACTURED	EXPORTED
Arçelik A.Ş.	White goods compresors	White goods
BASF Sümerbank Türk Kimya San. A.Ş.	Chemicals	Chemicals
CANKURTARAN HOLDING A.Ş.	Home appliances Chemicals Shoes	Home appliances Shoes
ASİL ÇELİK A.Ş.	Steel	Steel
Plastel Plastik ve Kauçuk Sanayi A.Ş.	Artificial leather Floor covering Plastify, stabilizer Styrophor, Aggricultural drugs Jeep glass, bath curtain	Artificial leather Floor covering Plastify, Stabilizer Bath curtain
Atabay Kimya San. ve Tic.A.Ş.	Drugs and drug raw materials	Drugs and drug raw material
Bakırsan Bakır Sanayi Mamulleri ve Ticaret A.Ş.	Electrolitic copper wires	Electrolitic copper wires
Farglas Kimyevi Maddeler Sanayi A.Ş.	Acrylic sheets Acrylic granules Thinner	Acrylic sheets
Istanbul Segman ve Gömlek Sanayi A.Ş.	Ring, sleeve	Ring, sleeve
Ardem Pişirici ve Isıtıcı Cihazlar San. A.Ş.	Ovens, Cookers	Ovens
Tozmetal Tic. ve San. A.Ş.		
Büro San. A.Ş.	Precition Instruments	Precition Instruments.

NAME OF FIRM	MANUFACTURED	EXPORTED
Ege Kimya A.Ş.	Industrial Chemicals	Ind. Chemicals
Beytes Karacabey Gıda San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Tomato Paste	Tomato Paste
Sunjüt Sun'i Jüt San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Polypropylene bag Polypropylene strip	Polypropylene bag
Topkim-Topkapı İlaç Premiks San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Veterinery drugs Feed, feed additives	Feed Feed additives
Kavi Kablo ve Emaye Bobin Teli San. A.Ş.	Enamel insulated copper wire, cables conductors	Enamel insulated copper wire
Çuhadaroğlu Alüminyum San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Aluminium Construction materials	Aluminium construction materials
Bekoteknik San. A.Ş.	Television, radio, mini set, video, cash register	Television
Tat Konserve San. A.Ş.	Tomatopaste Canned food	Tomatopaste
Izocam Tic. ve San. A.Ş.	Fiberglass, Styrophor	Fiberglass
Mutlu Akü Malzemeleri San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Batteries Antimony	Batteries Antimony
Nasaş Aluminyum San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Processed Aluminium	Processed aluminium
Kordsa Kord Bezi San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Conveyor band Industrial bands	Conveyor band Industrial band
Uniroyal Endüstri Türk A.Ş.	Vehicle tires and tubes	Tires and tubes
İvaliz Holding A.Ş.	Special chemicals PVA kinds alkid resins Softeners	Special chemicals PVA kinds alkid resins Softeners
Pabalk Ticaret ve Perlit San. A.Ş.	Perlite	Perlite
Arıkol Aerosol Ambalaj San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Aluminium tubes for drugs and cosmetics Aerosols	Aluminium tubes for cosmetics, Aerosols

NAME OF FIRM	MANUFACTURED	EXPORTED
Haznedar Ateş Tuğla Sanayi A.Ş.	Firebricks, isolation bricks, fire concrete Fireclay	Firebricks
Türk Demir Döküm Fabrikaları A.Ş.	Radiator, stove	Radiator

3.1.3. Method of Analysis

The data was obtained through mail questionnaire. It was a structured questionnaire with the response categories and undisquised since the respondents were easily able to know the purpose of the study. Questions were presented exactly in the same order and with the same wording to all respondents to provide standardization and comparability. The questions were mainly of multiple choice type and responses as well as questions were standardized. Thus, fixed alternative questions in which responses are limited to stated alternatives were utilized. It has the advantage such that the subject who has no opinion still was forced to answer one of the alternatives.

In the following part, the questionnaire design and the variables used will be explained.

3.1.3.1. Variables Utilized and Their Operational Measures

There were three sections in the questionnaire. The first section attempted to find out the organizational composition of firms. The variables studied here were:

Domestic market experience (Question 2)
Number of employees (Question 3)
Sales volume (Question 4)
Capital Investment (Question 5)

Export Experience (Question 6)
Continuity in exporting (Question 7)
Export Sales Growth Rate (Question 8)
Exports to Total Sales Ratio (Question 9)
Export Profit to Total Profit Ratio (Question 10)
Unit Responsible for Export Activities (Question 11)
Export Personnel's Demographic Profile in terms of Sex, Age, and Education (Question 12).

In the second section, five variables were utilized:

Motivations to Start Exporting (Question 1)

Respondents were asked to rank from first to seventh among the given alternatives of profit; expansion and growth with access to new markets; excess capacity; overproduction utilization; government incentives; declining domestic sales; competitive pressures.

Objectives in Exporting Today (Question 2)

Respondents were asked to rank the given alternatives. These were; to earn maximum long-run profit; to earn maximum short-run profit; to sell as much as possible; to gain highest possible market share; to sell surplus capacity not consumed in domestic market.

Level of Confidence with the Export Product/Products of the Company (Question 3)

This question consists of a set of characteristics of export product or products. The degree of confidence in each characteristics was measured by Likert scale which was presented in three categories as high, medium and low.

Competition Faced in Foreign Markets (Question 4)

An ordinal categorized scale was used. The categories were: very high, quite high, same as in domestic market, less than the domestic market.

Attitudes Toward Exporting (Question 5)

Twelve attitudinal exporting statements which were gathered through a review of literature and Czinkota (1981) had been administered. Likert scale of agreement was employed for responses as strongly agree, quite agree, disagree, strongly disagree.

In the third and last section, the export activities and behaviour of firms qere investigated:

Comparison of Production for Domestic Market and for Export Sales (Question 1)

The difference and similarity of products for domestic market and for exports were investigated in terms of production. Ordinal categorized scale was used. The categories were as follows: export product; same as produced for domestic market, revised partially according to needs and inquines of foreign customers, and manufactured primarily for export.

Marketing Mix Elements of Export Product/s as Compared to Domestic Sales (Question 3)

The Comparison of products for export and for domestic markets were analyzed in terms of packing, pricing, advertising, transportation, marketing research and distribution channels. A Likert scale was used with the categories of very different; quite different; quite undifferent; not different at all.

Export Channels (Question 5)

Respondents were asked to choose among seven alternatives with the possibility of answering more than one. Ordinal categorized scale was utilezed.

Principle Export Markets (Question 6)

Respondents were asked to rank their principle export markets in terms of their export sales volume.

Face to Face Contacts With Foreign Customers (Question 8)

Ordinal categorized scale was used for determination of frequency of face-to-face contacts with foreign customers. The categories were once a week, once a month, a few times a year, once a year, once a few years.

Investment for Exporting (Question 9)

It was utilized for investigating the type of investment for exporting whether it is for reduction of costs or development of product. Ordinal categorized scale was used.

Marketing Policy in Exporting (Question 10)

Ordinal categorized scale was used with the alternatives of market concentration and market diversification (spreading) to determine the marketing policy of firms in exporting.

Export Adaption Process (Question 11)

Export adaption process of firms were investigated by asking the respondents to select from two general decision processes; the one which most nearly represented that of his firm's, when it made export adaption process. These processes represented innovative adaption and problem oriented adaption processes.

Helpfullness of the foreign country factors investigated before exporting (Question 12)

Likert scale was used to determine the degree of perceived helpfullness in investigating foreign country factors with the categories of very helpful, quite helpful, less helpful, not helpful at all.

Use of Market Research Instruments (Question 13)

The frequency in the use of market research instruments was analyzed by a Likert scale, with the categories of; always, frequently, sometimes, never.

Importance of Financial Resources of Exporting Firms (Question 14)

The use of financial resources was measured in a Likert scale of importance. Very important, quite important, quite unimportant, not important.

Problems in Exporting (Question 15)

The density of the problems faced by exporting firms were measures in a Likert scale with the categories of too much, quite a lot, quite less, no problem.

Pricing Policy Used in Exporting (Question 16)

The pricing methods used by exporting firms qere investigated in ordinal categorized scale. The respondents were asked to select either cost oriented or market oriented pricing methods.

Preferences for International Involvement other than Exporting (Question 17)

Respondents were asked to rank their preferences for

international involvement other then exporting.

3.1.3.2. Statistical Methods of Analysis Utilized

SPSS (Statistical Package Programm for Social Sciences) has been used for investigation of export development process in terms of years of experience. In order to analyze the relations between variables, subprograms like frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, t test analysis and spearman rank correlations were employed.

The table below summarizes the kind of analysis conducted on the data to test the differences and similarities among firms in terms of the listed variables.

TABLE 3.2. RELATIONS TO BE TESTED AND KIND OF ANALYSIS UTILIZED

Variables Studied to Compare Less and More Experienced Firms	Type of Analysis
Organizational Characteristics	Crosstabulation
Motivations to Start Exporting	Spearman rank
Objectives in Exporting Today	Spearman rank
Level of confidence in the export product/s	T test
Competition in foreign markets	Crosstabulation
Attitudes toward exporting	T test
Production for export sales and for domestic market	Crosstabulation
Marketing mix elements of export product/s	T test
Export Channels	Crosstabulation
Principle Export market	Crosstabulation
Face to face contacts with foreign customers	Crosstabulation
Investment for exporting	Crosstabulation
Marketing Policies in exporting	Crosstabulation
Export Adaption Process	Crosstabulation

Helpfulness of foreign country factors investigated before exporting	T test
Use of market Research Instruments	T test
Importance of financial resources of exporting firms	T test
Problems in exporting	T test
Pricing Policies	Crosstabulation
Preferences for International involvement other than exporting	Spearman rank

3.2. RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this second part of chapter three, the results of the field study will be submitted. In this study, first, the summary findings will be reviewed. Findings related to the comparison of industrial goods manufacturing firms, exporting for more than five years and the ones exporting for less than five years, will succeed summary findings.

3.2.1. Summary Findings on Variables Studied

The results of the frequency analysis applied on the data will be cited in the form of tables. Each table will have a short explanation below it.

TABLE 3.3. ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FIRMS

Variables	Number of Firms	Percent
Domestic Market Experience (Question 2 in section I)		
1-12 years	9	30.0
13-24 years	11	36.7
25 and above	10	33.3
	30	100.0

Employment (Question 3 in section I)		
0-250	15	50.0
251-999	8	26.7
1000 and above	7	23.3
	30	100.0
Total Sales Volume (Question 4 in section I)		
0-5.999.999.999.- TL	16	55.2
6.000.000.000.-TL-15.000.000.000.-TL	7	24.1
More than 15.000.000.000.- TL	6	20.7
	29	100.0
Capital Investment (Question 5 in section I)		
0-500.000.000 TL	16	55.2
500.000.001-1.000.000.000.- TL	4	13.8
More than 1.000.000.000.- TL	9	31.0
	29	100.0
Export Experience (Question 6 in section I)		
0-5 years	17	56.7
More than five years	13	43.3
	30	100.0
Continuity en Exporting (Question 7 in section I)		
Continous	23	76.7
Sporadic	7	23.3
	30	100.0
Rate of Increase in Exports (Question 8 in section I)		
0-30 %	14	46.7
31 %-99 %	9	30.0
More than 99 %	7	23.3
	30	100.0
Exports to Total Sales Ratio (Question 9 in section I)		
0-14 %	14	46.7
15 % -29 %	9	30.0
More than 29 %	7	23.3
	30	100.0

Export Profit to Total Profit Ratio (Question 10 in Section I)		
None	1	3.3
Less than 10 %	14	46.7
10 %-20 %	8	26.7
21 %-40 %	5	16.7
41 %-65 %	1	3.3
More than 65 %	1	3.3
	30	100.0
Unit Responsible for Export Activities (Question 11 in section I)		
Special Exporting Department	15	36.6
Sales/marketing department	5	12.2
Owner/principal/vice president handles	9	21.9
Exprot Trading company assists	12	29.3
	41	100.0
Export Personnel Distribution: (Question 12 in section I)		
In Terms of Sex:		
Male	57	77.1
Female	17	22.9
	74	100.0
In Terms of Education:		
Business Administration	30	40.6
Economics	16	21.6
Engineer	11	14.8
High school	17	23.0
	74	100.0
In Terms of Age:		
20-25 years	12	16.3
26-35 years	47	63.5
36 and more	15	20.2
	74	100.0

As seen from the above table, distribution of organizational composition and characteristics were quite balanced across subcategories. Firms were divided evenly in regard to their domestic market experience. Relatively new established, experienced and old firms with more than 25 years of experience were about at the same numbers.

Balance against subcategories is seen will also in

export experience. 56 % of firms were found to have less than five years of experience and 43 % with more than five years of experience.

TABLE 3.4. RANKING OF MOTIVATIONS TO START EXPORTING
(Question 1 in Section II)

Motivations	Choice as First Important Motivation		Choice as Second Important Motivation		Choice as Third Important Motivation	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Profit	2	6.9	4	20.0	2	14.3
Expansion and growth with new markets	13	44.8	4	20.0	2	14.3
Excess capacity	5	17.2	4	20.0	1	7.1
Overproduction utilization	2	6.9	3	15.0	2	14.3
Government incentives	2	6.9	2	10.0	4	28.6
Declining domestic sales	3	10.3	2	10.0	2	14.3
Competitive Pressures	2	6.9	1	5.0	1	7.1
	29	100.0	20	100.0	14	100.0

As seen from the above table, the majority of firms declared "expansion and growth through new foreign markets" as their first important motivation to start exporting. Excess capacity constituted the next important factor regarding their choice of first important motivation. There was no one high concentration among firms for the ranking of motivations as their second important choice, although profit, expansion and excess capacity were equally mentioned. With the ratio of 28.6, firms declared government incentives as their third important motivation to start exporting.

TABLE 3.5. RANKING OF OBJECTIVES IN EXPORTING TODAY
(Question 2 in Section II)

Motivations	Choice as First Important Motivation		Chdice as Second Important Motivation		Choice as Third Important Motivation	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
To earn max. long-run profit	12	40.0	5	38.5	-	-
To earn max. short-run profit	1	3.3	-	-	-	-
To sell as much as possible	9	30.0	-	-	-	-
To gain highest passible market share	5	16.7	5	38.5	3	75
To sell surplus capacity not taken in domestic market	3	10.0	3	23.1	1	25
	30	100.0	13	100.0	4	100.0

The majority of firms as seen in the above table, ranked the motivation of "earning max profit in the long run" as their first important choice among four other alternatives. Less than the above mentioned group but still a high portion of firms stated "selling as much as possible" as their first important choice of motivation for exporting today.

TABLE 3.6. LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE IN THE EXPORT PRODUCT/S
(Question 3 in Section II)

	High		Medium		Low			
Characteristics	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	Mean*	Variance
High technology	16	57.1	8	28.6	4	14.3	2.429	.550
Low cost	7	25.0	13	46.4	8	28.6	1.964	.554
Unique Product	2	8.0	8	32.0	15	60.0	1.480	.427
High Capacity	14	51.9	13	48.1	-	-	2.519	.259
High Quality	18	64.3	9	32.1	1	3.6	2.607	.321
After Sale Service	10	55.6	3	16.7	5	27.8	2.278	.801

*Means are related to a scale where
1=low 2=medium 3=high

High technology, high production capacity and high quality were the main characteristics in which firms have considerable amount of confidence. However, almost all the firms did not see their export product/s as unique, which implies that they face severe competition in foreign markets as it is a more complex market.

TABLE 3.7. COMPETITION IN FROEIGN MARKETS
(Question 4 in Section II)

Competition in the Foreign Market is:	No	Percent
Much higher than domestic market	18	60.0
Quite higher than domestic market	10	33.4
Same as domestic market	1	3.3
Less than domestic market	1	3.3
	30	100.0

Competition foced in foreign markets was found to be much higher than in domestic market as seen from the score of 60 %.

TABLE 3.8. ATTITUDES TOWARD EXPORTING
(Question 5 in Section II)

Attitudinal Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean*	Variance
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent		
1. Exporting is a desirable task for my firm	19	63.3	9	30.0	-	-	2	6.7	1.500	.672
2. My firm has no specific export policy	3	10.0	4	13.3	16	53.3	7	23.3	2.9	.783
3. My firm has exportable products	25	83.3	5	16.7	-	-	-	-	1.167	.144
4. Exports could make a major contribution to my firm's growth	25	83.3	5	16.7	-	-	-	-	1.167	.144
5. My firm is not actively exploring the possibility of exporting	6	20.0	12	40	7	23.3	5	16.7	2.367	.999
6. Export profits have fully met my expectations	12	40.0	14	46.7	2	6.7	2	6.7	1.8	.717
7. Exporting is no different from doing business locally	2	6.7	4	13.3	8	46.7	16	53.3	3.267	.892
8. Exports do not make major contribution to my firm's profits	5	16.7	14	46.7	9	30.0	2	6.7	2.267	.685
9. My firm do not plan to increase its exports in the near future	6	20.0	1	3.3	11	36.7	12	40.0	2.967	1.275
10. My firm is actively planning for exporting	17	56.7	12	40.0	-	-	1	3.3	1.500	.466
11. Exporting is more risky than domestic market	6	20.0	11	36.7	8	26.7	5	16.7	2.4	1.007
12. My firm always tries to fulfill export orders	17	56.7	10	33.3	3	10.0	-	-	1.533	.464

*Means are related to a scale where values are:

Majority of firms stated "exporting as a desirable task" with 93 % total score of strongly agree and agree levels and mostly believed that "they have a specified export policy" with a percentage of 53.3.

All firms agreed that they have "exportable products" derived from a compiled score of strongly agree and agree levels. Although firms quite strongly agreed that "export could make a major contribution to the firms growth" (83.3 %) agreement appears to be somewhat less regarding the "contribution of export to the profits".

Firms did not believe much that "they are actively exploring the possibility of exporting". 60 % of firms believed in insufficient exploration. Profit gained by export activities of firms occurred to be at expected levels as derived from a compiled agreement score of 86.7 % for the statement of "export profits have fully met my expectations".

Firms strongly disagreed with the statement of "exporting is no different from doing business locally", with the strongly disagreement percentage of 53.3 but in terms of the statement of "exporting is more risky than domestic market, agreement reached only to a level of 36.7 %. Firms did not seem to have very high confidence for their exploration of the possibilities of exporting (Statement 5).

76.7 % of firms declared that they plan to increase their exports in near future derived from a compiled score of disagreement levels for the statement of "my firm do not plan to increase its exports in the near future. 56.7 % of firms strongly agreed with the statement of" my firm is actively planning for exporting.

Firms believed that they mostly try to fulfill export

orders as seen from 56.7 % strongly agree and 33.3 % agree levels (Statement 12).

TABLE 3.9. COMPARISON OF PRODUCTION OF EXPORT PRODUCT/S WITH THE PRODUCTS FOR DOMESTIC MARKETS (Question 1 in Section III)

Export Product/s	No	Percent
Same as produced for domestic market	13	43.3
Revised partially according to needs and inquiries of foreign customers	13	43.3
Manufactured primarily for export	4	13.4
	30	100.0

Only 13 percent of firms stated that they manufacture primarily for export. Firms exporting the same product produced for domestic market and firms exporting partially revised products appeared to be at equal percentages.

TABLE 3.10. MARKETING MIX ELEMENTS OF EXPORT PRODUCT AS COMPARED TO DOMESTIC SALES (Question 3 in Section III)

	Completely Different		Quite Different		Not much Different		Not Different			
Variables	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	Mean*	Variance
Packing	6	20.0	6	20.0	11	36.7	7	23.3	2.367	1.130
Pricing	12	40.0	13	43.3	5	16.7	-	-	3.233	.530
Advertising	8	32.0	4	16.0	5	20.0	8	32.0	2.480	1.591
Transport	11	36.7	5	17.9	9	32.1	3	10.7	2.857	1.164
Market Research	15	53.6	6	21.4	4	14.3	3	10.7	3.179	1.115
Distribution Channel	15	57.7	5	19.7	2	7.7	4	15.4	3.192	1.282

Marketing research and distribution channels were among the highly differentiated variables with "completely different" percentages of 53.6 and 57.7 respectively. Firms stated that they utilize somewhat different transportation in export and in domestic markets whereas in advertising systems this difference found to be less. Packing was the most undifferentiated element between both markets.

TABLE 3.11. EXPORT CHANNELS
(Question 5 in Section III)

	No	Percent
Export to foreign manufacturer for use as a component	15	28.8
Exprot to foreign manufacturer who labels and sells	5	9.6
Export directly to foreign retailers	2	3.8
Export directly to foreign final users/governments	10	19.2
Export directly to foreign distributors/ agents	8	15.4
Sell to export trading companies who in turn exports	12	23.2
	52	100.0

As it is seen from the above table, firms mostly indicated that they export to foreign manufacturers for use as an input to production and mostly sell to export trading companies who in turn exports. The least frequently observed distribution channel was exporting directly to foreign retailers.

TABLE 3.12. PRINCIPLE EXPORT MARKETS
(Question 6 in Section III)

			First Important		Second Important		Third Important	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
European Countries	14	19.1	6	20.0	5	17.2	3	13.6
Iran	18	24.6	7	23.3	10	34.5	1	4.5
Iraq	19	26.5	11	36.7	5	17.2	3	13.6
S.Arabia	3	4.1	1	3.3	1	3.4	1	4.5
Egypt	1	1.3	-	-	-	-	1	4.5
Lebanon	2	2.7	-	-	1	3.4	1	4.5
Libya	5	6.8	1	3.3	3	10.3	1	4.5
Jordan	5	6.8	-	-	1	3.4	4	18.2
Syria	4	5.4	1	3.3	1	3.4	2	9.1
Algeria	2	2.7	1	3.3	1	3.4	-	-
	73	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	17	100.0

The main export markets were Iraq, Iran and European Countries respectively.

Egypt and Algeria were stated as the least frequently exported markets. Firms stated Iraq as their first important export market and Iran as their second important market. Jordan was found to have highest percentage (18.2 percent) in third important export market category.

TABLE 3.13. FREQUENCY OF FACE-TO-FACE CONTACTS WITH FOREIGN CUSTOMERS
(Question 8 in Section III)

	No	Percent
Once a week	2	6.7
Once a month	3	10.0
A few times a year	20	66.6
Once a year	5	16.7
Once a few years	-	-
	30	100.0

Majority of firms stated their contacts with foreign customers as "a few a times a year".

TABLE 3.14. INVESTMENTS FOR EXPORTING
(Question 9 in Section III)

	No	Percent
For reduction of costs	8	26.7
For Development of Product and increasing technological know-how	14	46.6
Two of the aboves	5	16.7
No investment	3	10.0
	30	100.0

Firms which make investment for exporting prefered to make such investments for the development of product and increasing technological know-how.

TABLE 3.15. MARKETING POLICIES IN EXPORTING
(Question 10 in Section III)

	No	Percent
Market concentration	13	43.3
Market diversification	17	56.7
	30	100.0

Market expansion strategies were analyzed as a selection of concentration versus diversification strategy. Market concentration is characterized by a slow and gradual rate of growth in the number of markets served. The opposing strategy of diversification is characterized by a fast rate of growth in the number of markets served.

Distribution of marketing policies were quite balanced across the two sub-categories.

TABLE 3.16. EXPORT ADAPTION PROCESS
(Question 11 in Section III)

	No	Percent
Innovation oriented adaption process	17	56.7
Problem oriented adaption process	13	43.3
	30	100.0

Alternative adaption processes are problem oriented and innovation oriented (Lee and Brasch, 1978). In problem oriented process, the initiating force is one or a combination of interrelated problems such as mature product, increased competition within domestic market.

In innovation-oriented adaption, the initiating force is either precise knowledge of the existance of market oppurtunity in a foreign market or gaining technological knowledge of exporting.

There was no concentration in one of the processes. Firms were almost equally divided among two export adaption policies.

TABLE 3.17. HELPFULNESS OF THE FOREIGN COUNTRY FACTORS INVESTIGATED BEFORE EXPORTING (Question 12 in Section III)

	Very Helpful		Quite Helpful		Quite Unhelpful		Not Helpful at all			
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Per-cent	Mean*	Variance
Competing Products	20	74.1	3	11.1	4	14.8	-	-	3.593	.558
Foreign and Turkish Competing Firms	13	52.0	8	32.0	3	12.0	1	4.0	3.320	.727
Existing Potential Customers	16	57.1	10	35.7	2	7.1	-	-	3.500	.407
General Market and Trade Structure of the Country	15	51.7	12	41.4	2	6.9	-	-	3.448	.399
General Economic Structure of Country	8	27.6	18	62.1	2	6.9	1	3.4	3.138	.480
Price Research	21	72.4	5	17.2	3	10.3	-	-	3.621	.458

*Mean scale values are 4=very helpful, 3=quite helpful, 2=quite unhelpful 1=not helpful at all.

Price research and competing products were perceived as very helpful among the firms. For all foreign country factors, except "general economic structure of country" more than 50 percent of firms stated that they find them very helpful to investigate. Only "general economic structure of country" was perceived as quite helpful instead of very helpful.

TABLE 3.18. USE OF MARKET RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS
(Question 13 in Section III)

Market Research Instruments	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Means*	Variance
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent		
Export Development and Evaluation Organization (Igeme)	5	17.9	3	10.7	10	35.7	10	35.7	2.107	1.210
Chamber of Commerce and Industry	3	10.7	8	28.6	13	46.4	4	14.3	2.357	.757
Commercial Banks	-	-	2	7.1	10	35.7	16	57.1	1.500	.407
Visits to Foreign Markets	6	20.7	13	44.8	10	34.5	-	-	2.862	.552
Export Trading Firms	8	26.7	13	43.3	6	20.0	3	10.0	2.867	.878
Foreign Trade Committees Visiting Turkey	1	3.6	5	17.9	15	53.6	7	25.0	2.000	.593
Commerce attaches	2	7.1	4	14.3	15	53.6	7	25.0	2.036	.702
Trade Fairs	3	10.0	12	40.0	9	30.0	6	20.0	2.400	.869
Foreign and National Statistics	4	14.3	7	25.0	13	46.4	4	14.3	2.393	.840

*Mean scale values are: 4=always, 3=frequently, 2=sometimes, 1=never

Export trading firms and visits to foreign markets were the most utilized market research instruments. Whereas least utilized sources for market research were banks and foreign trade committees visiting Turkey.

TABLE 3.19. IMPORTANCE OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF EXPORTING FIRMS (Question 14 in Section III)

	Very Import.		Quite Import.		Quite Unimport.		Not Import. at all			
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	Mean*	Variance
Central Bank Sources	13	46.4	6	21.4	6	21.4	3	10.7	3.036	1.147
Firms' own Sources	14	46.7	12	40.0	4	13.3	-	-	3.333	.506
Foreign Bank or Financial Institution Credits	4	16.7	5	20.8	4	16.7	11	45.8	2.083	1.384
Importers' Soruces	3	13.0	1	4.3	6	26.1	13	56.5	1.739	1.111

*Mean values are as follows: 4=very important, 3=quite important, 4=quite unimportant, 1=not important at all.

Central Bank and firms' own resources were the most utilized and important financial resources. Firms perceived importers' resources and foreign bank or institution credits as not important. Thus inner financial sources were much more important compared to outer resources for exporting firms.

TABLE 3.20. PRICING POLICIES USED IN EXPORTING (Question 16 in Section III)

	No	Percent
Cost oriented price	5	16.7
Market oriented price	25	83.3
	30	100.0

Price differentiation by market rather than global price structure modified solely by cost factors was the most implemented pricing method with the ratio of 83.3 percent firms implementing the policy.

TABLE 3.21. PROBLEMS IN EXPORTING
(Question 15 in Section III)

	Very Import.		Quite Import.		Quite Unimport.		Not Import. at all			
Problems	No		No		No		No		Means*	
Product Adaption	1	3.7	4	14.8	12	44.4	10	37.1	1.852	.670
Promotion	4	7.7	3	11.5	12	46.2	9	34.6	1.923	.794
Information Collection on Export Procedures	4	14.3	5	17.9	2	46.4	1	21.4	2.250	.935
Market Research	4	14.8	12	44.4	8	29.6	3	11.1	2.630	.781
Communication	2	7.1	6	21.4	15	53.6	5	17.9	2.179	.671
Transport	5	17.9	4	14.3	13	46.4	6	21.4	2.286	1.026
Documentation	3	10.7	7	25.0	9	32.1	9	32.1	2.143	1.016
Finance	6	20.0	13	43.3	7	23.3	4	13.3	2.700	.907
Packing	4	13.8	5	17.2	11	37.9	9	31.0	2.138	1.052
Pricing	6	20.7	12	41.4	9	31.0	2	6.9	2.759	.761
Freight Determination	5	17.2	4	13.8	11	37.9	9	31.0	2.172	1.148
Economic and Political Problems in Foreign Markets	6	22.2	11	40.7	9	33.3	1	3.7	2.815	.695
Changes in Government Incentives	6	21.4	15	53.6	5	17.9	2	7.1	2.893	.692
After Sales Service	1	3.8	4	15.4	6	23.1	15	57.7	1.654	.795

*Mean Scale values are: 4=very important, 2=quite important, 2=quite unimportant, 1=not important at all.

Market research, finance, pricing, changes in government incentives and political/economic problems in foreign markets were stated as the most important problem areas.

After scale service, product adaption, promotion, packing were presented as the least important problem areas in exporting.

TABLE 3.22. RANKING OF PREFERENCES FOR INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT OTHER THAN EXPORTING (Question 17 in Section III)

International Involvement Types	First Preference No	First Preference Percent	Second Preference No	Second Preference Percent	Third Preference No	Third Preference Percent
To be representative of multinational firm in Turkey	2	7.7	1	5.3	5	27.8
To have patent or licence agreement	4	15.4	7	36.8	2	11.1
To make an investment in Turkey together with foreign firm	11	42.3	5	26.3	4	22.2
To make an investment together with a foreign firm in his country	6	23.1	2	10.5	4	22.2
To make an investment with a foreign firm in a third country	3	11.5	4	21.1	3	16.7
	26	100.0	19	100.9	18	100.0

The most striking accumalation of firms in their first choice among the alternatives for the types of international involvement other than exporting, was seen at the statement of making investment in Turkey with a foreign firm. As their second preference, 36.8 percent of firms want to have patent or licence agreement. In the third preference group, firms prefer more to be a representative of multinational firm in Turkey compared to other alternatives.

3.2.2. Findings Related to the Comparison of Less Experienced and Experienced Firms in Terms of Various Export Activities

Various approaches have been encountered for attempting to understand the reasons when and why firms begin to export and expand their export operations. Approach to exporting as a time phased function of the experience gathered is one of the widely encountered approaches.

Bilkey and Tesar; 1979, divided export development process of firms into six stages in terms of firms' management experience in exporting. Joyner and Lurie, suggested three stages of experience based on foreign customers of firms in exporting. Kahn, 1978, presented and analyzed firms based on their export venture stages. Chzinkota, 1981, in his research, segmented the firms into four levels of export experience groups; 1 to 2, 3 to 5, 6 to 10 and over ten years of export experience.

In this chapter, findings related to the comparison of firms in terms of their various export activities will be presented. Firms are divided into two categories regarding their years of experience in export activities, which are classified as firms with five years of export experience namely "less experienced and firms with more than five years of export experience namely "experienced" firms.

Characteristics and associations between two groups interms of various export activities will be presented herein under.

3.2.2.1. Export Experience and Organizational Characteristics

The comparison of organizational composition of firms with respect to years of experience in exporting is presented in Table 3.23. Thus characteristics of firms associated with the exposure to export experience are examined.

TABLE 3.23. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Variables	Less exper. n= (%)	Experienced n= (%)	$\chi^2_{calc.}$	d.f	α	cc/cv
1) Domestic Market Experience						
a. ≦12 years	41.2	23.0	0.36	2	NS	.11
b. 13-24 years	29.4	38.5				
c. ≧25 years	29.4	38.5				
2) Total Employment						
a. ≦250	52.9	46.2	0.72	2	NS	0.15
b. 251-999	29.4	23.1				
c. ≧1000 and above	17.7	30.8				
3) Total Sales Volume						
a. <6 billion TL	62.5	46.2	1.52	2	NS	.22
b. 6 B-15 B TL	25.0	23.1				
c. >15 billion TL	12.5	30.8				
4) Capital Investment						
a. <500 million TL	68.8	38.5	2.97	2	NS	.31
b. 500 m-1 billion TL	12.5	15.4				
c. >1 Billion TL	18.8	46.2				
5) Continuity in Exporting						
a. Continious	70.6	84.6	0.33	1	NS	.16
b. Sporadic	29.4	15.4				

TABLE 3.23. Cont.

Variables	Less exper. n= (%)	Experienced n= (%)	$\chi^2_{calc.}$	d.f	α	cc/cv
6) Rate of Increase in Exports						
a. ≦30 %	41.2	53.8	0.88	2	NS	.17
b. 31%-99%	23.5	38.5				
c. >99 %	35.3	7.7				
7) Export/Total Sales						
a. ≦14 %	41.2	53.8	1.58	2	NS	.22
b. 15 %-29 %	47.1	7.7				
c. >29 %	11.8	38.5				
8) Export Profit/Total Profit						
a. <10 %	52.9	46.1	0.52	2	NS	0.13
b. 10 %-20 %	17.6	38.5				
c. >20 %	29.5	15.4				
9) Export Activities Handle by:						
a. Export/sales dept.	48.1	50.0	0.22	2	NS	.10
b. General Directorate	25.9	14.3				
c. Export Trading Company Assists	26.0	35.7				
10) Export Personnel						
a. <4 persons	76.5	69.2	0.04	1	NS	.04
b. ≧4 person	23.5	30.8				
11) Education of Export Personnel						
a. Business Adm.	32.4	48.6	1.16	3	NS	.12
b. Economy	29.7	13.5				
c. Engineering	21.6	8.2				
d. High school	16.3	29.7				

TABLE 3.23. Cont.

Variables	Less exper. n= (%)	Experienced n= (%)	$\chi^2_{calc.}$	d.f.	α	cc/cv
12) Sex of Export Personnel						
a. Female	21.6	24.3	0.01	1	NS	.01
b. Male	78.4	75.7				
13) Age of Export Personnel						
a. 20-25	16.2	16.2	0.01	2	NS	.01
b. 26-35	62.2	64.9				
c. ≧36	21.6	18.9				

D.F. is degrees of freedom

α is significance level

NS is an abreviation for indicating that data is insignificant at a value greater than 0.10

cv/cc is Cramer's V or contingency coefficient which indicates the strength of association in case rows not equal to columns and rows equal to columns respectively.

Table 3.23 shows that organizational characteristics do not create differences since no statistically significant association was found between less experienced and experienced firms regarding their organizational characteristics.

Those firms with at most five years of export experience have the following characteristics:

They are in general newly founded firms with less than 13 years of experience in domestic market, whereas experienced exporters mostly have domestic experience greater than 13 years. They have less capital investment; The rate of increase in exports is small although considerable percent of less experienced firms (35.3%) have an increase rate of more than 99 %. This group constitutes the firms which have just started

exporting thus resulting at a high increase rate. Their export sales to total sales ratio mostly is in between 15-29 percent although a very small portion of experienced exporters fall to this range. This group have either a high export sales to total sales ratio or a quite low export volume as a percentage of total sales volume which may happen because firms also having a very high domestic sales value is bounded to have a Low export to total sales ratio because of the high value of domestic sales. The profits gained from exporting is small and the export activities are handled by export/sales department. The number of personnel responsible from export activities is less than 4. Mostly they employ male, young and business administration educated personnel. However, these relationships are neither significant nor appear to be strong, implying that years of export experience is not a good predictor of organizational characteristics of exporting firms.

In classifying firms in terms of years of experience in export activities, the data failed to produce statistically significant differences among experienced and less experienced firms regarding the above mentioned 13 organizational characteristics.

3.2.2.2. Export Experience and Motivations to Start Exporting

Another important factor in the export operations of firms investigated were the motivations which initiate firms to export. Firms were presented with 7 motivational factors and asked to indicate which ones represented the prime reasons for their exporting effort.

Spearman Rank Correlation was utilized to test this association between years of exposure to export activities and rank of initial motivations to start exporting. The data found statistically proved strong association between the

rankings of less experienced and experienced exporters. The data was significant at 0.05 level with five degrees of freedom.

TABLE 3.24. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND MOTIVATIONS TO START EXPORTING

Variables	Ranking of Motivations For Less Experienced	Ranking of Motivations For Experienced	$T_{calc.}$	d.f.	α	r_s
Profit	3	3	2.02	5	0.05	0.67
Expansion and Growth with new Markets	1	1				
Excess Capacity	2	4				
Overproduction Utilization	7	5				
Government incentives	5	2				
Declining Domestic sales	4	6				
Competitive Pressures	6	7				

Expansion and growth by access to new markets was found to be the prime initiative motivation for exporting in both group of exporters. The firms were also in conformity for the strength of profit as an initiative force to start exporting. Thus, there is no difference between two experience groups in terms of their motivations to start exporting.

3.2.2.3. Export Experience and Objectives in Exporting Today

Regarding the objectives in exporting today, the association between two groups of firms in terms of years of experience was testedby Spearman's Rank Correlation. With a value of 0.85 r_s indicated a high association between the

ranking of two groups. The results were statistically significant at 0.025 thus again indicated no difference.

Experienced and less experienced exporters aimed to gain maximum profit in the long run. Experienced firms aimed more to gain highest possible market share although the aim of selling as much as possible was more preferred one by experienced group.

TABLE 3.25. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND OBJECTIVES IN EXPORTING TODAY

Variables	Ranking of Motivations For Less Experienced	Ranking of Motivations For Experienced	$T_{calc.}$	d.f	α	r_s
To earn maximum long run profit	1	1	3.80	3	0.025	0.85
To earn maximum short run profit	5	5				
To sell as much as possible	3	2				
To gain highest possible market share	2	3				
To sell surplus capacity not taken in domestic market	4	4				

3.2.2.4. Export Experience and Confidence in the Export Product/s

Firms with five or less years of experience and firms with more exposure to export experience had about same degree of confidence in the success of their export product. The only statistically proved difference between two groups of exporters was in the unique characteristics of the product.

Less experienced exporters had more confidence in the uniqueness of their export product compared to experienced exporters. This may be true because they are in foreign markets for a shorter period of time than experienced group and may not know much about the competing products and competitors well thus may consider their product unique compared to experienced group. However, lowest confidence was given for both group of firms to possession of a unique export product/s.

Highest confidence was indicated for high quality in both experience groups. Except low costs, less experienced firms had more confidence in all the characteristics of export product compared to experienced group.

TABLE 3.26. DIFFERENCES IN CONFIDENCE TO EXPORT PRODUCTS BETWEEN TWO EXPERIENCE GROUPS

Variables	Less Experienced Mean*	σ	Experienced Mean*	σ	$T_{calc.}$	d.f.	α
High Technology	2.53	.717	2.27	.786	.87	20	.38
Low Cost	1.88	.719	2.08	.793	-.72	22	.47
Unique Product*	1.67	.724	1.20	.422	2.03	22	.08*
High Capacity	2.53	.516	2.50	.22	.17	23	.87
High Quality	2.67	.617	2.54	.519	.60	25	.56
After Sale Service	2.50	.850	2.00	.926	1.18	14	.25

*Scale used in mean calculations were: 3=high 2=medium 1=low

3.2.2.5. Export Experience and Competition in Foreign Markets

In comparison of competition faced in foreign markets, both the experienced and less experienced firms stated that they faced higher competition compared to domestic market.

No statistically significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of competition as shown in Table 3.27.

TABLE 3.27. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND COMPETITION FACED IN FOREIGN MARKETS

Variable	Less Experienced n= (%)	Experienced n= (%)	$\chi^2_{calc.}$	d.f.	α	cv/cc
Competition in Foreign Markets:						
Much higher than domestic market	53	69	3.29	3	NS	0.31
Quite higher than domestic market	35	31				
Same as in domestic market	6	-				
Less than domestic market	6	-				

3.2.2.6. Export Experience and Attitudes Toward Exporting

Another objective of the study was to investigate the attitudes held toward exporting. The approach tested was; longer exposures to export activities produce significant changes in attitudes. Various attitudinal exporting statements had been administered to the firms. Firms at both levels of experience groups had positive attitudes toward exporting. The strength of these attitudes, however, maked experienced group significantly different from less experienced exporters for five statements. Except in one case, a trend to the same effect was visible for these five statements. The one exception concerns the "contribution of exports to total firm's growth" which may indicate, for less experiened firms, the fact of seeing exports as marjinal business. The results indicate

TABLE 3.28. DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES TOWARD EXPORTING BETWEEN TWO EXPERIENCE GROUPS

Variables	Less Experienced Mean	σ	Experienced Mean	σ	$T_{calc.}$	df	α
1* Exporting is a desirable task for the firm	1.23	.43	1.85	1.06	1.94	15	.02*
2* My firm has no specified export policy	3.18	.73	2.54	.96	1.99	21	.03*
3. My firm has exportable products	1.24	.43	1.08	.27	1.21	27	.24
4* Exports could make a major contribution to moy firm's growth	1.29	.47	1.00	.00	2.58	16	.03*
5. My firm is not actively exploing the possibility of exporting	2.23	1.03	2.54	.96	.83	26	.42
6. Export profits have fully met my expectations	1.94	1.02	1.61	.51	1.14	24	.23
7. Exporting is no different from doing business locally	3.29	1.04	3.23	.83	.18	27	.81
8. Exports do not make major contributions to my firm's profits	2.35	.86	2.15	.80	.65	26	.53
9* My firm do not plan to increase its exports in near future	3.24	1.14	2.62	1.04	1.54	27	.10*
10* My firm is actively planning for exporting	1.29	.47	1.77	0.85	1.85	17	.02*
11. Exporting is more risky then domestic market	2.35	.93	2.46	1.12	.28	23	.75
12. My form always tries to filfill export orders	1.47	.71	1.61	.65	.58	27	.54

*Scales used in mean calculations were

1=strongl agree
2=agree
3=disagree
4=strongly disagree.

that as firms gain more experience in exporting their unfavorable attitude, become stronger. The data which produced statistically significant difference between two groups is given in Table 3.28. The remaining seven attitude, failed to establish statistically significant differences between experienced and less experienced group of firms.

The results showed that less experienced firms see exporting as a more desirable task; are more eager to increase their export volume and have more confidence in export activities in regard to the contribution it makes to total profits but do not have as much confidence for the contribution of exports to firms growth.

3.2.2.7. Export Experience and Production of Export Products Compared to Domestic Sales

It was found that a higher percentage of less experienced exporters export the same product produced domestically whereas more experienced firms alter production line according to the inquiries and needs of customers, in foreign markets. This difference between two experience groups was not strong enough to produce statistically proved significance. The data had a χ^2 value of 0.24 with 2 degrees of freedom and was significant at 0.88.

more in need of such research to adopt themselves to foreign environment. In fact, in terms of means calculated, pricing is the most altered and differently applied element compared to domestic implementation in both groups. Although it is not statistical, there is considerable difference between two groups, in terms of means, regarding distribution channel structure change between domestic and foreign markets.

TABLE 3.30. DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MARKETING MIX ELEMENTS BETWEEN TWO EXPERIENCE GROUPS

	Less Experienced		More Experienced				
Variables	Mean	σ	Mean	σ	$T_{calc.}$	d.f.	α
Packing*	2.0	0.86	2.84	1.14	-2.22	21	0.02*
Pricing	3.23	0.66	3.23	0.83	0.02	22	0.98
Advertisement	2.76	1.23	2.16	1.26	1.20	22	0.24
Transport	2.73	1.10	3.00	1.08	-0.65	25	0.52
Market Research*	3.46	0.74	2.84	1.28	1.54	18	0.10*
Distribution Channels	3.42	0.93	2.91	1.30	1.13	19	0.25

*Mean scales were: 1=not different at all, 2=not much different, 3=quite different, 4=completely different.

3.2.2.9. Export Experience and Export Channels

The data did not prove any differences significant statistically. Both group of firms mostly exported their products to foreign manufacturer for use as a component in the production line and exported directly to final users/governments. Exporting to foreign manufacturer as a final product has more utilized way of exporting in less experienced firms.

Besides, the fact that experienced and less experienced firms used one or two export channels together, they also used export trading companies as well.

TABLE 3.31. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND EXPORT CHANNELS

Variables	Less Experienced n= (%)	Experienced n= (%)	$\chi^2_{calc.}$	d.f	α	cc/cv
To foreign manufacturer for use as a component	29.0	21.0	4.44	5	NS	0.25
To foreign manufacturer who labels and sells	11.0	-				
To foreign retailer directly	-	7.0				
Directly to foreign final user/government	13.0	18.0				
To foreign distributor/ agent	11.0	11.0				
To export Trading Companies	42.0	43.0				

3.2.2.10. Export Experience and Principle Export Markets and Number of Exported Countries

In comparison of years of experience in exporting and the export markets, no statistically significant difference was found. Less experienced and more experienced firms did not differ from each other regarding export markets. For both group of firms, the most exported markets were Middle East, Exrope and North Africa, respectively. In Middle East, having the potential of being highest export market group, namely, Irak and Iran were the main principal markets for exporting. Although it was not statistically significant, Iran was the principal export market for less experienced and Iraq for the more experienced firms.

In terms of the number of countries firms export to; although there was no statistical significance, less

experienced firms exported mostly to 3-5 countries and more experienced firms exported mostly to more than five countries.

TABLE 3.32. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND PRINCIPLE EXPORT MARKETS/NUMBER OF EXPORTED COUNTRIES

Variables	Less Experienced n= (%)	Experienced n= (%)	$\chi^2_{calc.}$	d.f	α	cc/cv
Middle East	43.0	46.0	0.046	3	NS	0.03
North Africa	17.0	15.0				
Europe	25.0	27.0				
Others	15.0	12.0				
Number of Exported Countries						
1-2	35.0	23.0	2.08	2	NS	0.25
3-5	59.0	23.0				
More than 5	6.0	54.0				

3.2.2.11. Export Experience and Policies Regarding Export Activities

The data was examined by cross tabulation analysis to determine the association between firms with five years of experience and more experienced ones in terms of the policies established regarding their export activities. The policies that were crosstabulated with two groups of exporting firms were: investment policy for promotion of exports; marketing policy; export adaption policy and pricing policy.

In four of these tested policies for two groups of exporting firms, no statistically significant difference was found. Althoug not statistically significant, the results

for the comparison of both groups are as follows:

With respect to investment policy, rate of making investment was higher in experienced firms. All the firms in experienced group declared that they have investments, whereas 18 % of less experienced group stated they have no investments for exports.

Experienced group were investing mostly for development of product and creating technological know-how. In less experienced group, data showed no clear difference for the type of investment.

The basis of any effective marketing operation whether at home or abroad, is effective market selection. Firms may choose market concentration or market spreading as a matter of conscious marketing policy. 59 % of less experienced exporters market policy was primarily market diversification. The data was not able to produce statistically significant difference with a χ^2 value of 0.01. A higher percentages of experienced firms chosed market spreading than concentration but the difference was not strong as in less experienced group.

Export adaption process as a decision to make initial international commitment is initiated either by knowledge of problems or awareness of opportunities. Statistically significant difference was not found between less and more experienced groups in terms of export adoption process. New and experienced firms had innovative export adaption process with values of 58.8 % and 53.9 % respectively indicating that innovation oriented adaption process is more common than problem oriented adoption process among exporting firms.

Less experienced as well as more experienced firms

administered mostly market based pricing method, thus they were not different from each other according to their pricing policies. No significance was found statistically between the two groups. Among the less experienced exporters adoption of cost-based pricing policy was higher (23,5 %) than more experienced exporters (7.7 % only).

TABLE 3.33. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND POLICIES REGARDING EXPORT ACTIVITIES

Variables	Less Experienced n= (%)	Experienced n= (%)	$\chi^2_{calc.}$	d.f.	α	cc/cv
Investment Policy						
Reduction of Costs	29.4	23.1	5.76	3	NS	0.43
Development of Product	29.4	61.5				
Two of the Above	11.8	15.4				
No investment	29.4	0.0				
Marketing Policy						
Market Concentration	41.2	46.1	0.01	1	NS	0.017
Market Diversification	58.8	53.9				
Export Adaption Policy						
Innovation Oriented	58.8	53.9	0.02	1	NS	0.02
Problem Oriented	41.2	46.1				
Pricing Policy						
Cost Oriented	23.5	7.7	0.51	1	NS	0.13
Market Oriented	76.5	92.3				

3.2.2.12. Export Experience and Perceived Helpfulness of Research in Exporting

With regard to perceived helpfulness of research in export activities, two groups of firms showed no statistically significant difference. As it is shown in the table; 3.34,

experienced firms placed more emphasis on all of the cited foreign market research issues.

Firms perceived price investigation as the most helpfull foreign market research. More experienced firms perceived research for competitors and competing products as highly useful and less experienced group of firms perceived investigating potential customers and potential markets as more helpfull for forign market activities. Thus, although there was no statistically significance, more experienced firms were more research oriented and find information on competition more useful. Both group of firms perceived not much use in investigating economic structure of foreign markets.

TABLE 3.34. DIFFERENCES IN PERCEIVED HELPFULLNESS OF RESEARCH BETWEEN TWO EXPERIENCE GROUPS

Variable	Less Experienced More	σ	More Experienced More	σ	$t_{calc.}$	d.f.	α
Competing Products	3.44	.81	3.82	.60	-1.40	25	.17
Turkish and Foreign Competitors	3.19	.91	3.56	.73	-1.11	20	.25
Potential Customers	3.47	.62	3.55	.69	- .29	20	.73
Trade and Market Structure of Foreign Countries	3.41	.62	3.50	.67	- .36	22	.70
General Economic Structure of Foreign Market	3.12	.60	3.17	.84	- .17	19	.82
Price Investigation	3.59	.62	3.67	.78	- .29	20	.74

Mean Scales were: 4=very helpful, 3=quite helpful, 2=quite unhelpful, 1=not helpful at all

3.2.2.13. Export Experience and Use of Market Research Instruments

Although it was found in the earlier sections that experienced

group pay more emphasis on research and perceive foreign market research as more helpfull than less experienced group of firms, the latter group use market research instruments more frequently. T-test analysis was utilized to determine the differences and similarities between two exporter groups.

For collection of information and market research, both group of firms used most frequently, export trading companies and prefered to make personnel visits to foreign markets. Although the data was not statistically significant, in terms of ranking the instruments used, experienced firms prefered more, "visits to foreign markets" than use of export trading company and this finding was the opposite for less experienced group.

IGEME and other state export organization were not much utilized by the companies, for information collection. The underlying reasons may be the inadequency of services or being unreliable, lack of habits to apply to such organization for collection of information, or not to spend time on such statistical and written reports and researches. The least used information source for both groups were banks.

TABLE 3.35. DIFFERENCES IN FREQUENCY OF USING MARKET RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS BETWEEN TWO EXPERIENCE GROUPS

Variables	Less Experienced Mean	σ	Experienced Mean	σ	$t_{calc.}$	d.f.	α
Export Development and Evaluation Organization (IGEME)	2.19	1.22	2.00	0.95	0.46	26	0.62
Chamber of Commerce and Industry	2.38	0.96	2.33	0.78	0.13	26	0.94
Commercial Banks	1.44	0.63	1.58	0.67	-.59	23	0.58
Visits to FOreign Markets	2.88	0.72	2.85	0.80	0.10	24	0.93
Export Trading Firms	3.00	0.94	2.69	0.95	0.89	26	0.39
Foreign Trade Committees Visiting Turkey	2.13	0.89	1.83	0.58	1.05	26	0.38
Commerce attaches	2.06	0.85	2.00	0.85	0.19	24	0.81
Trade fairs	2.47	0.87	2.31	1.03	0.46	23	0.64
Foreign and National Statistics	2.56	0.96	2.17	0.84	1.16	25	0.28

Mean Scales were: 4=always, 3=frequently, 2=sometimes, 1=never.

3.2.2.14. Export Experience and Financial Resources

The data was analyzed by t-test in order to determine the differences and similarities between experienced and less experienced firms in terms of use of financial resources for exporting. No statistically significant difference was proved by the data except in the case of importing firms' sources as a financial source.

Less experienced companies utilized more their own financial sources compared to experienced firms although the

difference between the two groups was not statistically significant. But in general, both group of firms' main sources of finance were their own sources and sources of Central Bank through the intermediancy of banks and export trading companies.

TABLE 3.36. DIFFERENCES IN THE USE OF FINANCIAL SOURCES BETWEEN TWO EXPERIENCE GROUPS

Variables	Less Experienced Mean	σ	Experienced Mean	σ	$t_{calc.}$	d.f.	α
Sources of Central Bank	3.00	1.03	3.08	1.65	0.20	22	0.84
Firms' Own Sources	3.47	0.51	3.15	0.89	1.14	18	0.23
Foreign Bank and Financial Institution Credits	2.13	1.30	2.00	1.00	0.28	20	0.79
Importers' Sources*	1.93	1.22	1.37	0.51	1.53	20	0.10*

Mean scales were: 4=very important, 3=quite important, 2=quite unimportant 1=not important at all

3.2.2.15. Export Experience And Problems in Exporting

In examining the problems faced by exporters t-test was used to determine the differences and similarities between less and more experienced firms in regard to the importance of problems faced in foreign markets. The relationships between the two groups of firms in terms of the strength of problems faced is given in Table 3.37.

Less experienced firms showed some differences from experienced ones although they are not statistically significant. These differences are as follows:

Less experienced firms had more problems in collecting necessary information as to the general application of export procedures, which may be caused by informal interfirm commu-

nication and less development make-up. They faced more problems in handling advertisement activities which might be caused by several factors, like not being able to collect necessary information in the foreign markets about the promotion programs that are carried, or not being able to attain or be informed for the several exhibition and other displays, or not having adequate back-up for carrying advertisement activities in foreign markets.

Communication was more of a problem for experienced firms, suprisingly. But this may be caused by the fact that experienced firms exported to higher number of export markets compared to less experienced group and exporting to several markets may result in complex communication. Experienced firms faced greater problems in packing of export products as well. This also supports the data obtained and interpreted in implementation of marketing mix elements section. Since less experienced firms did not have differentiated packing other than used in domestic market, they do not have to face extra finance for export packing. Less experienced firms have more problems in determination of freight rate because of less experience in contacts in the transportation issues.

For both experienced and less experienced firms frequent changes in incentives and export promotion programmes carried by the government and political as well as economic problems in foreign markets constitute the main troublesome problems in exporting. In general. it is not possible to say, export problems are perceived as gradually declining in their severity from less experienced to experienced groups.

TABLE 3.37. DIFFERENCES IN PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED IN EXPORTING BETWEEN TWO EXPERIENCE GROUPS

Variables	Less Experienced Mean	σ	Experienced Mean	σ	$t_{calc.}$	d.f.	α
Product Adoption	1.81	0.91	0.91	0.70	-.31	25	0.73
Promotion	2.06	.99	1.70	0.68	1.10	24	0.25
Information Collection on Export Procedures	2.31	1.08	2.17	0.84	0.40	26	0.62
Market Research	2.75	0.86	2.46	0.93	0.84	20	0.48
Communication	2.06	0.85	2.33	0.78	-.87	25	0.37
Transport	2.25	0.93	2.33	1.16	-.20	21	0.83
Documentation	2.13	1.15	2.17	0.84	-.11	26	0.94
Finance	2.76	0.97	2.62	0.96	0.42	26	0.67
Packing	1.94	1.18	2.38	0.77	-1.23	26	0.22
Pricing	2.77	1.03	2.75	0.62	0.05	26	0.91
Freight	2.19	1.11	2.15	1.07	0.08	26	0.92
Product Quality	1.88	1.17	1.92	0.86	-.11	28	0.93
Economic and Political Problems in Foreign Markets	2.80	0.86	2.83	0.83	-.10	24	0.91
Changes in Government Incentives	3.00	1.03	2.75	0.45	0.86	21	0.33
After Sale Services	1.66	1.04	1.63	0.67	0.09	23	0.92

Scales for means were 4=very important, 3=quite important, 2=quite unimportant, 1=not important at all.

3.2.2.16. Export Experience and Preferences for International Involvement Other Than Exporting

The associtaion between preferences for various international involvement types and export experience depending upon years of exposure to export activities was tested by Spearman Rank Correlaton. The results indicated a strong association in the rankings of 2 groups. The data found statistically that more experienced exporters and less

experienced group have similar preferences for international involvement other than exporting. It is significant with a t-value of 3.16 and three degrees of freedom at 0.025.

Both group of exporters preferred as their first choice to get involved in investment together with a foreign firm in Turkey. Experiened and less experienced firms agreed in preferring least to become a representative of a multinational company.

TABLE 3.38. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPORT EXPERIENCE AND PREFERENCE FOR INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

Variable	Ranking For Less Experienced	Ranking For Experienced	$T_{calc.}$	d.f.	α	r_s
To be a representative of a MNC in Turkey	5	5	3.60	3	0.025	0.91
To have a patent or licence agreement	3	2				
To make an investment in Turkey together with a foreign firm	1	1				
To make investment together with a foreign firm in his country	2	3				
To make investment with a foreign firm in a third country	4	4				

IV. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The chapter will be presented in two sections:

(a) Summary and Discussion of Findings
(b) Implications and Limitations to the Study

4.1. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study is conducted with the exporting firms operating in the manufacturing sector of industrial goods. This sector constitutes a very important place in our total exports. With a drastic change, the share of industrial goods in total exports increased to 74 percent in 1984 from a share of 36 percent in 1980 (Istanbul Chamber of Commerce, 1984). This research is conducted to provide some highlights for the export activities of firms depending upon their export experience in terms of years.

The study was conducted on 30 firms via data collection procedure of questionnaire. 56.7 percent of firms had five years of export experience and 43.3 percent had more than five years of experience.

The questionnaire included questions that probed into the organizational characteristics, attitudes, motivations,

objectives, confidence in the export products, competition faced in foreign markets, principle export markets, perceived helpfulness of research, market research instruments, financial resources, export channels, export adaption process, investment, pricing and marketing policies, face to face contacts with foreign customers, production and marketing mix elements and problems of exporting firms.

The filled-up questionnaires by the export responsibles of 30 exporting firms were analyzed by the aid of SPSS Computer programm and subprograms like frequency distribution, crosstabulations, t test analysis and Spearman rank correlation analysis. In the following paragraphs, the findings of the study will be summarized and some conclusions will be reached.

One of the main findings of this study is that the level of internationalization measured by the length of exporting experience is not a good predictor for the organisational composition of exporting firms. Years of exposure to export activities do not discriminate firms well in terms of organizational characteristics.

Less experienced firms with five years of export experience are, in general, newly founded firms with small number of full time employees and capital investment. Their export sales as a percentage of total company sales as well as rate of increase in exports and annual sales volume are small. Profits derived from exporting constitute, a small per cent of total profits. Sales department handles export activities with the assistance of export trading companies and employ very few personnel for export operations which are mostly male, young and having university education.

More experienced firms differ from less experienced

companies, in the characteristics of having higher employment, total annual sales, capital investment and export sales to total sales ratio. Both groups have continuous export activities.

Firms had similar initiative motivations to start exporting. The principal initial motivation which cause firms of both groups to export is expansion and growth by having an access to new markets. Profit was also another important initiative motivation of firms. This may reveal that firms are more motivated by proactive factors representing circumstances which are planned for by the firm, rather than reactive factors; presenting circumstances to which the firms responded by exporting (Proactive and reactive factors; Czinkota, 1981).

Firms export objectives for continuing to export today were primarily associated with profit and than by volume. The implication of this may lie in challanging the traditional view of exporting as marjinal business. For less experienced firms to gain highest possible market share was more important than experienced companies which aim to sell as much as possible. It may be that experienced firms having extensive information as to the conditions and complexity of competition in foreign markets thus being more pessimist to gain market share in foreign markets, aimed to sell as much as possible instead of trying to establish a high market share.

As revealed by the results, firms had quite high confidence for their principal export products except the characteristic of being a unique product. This variable had also been found to be the strongest for discriminating experienced and less experienced exporters. Less experienced firms had more confidence for the uniqueness as well as for

the other characteristics of product only except for low cost. An explaination can be such that as firms access to more and new foreign markets they are forced to face extensive competition and more developed competing products thus realise that their product is not the best of all.

Competition faced in foreign markets is considered to be very high as compared to domestic market. The intensity of competition was even more strong for less experienced firms.

Firms at both levels of experience groups held highly positive attitudes toward exporting. The strength of export experience as discriminating factor in the attitudes of both group of firms toward exporting was found in the following statements:

Less experienced firms were more in agreement with the statement of "export is a desirable task for my firm" and less in agreement with "my firm has no specified export policy" compared to experienced group.

"Exports could make a major contribution to my firms growth" statement was more strongly agreed by experienced group. Less experienced firms were more in disagreement with "my firm does not plan to increase its exports in near future" and more in agreement with "my firm is actively planning for exports".

The results indicated that as firm again more experience in exporting their infavorable attitudes become stronger. Less experienced exporters believe more in the contribution of export profit to total firm's profit than the confidence for the contribution of exports to firm's growth. This may be explained by the fact that less experienced exporters see export activities as marjinal business relatively.

It was found that the export product's is the same product line as for domestic market in case of less experienced firms. Although not produced primarily for exports, experienced exporters alter the production according to the needs of foreign customers.

Exporting activities could be considered at a more different scale. Therefore, firm's selling both to domestic and foreign markets, besides production, should be differentiated in terms of packing, pricing, promotion, transportation, market research and distribution channel policies between two markets. Among these marketing policies, packing and market research differences between foreign and domestic markets were differentiated statistically by the years of export experience.

The differentiation between two markets is observed higher in market research for less experienced firms as can be explained with the higher need of market information for exporting activities.

For experienced exporters, packing policy was the highest unified policy between two markets. This can be explained by the fact that this group deals with more competitive markets where packings need to be stronger and more up date.

The number of export markets entered by firms in the survey were substantially lower than those found in the earlier studies (Piercy, 1980). In a study established by Piercy majority of firms exported to less than 50 markets and in another study conducted in France, the range have been even larger as "less than 60 markets". In Turkey, the number of export markets are much fewer. This number is even smaller for less experienced group compared to firms exporting more than five years.

Taking into consideration the small number of export markets compared to the studies mentioned, one should not reach a conclusion such that the firms utilized market concentration strategy rather than spreading. This is because of the less developed structure of economy and exports relative to developed economies thus creating an availability to export to such number of markets.

The above discussion can also be supported by the data obtained from both group of firms regarding their market policy. Majority of firms deal with as many markets as they can and thus do not limit market numbers. This policy of market diversification is more strikingly common for less experienced firms compared to firms having longer exposure to export activities.

For both group of firms Middle East Constitutes the most exported area. Iraq was found as the main export market for experinced group and Iran for the less experienced exporters.

As to the findings of investment policy for promotion of exports, it is found that statistically the experienced firms are more investment oriented than new exporters and the objective of making investment for exporters is development of product and establishing technological know-how. The data do not discriminate clearly the type of investment adopted by less experienced firms.

Adaption of exporting is an organized decision to make use of export sales as an integral part of the marketing strategy. Exporting is considered to be adopted when the manufacturer both attitudinally and behaviorally commits itself to export sales. Contrary to the assumption that among firms in Turkey, the problem oriented adaption

process is more common than imovation-oriented adaption, (IOAP) found to be more common for both group of firms. This may have been due to change agents (government agencies, banks, other export organizations). Taking into consideration the general export structure of Turkey, it is clear that these change agents are export trading companies which have been well active since formal interfirm communications are very rare in Turkey and informal level interfirm communications may have some source credibility problems and seems to have resulted in high incidence of the innovation-oriented adaption process. This fact also supports the findings reached at the beginning of this section regarding the firms motivations to start exporting and provides an explanation to the issue, where main initiative motivation which cause firms to export was expansion and growth by access to new markets rather than other motivations regarding one or combination of inter-related problems. This, export trading companies export orders stimulate export action on the part of the firm.

Regarding export pricing strategies of firms, emphasis is on the market based methods which is pricing to market, customer or competition conditions rather then cost based method. The result seems not to be very clear since, both groups of firms were also found to be market spreading oriented. But this should not be considered as a short coming, as well. Because firms are not operating at large number of markets and this may justify the market based pricing in firms adapting market diversification policy.

Experienced firms place more emphasis on foreign market research issues. Price investigations are perceived as the most helpful research for both group of firms. Another interesting indication found is that where experienced firms find searching for competition as more helpful, less experienced group is more on the side of investigating potential customers.

Market research instruments are more frequently used by less experienced firms compared to experienced ones. But in terms of the types of sources used, there is one important common point. Primary data sources are more preferred rather than secondary data, which can be interpreted such that the personal experiences are considered to be more reliable to the exporters of both group.

The reasons for such a consideration may lie in the fact that they are not used to utilise secondary data or not being able to obtain enough and reliable information.

Among the major sources of primary data which utilized by both group of firms are personal visits to foreign markets and obtaining information from export trading companies.

In case of obtaining not valuable and enough information from export trading companies; as one of the two major source of data, this fact constitutes one of the shortcomings of exporting firms. The frequency of having face-to-face contact with foreign customers is quite low as only a few times a year for both groups and this implies that firms are not furnished by enough information.

The most important problems the firms face in both groups, are export promotion program; the frequent changes in incentives and instabilized program and as well as the political or economic problems in foreign markets.

Collecting information for export procedures and advertisement is more troublesome for less experienced firms which can be explained by the inadequate communications with the environment and less developed organizational make-up where the firm is often handicapped by limited internal supply of large amount of information.

For more experienced firms, packing and communication are found to be the most troublesome problems which may caused by exporting to more distinct and competitive foreign markets. In general, it is not possible to say export problems are perceived as gradually declining in their severity from less experienced to experienced group.

Two experience groups were proved to be different for the use of financial sources from the importer's sources which was more preferred to be utilized by the less experienced exporters.

Both group of firms have similar preferences for international involvement other than exporting. The most preferred involvement pursued by exporting for experienced as well as less experienced firms is to make investment in Turkey with a foreign firm. It is contrary to the traditional internationalization process in which the further stage proceding export commitments is investing in export markets. The newly issued promotion programm for foreign investment in Turkey, may have an impact in obtaining such a result.

The widely used export chanel for both groups of firms is exporting to foreign manufacturer for use as a component. Besides the fact that experienced and less experienced firms use one or two export channels together, they also use export trading companies to export, as well. This is the underlying factor for a number of similarities between two exporting groups on some of the factors of export behavior.

Manufacturing exporters working with export trading companies are often under the assistancy of those companies and the export procedures or marketing activities, actually, are carried by them. Thus, attitudinal and behavioral commitment for exporting do not come out to be very strong on the side of manufacturing exporters.

All of the above findings and conclusion are expected to have some implications on marketers, academicians and the readers. The implications and recommendations will be discussed in the following section which will be finalised upon the presentation of the limitations to the study.

4.2. IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

This research is intended to investigate the approach of gradual internationalization process of exporting firms. The results show that changes in exporting attitudes and behavior are associated with growing length of export experience although these changes are often subtle. The acceptance of gradual internationalization theory therefore, be encouraged for the stages shorter than the ranges taken in this study.

The intention is that by adapting an inconventional view, this study will contribute to reappraisal of exporting at the company level and in the academic contribution to export development.

Several researches have been conducted to find differences among exporting firms based on various measures that account for the international progress of firms. These various approaches were; managerial attitudes, size of the firm, service orientation, distribution channels, market ventures, management experience (Czinkota, 1981).

The study attempted to find differences among exporting firms at different levels of internationalization in terms of years of export. The results suggest that experienced and new exporters do not differ much in terms of measurable characteristics and organizational structure.

Closely related to internationalization is the question of motivations and objectives in exporting. It was found that firms were motivated more by proactive factors i.e. circumstances which were planned for by the firm, rather than reactive factors, i.e. presenting circumstances to which the firms responded by exporting. This result indicates a positive environment for the development of export figures in future. It is favorable in the sense that firms, no more respond to exporting as a result of forced factors like saturated domestic market, rather they aim to export and increase their activities by planned strategies which arise from the advantages firms create by time. After 1980s, Turkey aimed to increase export volume as a main objective of its economic policy. In order to reach the target figures and accelerate export volume, it is reasonable for the government to expand tax rebates and other facilities to provide additional advantages to the ones created by the firms themselves.

The major emphasis on profit objective casts doubt on the usefulness of the classical model of exports to gain volume. In turn, places under suspician the general acceptability of the marginal setting approaches to exporting which have often been advocated.

The research indicates that unfavorable attitudes become stronger as the firm gain more experience in exporting. This result should be taken with care. Necessary steps should be taken by the administers to revise and improve the export procedures and regulations enabling firms to consider exporting with more positive attitudes which is an important factor for increasing of exports.

Exporters rate product quality highest as their competitive weapon, and showed lowest confidence for the unique characteristic of export products.

Less experienced exporters are more in need of information to get know the conditions in foreign markets. Thus, information related to foreign markets is better to be directed more at firms in early stages.

Majority of exporters deal with as many markets as they can, in which it is a more common strategy among less experienced exporters. The most important implication of this finding is the empirical justificaton of an alternative to key market concentration strategy in the form of market spreading.

The underlying reasons for market spreading could be; practical need to deal with many markets to gain adequate sales volume or low incremental costs of dealing with additional markets and cheapness of gaining low market shares.

By implication, in the absence of adequate information it may be more rational to avoid concentration and to spread risks by dealing with as many markets as are available. Similarly, the common advice to exporters to adopt market based pricing policies which is highly utilized by both groups is that it is also dependent on the availability of information about the market.

It was found in this survey that the major source of market research, utilized by both group of firms differentiated in terms of export experience in years, was intelligence data; mainly salesmen (personal visits to foreign markets) and export trading companies. Secondary data was not much preferred.

While this picture is much as expected, two implications are important. First, for most exporters export marketing information comes largely from qualitative, subjective

intelligence sources which are probably restricted to existing markets. Secondly, the existence of firms not to say never but very limited using secondary or primary marketing information sources in exporting costs doubts on the availability of an adequate information base for making export decisions.

The most important problems for both group of firms is the implementation of export promotion program. By implication, the frequent changes in incentives and political or economic problems in foreign markets, as well, pursue firms to function in an environment of increased uncertainity. Since the success of exporting, today, lies mainly upon the performance of governments; inside and outside of country, it should be noted that incentives have to be held more stable enabling firms to function with more certainity for the future. In the dynamic state of today's world foreign trade, government should take more action to strengthen the relations with the countries of export markets.

More investigation into the approach of incremental internationalization process is needed. The length of exporting experience needs to be broken down into finer categories, dealing with individual years rather than group of years or perhaps even smaller time units. It would also be valuable in future investigations to include firms with less than one year of export experience in order to more clearly observe the development process. Such a task will, however, be quite difficult due to the frequent lack of rapid data availability about exports. For such investigations the case study method might therefore be a more valuable research method than broad based surveys.

Changes in the export development of firms could perhaps also be investigated based on factors such as number of customers or amount of export transactions. Different

levels of these factors might be more indicative of export experience than time alone and might therefore yield better results. Similarly, an assessment of the export experience of the individual(s) in charge of exports might be more valuable than the experience of the firm. Finally, it would seem worthwile to trace the development of the experienced exporters further, in an attempt to see whether or not the international life cycle hypothesis of the firm, consisting of foreign investment or diffusion with a foreign firm in domestic market holds true.

Overall, investigations dealing with segmentation of exporting firms must continue. The needs of firms on the exporting area must be responded to if Turkey's export performance is to improve. In these times of import pressures, such an improvement is not only an economic goal but also a geostrategic one.

The research findings and conclusions should be interpreted in light of several limitations although data collection procedure as well as analysing the survey findings are done with most attention, effort and accuracy. In this very last part of the study, these limitations will be discussed briefly.

The main limitation of the study comes from the sample size while this study obtained a high rate of response, the absolute number of exporting firms studied was only 30. For any specified difference between means and any significance level, type of error is a function of sample size. In other words, the smaller the sample, the greater the possibility of accepting a null hypothesis when it is, in fact, false.

Another limitation of the study roots from the administration of the study. The questionnaires were filled by

respondents without directly facing the writer. They were instructed either by telephone calls or by very short face-to-face interviews but not directed totally all through the questionnaire by the writer.

Other limitations which should be taken into consideration when interpreting the research findings are as follows. First, the sample was restricted to firms within a single time period. Naturally one would like to see replications of the study utilizing other samples. Second, the cross-sectional nature of the study doesn't enable the researcher to delve into issues of causality. Longitudinal studies would be especially useful in this regard. Third, changes in the export development of firms should not only be investigated in terms of years of experience but could perhaps also be investigated based on factor such as the number of export customers or amount of export transactions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1- Ayal,Iqal: "Industry Export Performance: Assessment and Prediction", Review of Marketing, 1981.

2- Bilkey,J.Warren: "An Attempted Integration of the Literature on the Export Behaviour of Firms", Journal of International Business Studies, 1978 (Spring/Summer).

3- Bilkey,J.Warren and G.Tesar: "The export behaviour of Smaller Sized Wisconsin Manufacturing Firms", Journal of International Business Studies (Spring/Summer) 1978.

4- Bodur,M.: "Dışsatım Pazarlama Yönetimi: Gıda ve tekstil sektörlerindeki işletmeler üzerine karşılaştırmalı inceleme", Basılmamış Doçentlik Tezi, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 1982.

5- Cannon,T.: "Managing International and Export Marketing", European Journal of Marketing, 1980.

6- Cooper,R.A., K.Hartley and CRM Harvey: "Export Performance and the Pressure of Demand", New York Humanities Press, 1970.

7- Cunningham,M.T. and R.I.Spigel: "A Study in Successful Exporting", British Journal of Marketing (Spring), 1978.

8- Czinkota,M.R.: "The Export Development Process: A Validation Inquiry", Paper Presented at the 1981 Annual Meeting of the Euorepan Academy for Advanced Research in Marketing, (March) 1981.

9- Çavuşgil,T.: "On the Internationalization Process of Firms", European Research (November), 1980.

10- Çavuşgil,Tamer and J.R.Nevin: "Internal Determinants of Export Marketing Behaviour: An Empirical Investigation", Journal of Marketing Research (February) 1981.

11- Çavuşgil,T. and J.R.Nevin: "International Marketing - An Annotated Bibliography" American Marketing Association, 1983.

12- Enis,B.M. and K.J.Roering: "State of the Art in International Marketing: An Assessment", Review of Marketing, 1981.

13- Hirsch,S. and B.Lev: "Sales Stabilization Through Export Diversification", The Review of Economics and Statistics (August) 1971.

14- Istanbul Chamber of Commerce: The Results of 1984 Export Questionnaire (September), 1984.

15- Johanson,W.J. and M.R.Czinkota: "Size of firm as a Determinant of Exporting Attitudes and Activities", Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of International Business, New Orleans, 1980.

16- Johanson,J. and Vahlne: "The Internationalization Process of the firm: A model of knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Market Commitment", Journal of International Business Studies, 1977.

17- Lee,W.Young and John J.Brasch: "The Adaption of Export As an Innovative Strategy", Journal of International Business Studies, 1978.

18- Mustafa,M.E.: "Pricing Strategy for Export Activity in Developing Nations", 1978.

19- Piercy,N.: "Company Internationalization: Active and Reactive Exporting", European Journal of Marketing, 1981.

20- Poward,W. and R.G.Bogart: "The Dynamics of Decision to Export", Akron Business and Economic Review, 1975.

21- Simpson,C.L.: "The Export Decision: An Interview Study on the Decision Process in Tennessee Manufacturing Firms", Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia.

22- Tesar,G.: "Empirical Study of Export Operations Among Small and Medium-Sized Manufacturing Firms", Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1975.

23- Tusiad, "The Turkish Economy", 1983.

24- Tusiad, "The Turkish Economy at the Beginning of 1984", 1984.

25- Wiedersherm,F.Paul, H.C.Olson and Lawrence S.Welch: "Pre-Export Activity: The first step in Internationalization", Journal of International Business Studies, 1978.

26- Wind,Y., S.Douglas and H.V.Perlmutter, "Guidelines for Developing International Marketing Strategies", Journal of Marketing, 1973.

APPENDIX 1

BÖLÜM 1

1. Firmanın Ticari Ünvanı: _____
   Adresi: _____
   Cevaplayıcının Adı ve Görevi: _____

2. Firmanız kaç yıldır faaliyette bulunmaktadır:

   _____

3. Firmanızda çalışan eleman sayısı:

   _____

4. Yıllık ortalama satışınız:

   _____

5. Sermayeniz:

   _____

6. Firmanız kaç yıldır ihracat faaliyetlerinde bulunmaktadır?:

   _____

7. İhracatınız sürekli midir?

   ( ) Sürekli
   ( ) Arasıra

8. İhracatınızdaki artış ortalama yüzde kaçtır?
   % _____

9. Son üç sene içerisinde dış satım/toplam satış yüzdeniz:
   1983: % _____
   1984: % _____
   1985: % _____

10. Ortalama olarak firmanızın toplam kârı içerisinde ihracatın oranı ne olmaktadır?

    ( ) Kârsız
    ( ) % 10 dan az
    ( ) % 10-% 20
    ( ) % 21-% 40
    ( ) % 41-% 65
    ( ) % 65 ve daha fazla

11. Firmanızda ihracat faaliyetlerini hangi ünite yürütür?

    ( ) İhracat departmanı
    ( ) Satış-Pazarlama departmanı
    ( ) Firma sahibi/Genel Müdür/Genel Müdür Yardımcısı
    ( ) İhracatçı pazarlama şirketi yardımcısı olur.
    ( ) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) _____

12. İhracat bölümü personelinin yaş ve cinsiyetine göre eğitim durumunu sayı ile belirtiniz.

	20-25		26-35		36-45		45+	
	Kadın	Erkek	Kadın	Erkek	Kadın	Erkek	Kadın	Erkek
İşletme Mz.								
Ekonomi Mz.								
Mühendis								
Lise Mz.								
Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz)								

13. Firmanızın: Mamul Türlerini (Lütfen Belirtiniz).

Ürettiği:
Dışsatımını yaptığı:

14. Firmanız kuruluşundan bu yana faaliyet alanı açısından bir değişiklik geçirdi mi? _____

Geçirdiyse bu değişikliğin ne olduğunu belirtiniz:

_____

BÖLÜM 2

1. İhracata başlarken, firmanızı ihracata teşvik eden faktörler neydi? Önem sırasına koyunuz.

( ) Kâr
( ) Yeni pazarlak bularak genişleme, büyüme
( ) Atıl kapasite
( ) Üretim fazlasını değerlendirme
( ) Teşviklerden yararlanma
( ) İç piyasada gittikçe düşen satış hacmi
( ) İç piyasada artan rekabet
( ) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) _____

2. İhracatınızda bugünkü hedefiniz nedir?

( ) Uzun dönemde maximum kârı sağlama
( ) Kısa dönemde maximum kârı sağlama
( ) Mümkün olduğu kadar fazla mal satma
( ) Mümkün olan en yüksek pazar payına sahip olma
( ) İç piyasada tüketilmeyen üretim fazlasını satma
( ) Diğer (Belirtiniz) _____

3. Ana ihraç malınız nedir? _____

Bu mal ile ilgili aşağıda belirtilen özelliklere ne derece güvendiğinizi belirtiniz:

	Çok fazla	Orta	Az
Yüksek teknoloji	3	2	1
Düşük maliyet	3	2	1
Emsalsiz oluşu	3	2	1
Yüksek kapasite	3	2	1
Kalite üstünlüğü	3	2	1
Servis, bakım, tamir gibi Satış sonrası hizmetler	3	2	1
Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz)	3	2	1

4. İç piyasaya kıyasla, sizce, dış piyasada karşılaştığınız rekabet:

( ) Çok fazla
( ) Oldukça fazla
( ) Aynı
( ) Daha az

5. Aşağıdaki cümleler sizin için ne derece geçerlidir. Dört seçenekten birini işaretleyiniz:

	Tamamen Aynı Fikirdeyim	Kısmen Aynı Fikirdeyim	Karşıt Fikirdeyim	Tamamen Karşıt Fikirdeyim
1. İhracat firmam için cazip gözükmektedir.				
2. Belirgin bir ihracat politikamız yoktur.				
3. Firmamız, ihraç imkânı olan ürünlere sahiptir.				
4. İhracat firmanın büyümesine büyük katkıda bulunabilir.				
5. İhraç olanakları firmamızda aktif ve sistemli bir şekilde araştırılamamaktadır.				
6. İhracattan, geçmiş yıllarda elde ettiğimiz kâr, beklentilerimiz yönünde olmuştur.				
7. İhracat iç satımdan farklı değildir.				
8. İhracat, firmanın kârına büyük katkılarda bulunmamaktadır.				
9. Yakın gelecekte ihracatımızı daha fazla arttırmayı düşünmüyoruz.				

	Tamamen Aynı Fikirdeyim	Kısmen Aynı Fikirdeyim	Karşıt Fikirdeyim	Tamamen Karşıt Fikirdeyim
10. İhracatımızın geliştirilmesi için planlama yapılmaktadır.				
11. İhracat, iç satıma kıyasla risklidir.				
12. Firmamızda tüm ihracat taleplerine cevap verilir.				

BÖLÜM 3

1. Ana ihraç, üretim açısından iç piyasa verilenlerle,

   ( ) Aynıdır
   ( ) Dış piyasa özelliklerine veya taleplerine göre kısmen değiştirilmiştir.
   ( ) Tamamen ihraç maksadıyla üretildiğinden tümüyle farklıdır.

2. İhraç malınızda, iç satıma kıyasla bir değişiklik yapılıyorsa, bu değişikliğin hangi ülkede, nasıl, ne ölçüde ve neden yapıldığını lütfen belirtiniz.

Hangi Ülkede	Nasıl	Ne Ölçüde	Neden

3. Ana ihraç malınızın, üretimin dışında, diğer pazarlama hususlarında iç satıma kıyasla ne derece farklılık gösterdiğini belirtiniz:

	Çok Farklı	Oldukça Farklı	Az Farklı	Farklı Değil	(Varsa) Fark Nedir?
Ambalajlama	4	3	2	1	
Fiatlandırma	4	3	2	1	
Reklam	4	3	2	1	
Nakliye	4	3	2	1	
Pazar araştırması	4	3	2	1	
Dağıtım kanalları	4	3	2	1	
Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz)	4	3	2	1	

4. İhracatını yaptığınız malları hangi marka altında satıyorsunuz?

   ( ) Kendi markamız
   ( ) Dışalımcı firmanın markası
   ( ) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) _____

5. İhracatımızı daha çok hangi yoldan yapmaktasınız?

( ) Doğrudan doğruya dış üreticiye (üretimine girdi olarak)
( ) Doğrudan doğruya dış üreticiye (nihai mamul olarak)
( ) Doğrudan doğruya dış perakendeciye
( ) Doğrudan doğruya dış ülkedeki devlete
( ) Dış acenta veya distribütöre
( ) Tarafından satılmak üzere yurt içindeki ihracatçı firmaya
( ) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) _____

6. İhracat yaptığınız ülkeleri satış hacimlerine göre önem sırasına koyunuz.

( ) Avrupa Ülkeleri
( ) İran
( ) Irak
( ) S.Arabistan
( ) Mısır
( ) Lübnan
( ) Libya
( ) Ürdün
( ) Suriye
( ) Cezayir
( ) Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz) _____

7. Genelde ihracat yaptığınız ülkelerde aşağıda belirtilen rakiplerinizi önem derecesine göre sıralayınız.

( ) O ülkede mal satan üçüncü ülke firmaları
( ) Türkiye'den mal satan üçüncü ülke firmaları
( ) Türkiye'deki rakip firmalar
( ) O ülkedeki firmalar
( ) Diğer: (Lütfen belirtiniz) _____

8. Hangi sıklıkta dış alıcı ile yüzyüze görüşmektesiniz.

( ) Haftada bir
( ) Ayda bir
( ) Yılda birkaç kez
( ) Yılda bir
( ) Birkaç yılda bir

9. İhracatınızı geliştirmek için yatırım yapmakta mısınız? Eğer yapıyorsanız, bu yatırımlar ne yönde olmaktadır?

( ) Fiatı koruyucu/maliyetleri azaltıcı,
( ) Ürünü geliştirici, teknolojik know-how sağlayıcı.

10. Şu andaki ihracatta pazar politikanız aşağıdakilerden hangisine uygun düşmektedir.

( ) Tüm ihraç kapasitesini belirgin olarak bir iki ana pazara yöneltmek.
( ) Mümkün olan tüm pazarlara cevap verebilmek.

11. Firmanızın ihracata başlama nedenini aşağıdaki iki seçenekten hangisi daha iyi açıklar.

( ) İhraç olanağı olan bir pazarın varlığını duyduk. İhracat tekniklerini, prosedürlerini ve olanaklarını öğrendik ve malımızı ihraç edebileceğimiz piyasalar hakkında bilgi toplamaya başladık.

( ) İç piyasadaki çeşitli nedenlerle (rekabetin artması, idaredeki değişiklik atıl kapasite vs) yeni piyasalara ihtiyaç duyduk. Alternatif çözümler ararken, dış piyasanında geçerli olabileceğini anladık.

12. İhracatınız için, aşağıdaki hususların araştırılmasını fayda ve başvuru sıklığı açılarından belirtiniz.

	Çok Faydalı	Oldukça Faydalı	Az Faydalı	Hiç Faydası Yok	Her Zaman	Ara Sıra	Hiçbir Zaman
1. Rakip mallar	4	3	2	1	3	2	1
2. Rakip Türk ve yabancı firmalar	4	3	2	1	3	2	1
3. Mevcut potansiyel müşteriler	4	3	2	1	3	2	1
4. Genel piyasa ve ticaret yapısı (dış alımcı ülkenin)	4	3	2	1	3	2	1
5. Genel ekonomik yapısı	4	3	2	1	3	2	1
6. Pazardaki fiat araştırmaları	4	3	2	1	3	2	1

13. İhracat araştırması sırasında kullandığınız kaynak ya da yöntemleri kullanım sıklığına göre belirtiniz.

	Her Zaman	Genellikle	Nadiren	Hiç
1. İgeme ve benzeri ihracatla ilgili devlet kuruluşları	4	3	2	1
2. Ticaret ve Sanayi odaları	4	3	2	1
3. Bankalar	4	3	2	1
4. Dış ülkelere seyahat	4	3	2	1
5. İhracat şirketleri	4	3	2	1
6. Ülkemize gelen yabancı heyetler	4	3	2	1
7. Ticari ateşelikler	4	3	2	1
8. Fuarlar	4	3	2	1
9. Yerli ve yabancı istatistikler	4	3	2	1
10. Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz)	4	3	2	1

14. İhracatınızın finansmanı için kullandığınız kaynakları kullanılma hacimlerine göre önem derecelerini belirtiniz.

	Çok Önemli	Oldukça Önemli	Oldukça Önemsiz	Hiç Önemli Değil
1. Merkez Bankası kaynakları (ihracatçı firmalardan veya bankalardan sağlanan ihracat kredileri)	4	3	2	1
2. Firmanın kendi öz kaynakları	4	3	2	1
3. Yabancı banka veya finans kuruluşlarından sağlanan krediler	4	3	2	1
4. Alıcı firma kaynakları	4	3	2	1
5. Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz)	4	3	2	1

15. Aşağıdaki hususlar firmamız ihracatında ne derece sorun olmaktadır.

	Çok Fazla	Oldukça Fazla	Oldukça Az	Sorun Değil
1. Mal adaptasyonu	4	3	2	1
2. Reklam	4	3	2	1
3. Genel ihracat uygulamaları ile ilgili bilgi toplama	4	3	2	1
4. Piyasa araştırması	4	3	2	1
5. İletişim araçları ve kişilerarası yazılı ve sözlü iletişim	4	3	2	1
6. Nakliye	4	3	2	1
7. Evrak, dökümantasyon	4	3	2	1
8. Finansman	4	3	2	1
9. Ambalaj	4	3	2	1
10. Fiatlandırma	4	3	2	1
11. Navlun tespiti	4	3	2	1
12. Mal kalitesi	4	3	2	1
13. Dış piyasadaki ekonomik ve politik sorunlar	4	3	2	1
14. Devletin çeşitli teşvik politikaları	4	3	2	1
15. Yedek parça, servis, bakım vs.	4	3	2	1
16. Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz)	4	3	2	1

16. İhracatını yaptığınız mal veya mallarda fiatlandırma yönteminiz aşağıdakilerden hangisine uymaktadır?

( ) Maliyet bazında fiatlandırma

Malın maliyeti artı o mal veya mallar için saptanmış belli bir marjı

( ) Pazar bazında fiatlandırma

Malın maliyeti artı yöneldiği piyasadaki rekabet ve diğer şartlarına bağlı olarak değişen bir marj

17. İhracat dışında, firmanız yabancı, ülkelerle ne tür ilişkilere girmek ister. Aşağıdaki ilişkileri tercih sırasına göre belirtiniz:

	Tercih No
1. Çokuluslu bir firmanın Türkiye temsilcisi olmak	
2. Yabancı firmayla patent/lisans anlaşması yapmak	
3. Yabancı bir firmayla Türkiye'de ortak bir yatırım yapmak	
4. Yabancı bir firmayla o firmanın kendi ülkesinde yatırım yapmak	
5. Yabancı bir firmayla üçüncü bir ülkede yatırım yapmak	
6. Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz).	

18. İmalatçı bir firma olarak, ihracatçı firmalar ile aranızda meydana gelen en önemli sürtüşmeler, sorunlar nelerdir? Bu konudaki önerilerinizi lütfen belirtiniz.

Sorun/Sürtüşmeler	Öneriler

APPENDIX 2

TABLE 3.23

DOMESTIC MARKET EXPERIENCE

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V002 1.	V002 2.	V002 3.	ROW TOTAL
1.		7 41.2	5 29.4	5 29.4	17 56.7
2.		3 23.0	5 38.5	5 38.5	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		10 33.3	10 33.3	10 33.4	30 100.0

EMPLOYMENT

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	V003 1.	V003 2.	V003 3.	ROW TOTAL
1.		9 52.9 60.0 30.0	5 29.4 62.5 16.7	3 17.6 42.9 10.0	17 56.7
2.		6 46.2 40.0 20.0	3 23.1 37.5 10.0	4 30.8 57.1 13.3	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		15 50.0	8 26.7	7 23.3	30 100.0

CHI SQUARE=.72237 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE=.69
CRAMER,S V=.15517
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT=.15334
LAMBDA (ASYMMETRIC)=.07692 WITH V006 DEPENDENT.
LAMBDA (SYMMETRIC)=.03571

TOTAL SALES VOLUM

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	V004 1.	V004 2.	V004 3.	ROW TOTAL
1.		10 62.5 62.5 34.5	4 25.0 57.1 13.8	2 12.5 33.3 6.9	16 55.2
2.		6 46.2 37.5 20.7	3 23.1 42.9 10.3	4 30.8 66.7 13.8	13 44.8
COLUMN TOTAL		16 55.2	7 24.1	6 20.7	29 100.0

CHI SQUARE=1.51540 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE=.46
CRAMER,S V= .22859
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT=.22285
LAMBDA (ASYMMETRIC)=.15385 WITH V006 DEPENDENT.
LAMBDA (SYMMETRIC)=.07692
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS:1

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	V005 1.	V005 2.	V005 3.	ROW TOTAL
		11	2	3	16
		68.8	12.5	18.8	55.2
		68.8	50.0	33.3	
	1.	37.9	6.9	10.3	
		5	2	6	13
		38.5	15.4	46.2	44.8
		31.3	50.0	66.7	
	2.	17.2	6.9	20.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	16	4	9	29
		55.2	13.8	31.0	100.0

CAPITAL INVESTMENT

CHI SQUARE=2.97145 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE=.2263
CRAMER,S V=.32010
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT=.30486
LAMBDA (ASYMMETRIC)=.23077 WITH V006 DEPENDENT.
LAMBDA (SYMMETRIC)=.15385
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS=1

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V007 1.	V007 2.	ROW TOTAL
		12	5	17
		70.6	29.4	56.7
		52.2	71.4	
	1.	40.0	16.7	
		11	2	13
		84.6	15.4	43.3
		47.8	28.6	
	2.	36.7	6.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	23	7	30
		76.7	23.3	100.0

CONTINUITY IN EXPORTING

FISHER,S EXACT TEST=.32567
PHI = .16434
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = .16217
LAMBDA (ASYMMETRIC) = .00000 WITH V006 DEPENDENT.
LAMBDA (SYMMETRIC) = .00000

RATE OF INCREASE IN EXPORTS

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V008 1.	V008 2.	V008 3.	ROW TOTAL
1.		7 41.2	4 23.5	6 35.3	17 56.7
2.		7 53.8	5 38.5	1 7.7	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		14 46.7	9 30.0	7 23.3	30 100.0

EXPORT/TOTAL SALES

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V009 1.	V009 2.	V009 3.	ROW TOTAL
1.		7 41.2	8 47.1	2 11.8	17 56.7
2.		7 53.8	1 7.7	5 38.5	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		14 46.7	9 30.0	7 23.3	30 100.0

EXPORT PROFIT/ TOTAL PROFIT

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V010 1.	V010 2.	V010 3.	ROW TOTAL
1.		9 52.9	3 17.5	5 29.6	17 56.7
2.		6 46.2	5 38.5	2 15.3	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		15 50.0	8 26.6	7 23.4	30 100.0

V006 by V011 — EXPORT ACITIVITIES HANDLE BY

COUNT / ROW PCT	1.	2.	3.	ROW TOTAL
1.	13 48.1	7 25.9	7 26.0	27 65.6
2.	7 50.0	2 14.3	5 35.7	14 34.4
COLUMN TOTAL	20 48.8	9 21.9	12 29.3	41 100.0

V006 by V012 — EXPORT PERSONNEL

COUNT / ROW PCT	1.	2.	ROW TOTAL
1.	13 76.5	4 23.5	17 56.7
2.	9 69.2	4 30.8	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL	22 73.3	8 26.7	30 100.0

V006 by V013 — EDUCATION OF EXPORT PERSONNEL

COUNT / ROW PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1.	12 32.4	11 29.7	8 21.6	6 16.3	37 50.0
2.	18 48.6	5 13.5	3 8.2	11 29.7	37 50.0
COLUMN TOTAL	30 40.5	16 21.6	11 14.9	17 33.0	74 100.0

SEX OF EXPORT PERSONNEL

COUNT / ROW PCT	V014 1.	V014 2.	ROW TOTAL
V006 1.	8 21.6	29 78.4	37 50.0
V006 2.	9 24.3	28 75.7	37 50.0
COLUMN TOTAL	17 22.9	57 77.1	74 100.0

AGE OF EXPORT PERSONNEL

COUNT / ROW PCT	V015 1.	V015 2.	V015 3.	ROW TOTAL
V006 1.	6 16.2	23 62.2	8 21.6	37 50.0
V006 2.	6 16.2	24 64.9	7 18.9	37 50.0
COLUMN TOTAL	12 16.2	47 63.5	15 20.3	74 100.0

TABLE 3.24

COUNT / ROW PCT	V017-24 1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	ROW TOTAL
V006 1.	7 13.2	14 26.5	8 15.1	5 9.4	6 11.3	7 13.2	6 11.3	53 60.9
2.	5 14.7	8 23.5	5 14.7	4 11.8	6 17.7	3 8.8	3 8.8	34 39.1
COLUMN TOTAL	12 13.8	22 25.3	13 14.9	9 10.3	12 13.8	10 11.5	9 10.4	87 100.0

TABLE 3.25

COUNT / ROW PCT	V025-29 1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	ROW TOTAL
V006 1.	10 38.5	- 0.0	5 19.2	8 30.8	3 11.5	26 50.9
2.	7 28.0	2 8.0	6 24.0	5 20.0	5 20.0	25 49.1
COLUMN TOTAL	17 33.3	2 3.9	11 21.6	13 25.5	8 15.7	51 100.0

TABLE 3.26

GROUP 1 - V006 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - V006 EQ 2.

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TA PRO
V030	GROUP 1	17	2.5294	.717	.174	1.20	.718	.89	26	.381	.87	20.04	.38
	GROUP 2	11	2.2727	.786	.237								
V031	GROUP 1	16	1.8750	.719	.180	1.22	.708	-.73	26	.474	-.72	22.48	.47
	GROUP 2	12	2.0833	.793	.229								
V032	GROUP 1	15	1.6667	.724	.187	2.95	.109	1.83	23	.080	2.03	22.72	.08
	GROUP 2	10	1.2000	.422	.133								
V035	GROUP 1	15	2.5333	.516	.133	1.02	.951	.17	25	.870	.17	23.60	.87
	GROUP 2	12	2.5000	.522	.151								
V034	GROUP 1	15	2.6667	.617	.159	1.41	.552	.59	26	.561	.60	25.98	.56
	GROUP 2	13	2.5385	.519	.144								
V035	GROUP 1	10	2.5000	.850	.269	1.19	.792	1.19	16	.250	1.18	14.50	.25
	GROUP 2	8	2.0000	.926	.327								

TABLE 3.27

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V036 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1.		9 53.0	6 35.2	1 5.9	1 5.9	17 56.7
2.		9 69.2	4 30.8	- 0.0	- 0.0	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		18 60.0	10 33.4	1 3.3	1 3.3	30 100.0

GROUP 2 - V006 TO 2.

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TA PRO
V037	GROUP 1	17	1.2353	.437	.106	5.97	.001	-2.14	28	.041	-1.94	15.09	.02
	GROUP 2	13	1.6462	1.068	.296								
V038	GROUP 1	17	3.1765	.728	.176	1.77	.285	2.06	28	.048	1.99	21.60	.03
	GROUP 2	13	2.5385	.967	.268								
V039	GROUP 1	17	1.2353	.437	.106	2.49	.117	1.14	28	.264	1.21	27.22	.24
	GROUP 2	13	1.1769	.277	.077								
V040	GROUP 1	17	1.2941	.470	.114	.00	1.000	2.25	28	.033	2.58	16.00	.03
	GROUP 2	13	1.0000	.000	.000								
V041	GROUP 1	17	2.2353	1.033	.250	1.14	.833	-.82	28	.420	-.83	26.77	.42
	GROUP 2	13	2.5385	.967	.268								
V042	GROUP 1	17	1.2412	1.029	.250	4.13	.018	1.05	28	.305	1.14	24.47	.23
	GROUP 2	13	1.6154	.506	.140								
V043	GROUP 1	17	3.2941	1.047	.254	1.58	.425	.18	28	.859	.18	27.93	.81
	GROUP 2	13	3.2308	.832	.231								
V044	GROUP 1	17	2.3529	.862	.209	1.16	.809	.65	28	.523	.65	26.87	.53
	GROUP 2	13	2.1538	.801	.222								
V045	GROUP 1	17	3.2353	1.147	.278	1.21	.752	1.52	28	.139	1.54	27.08	.10
	GROUP 2	13	2.6154	1.044	.290								
V046	GROUP 1	17	1.2941	.470	.114	3.14	.035	-1.98	28	.057	-1.85	17.77	.02
	GROUP 2	13	1.7692	.832	.231								
V047	GROUP 1	17	2.3529	.931	.226	1.46	.470	-.29	28	.775	-.28	23.09	.75
	GROUP 2	13	2.4615	1.127	.312								
V048	GROUP 1	17	1.2706	.717	.174	1.22	.742	-.57	28	.573	-.58	27.11	.54

TABLE 3.29

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	V049 1.	2.	3.	ROW TOTAL
		8	7	2	17
		47.0	41.2	11.8	56.7
		61.5	53.8	50.0	
	1.	26.7	23.3	6.7	
		5	6	2	13
		38.4	46.2	15.4	43.3
		38.5	46.2	50.0	
	2.	16.7	20.0	6.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	13	13	4	30
		43.3	43.3	13.3	100.0

TABLE 3.30

GROUP 1 - V006 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - V006 EQ 2.

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TA PRO
V050	GROUP 1	17	2.0000	.866	.210	1.74	.296	-2.31	28	.029	-2.22	21.70	.02
	GROUP 2	13	2.8462	1.144	.317								
V051	GROUP 1	17	3.2353	.664	.161	1.57	.394	.02	28	.987	.02	22.53	.98
	GROUP 2	13	3.2308	.832	.231								
V052	GROUP 1	13	2.7692	1.235	.343	1.05	.925	1.20	23	.241	1.20	22.73	.24
	GROUP 2	12	2.1667	1.267	.366								
V053	GROUP 1	15	2.7333	1.100	.284	1.04	.961	-.65	26	.524	-.65	25.56	.52
	GROUP 2	13	3.0000	1.080	.300								
V054	GROUP 1	15	3.4667	.743	.192	2.97	.056	1.59	26	.123	1.54	18.66	.10
	GROUP 2	13	2.8462	1.281	.355								
V055	GROUP 1	14	3.4286	.938	.251	1.96	.250	1.16	24	.259	1.13	19.57	.25
	GROUP 2	12	2.8167	1.311	.379								

TABLE 3.31

COUNT / ROW PCT	V057-063 1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	ROW TOTAL
V006 1.	9 29.0	4 11.0	- 0.0	5 13.0	4 11.0	16 42.0	38 57.6
2.	6 21.0	- 0.0	2 7.0	5 18.0	3 11.0	12 43.0	28 42.4
COLUMN TOTAL	15 22.7	4 6.0	2 3.0	10 15.2	7 10.6	28 42.5	66 100.0

TABLE 3.32

COUNT / ROW PCT	064-069 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
V006 1.	17 42.5	7 17.5	10 25.0	6 15.0	40 60.6
2.	12 46.1	4 15.4	7 29.0	3 11.5	26 39.4
COLUMN TOTAL	29 43.9	11 16.7	17 25.8	9 13.6	66 100.0

PRINCIPL EXPORT MARKET

COUNT / ROW PCT	1.	2.	3.	ROW TOTAL
V006 1.	6 35.3	10 58.8	1 5.9	17 56.7
2.	3 23.0	3 23.0	7 54.0	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL	9 30.0	13 43.3	8 26.7	30 100.0

NUMBER OF MARKETS

TABLE 3.33

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V075 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	1.	5 29.4 62.5 16.7	5 29.4 38.5 16.7	2 11.8 50.0 6.7	5 29.4 100.0 16.7	17 56.7
	2.	3 23.1 37.5 10.0	8 61.5 61.5 26.7	2 15.4 50.0 6.7	0 .0 .0 .0	13 43.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	8 26.7	13 43.3	4 13.3	5 16.7	30 100.0

INVESTMEN
POLICY

CHI SQUARE=5.76140 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE=.1238
CRAMER,S V=.43823
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT=.40138
LAMBDA (ASYMMETRIC)=.23077 WITH V006 DEPENDENT.=.00000 WITH
LAMBDA (SYMMETRIC)=.10000

MARKETING POLICY

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V076 1.	2.	ROW TOTAL
	1.	7 41.2	10 58.8	17 56.7
	2.	6 46.1	7 53.9	13 43.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	13 43.3	17 56.7	30 100.0

EXPORT ADAPTION POLICY

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V077 1.	V077 2.	ROW TOTAL
1.		10 58.8	7 41.2	17 56.7
2.		7 53.9	6 46.1	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		17 56.7	13 43.3	30 100.0

PRICING POLICY

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V105 1.	V105 2.	ROW TOTAL
1.		4 23.5	13 76.5	17 56.7
2.		1 7.7	12 92.3	13 43.3
COLUMN TOTAL		15 16.6	25 83.4	30 100.0

GROUP 1 - V006 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - V006 EQ 2.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA T VALUE	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA 2-TA PRO
V106												
GROUP 1	16	2.1875	1.223	.306	1.65	.408	.44	26	.664	.46	25.94	.62
GROUP 2	12	2.0000	.953	.275								
V107												
GROUP 1	16	2.3750	.957	.239	1.51	.493	.12	26	.903	.13	25.78	.94
GROUP 2	12	2.3333	.778	.225								
V108												
GROUP 1	16	1.4375	.629	.157	1.13	.809	-.59	26	.560	-.59	23.02	.58
GROUP 2	12	1.5833	.669	.193								
V109												
GROUP 1	16	2.8750	.719	.180	1.24	.683	.10	27	.919	.10	24.47	.93
GROUP 2	13	2.8462	.801	.222								
V110												
GROUP 1	17	3.0000	.935	.227	1.03	.943	.89	28	.382	.89	25.81	.39
GROUP 2	13	2.6923	.947	.263								
V111												
GROUP 1	16	2.1250	.885	.221	2.35	.158	.99	26	.330	1.05	25.61	.38
GROUP 2	12	1.8333	.577	.167								
V112												
GROUP 1	16	2.0625	.854	.213	1.00	1.000	.19	26	.849	.19	23.87	.81
GROUP 2	12	2.0000	.853	.246								
V113												
GROUP 1	17	2.4706	.874	.212	1.39	.528	.47	28	.644	.46	23.49	.64
GROUP 2	13	2.3077	1.032	.286								
V114												
GROUP 1	16	2.5625	.964	.241	1.33	.638	1.14	26	.266	1.16	25.38	.28
GROUP 2	12	2.1667	.835	.241								

TABLE 3.36

GROUP 1 - V006 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - V006 EQ 2.

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA T VALUE	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA 2-TA PRO
V115	GROUP 1	16	3.0000	1.033	.258	1.27	.652	-.20	26	.843	-.20	22.15	.84
	GROUP 2	12	3.0833	1.165	.336								
V116	GROUP 1	17	3.4706	.514	.125	3.05	.040	1.22	28	.233	1.14	17.92	.23
	GROUP 2	13	3.1538	.899	.249								
V117	GROUP 1	15	2.1333	1.302	.336	1.70	.457	.26	22	.795	.28	20.46	.79
	GROUP 2	9	2.0000	1.000	.333								
V118	GROUP 1	15	1.0333	1.223	.316	5.58	.031	1.22	21	.235	1.53	20.38	.10
	GROUP 2	8	1.3750	.518	.183								

TABLE 3.37

GROUP 1 = V006 EQ 1:
GROUP 2 = V006 EQ 2:

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMA T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TA PRO
V090												
GROUP 1	16	1.9125	.911	.228	1.69	.405	-.30	25	.770	-.31	24.60	.73
GROUP 2	11	1.9091	.701	.211								
V091												
GROUP 1	16	2.0625	.998	.249	2.19	.237	1.01	24	.323	1.10	23.77	.25
GROUP 2	10	1.7000	.675	.213								
V092												
GROUP 1	16	2.3125	1.078	.270	1.67	.395	.39	26	.701	.40	25.95	.62
GROUP 2	12	2.1667	.835	.241								
V093												
GROUP 1	16	2.7500	.856	.214	1.19	.737	.85	25	.404	.84	20.36	.48
GROUP 2	11	2.4545	.934	.282								
V094												
GROUP 1	16	2.0625	.854	.213	1.20	.769	-.86	26	.397	-.87	24.93	.37
GROUP 2	12	2.3333	.778	.225								
V095												
GROUP 1	16	2.2500	.931	.233	1.54	.431	-.21	26	.834	-.20	20.73	.83
GROUP 2	12	2.3333	1.155	.333								
V096												
GROUP 1	16	2.1250	1.147	.287	1.89	.290	-.11	26	.916	-.11	25.99	.94
GROUP 2	12	2.1667	.835	.241								
V097												
GROUP 1	17	2.7647	.970	.235	1.02	.992	.42	28	.678	.42	26.11	.67
GROUP 2	13	2.6154	.961	.266								
V098												
GROUP 1	16	1.8375	1.181	.295	2.37	.139	-1.18	27	.250	-1.23	25.90	.22
GROUP 2	13	2.3846	.768	.213								
V099												
GROUP 1	17	2.7647	1.033	.250	2.76	.094	.04	27	.965	.05	26.49	.94
GROUP 2	12	2.7500	.622	.179								
V100												
GROUP 1	16	2.1875	1.109	.277	1.08	.910	.08	27	.935	.08	26.16	.92
GROUP 2	13	2.1538	1.068	.296								
V101												
GROUP 1	17	1.8824	1.166	.283	1.83	.293	-.11	28	.917	-.11	27.98	.93
GROUP 2	13	1.9231	.862	.239								
V102												
GROUP 1	15	2.8000	.862	.223	1.07	.931	-.10	25	.920	-.10	24.03	.91
GROUP 2	12	2.8333	.835	.241								
V103												
GROUP 1	16	3.0000	1.033	.258	5.21	.009	.78	26	.442	.86	21.72	.33
GROUP 2	12	2.7500	.452	.131								
V104												
GROUP 1	15	1.6667	1.047	.270	2.41	.167	.08	24	.934	.09	23.70	.92

TABLE 3.38

V006	COUNT / ROW PCT	V112-V116 1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	ROW TOTAL
	1.	6 15.4	7 17.9	11 28.2	8 20.6	7 17.9	39 38.2
	2.	9 14.3	13 20.6	19 30.2	12 19.0	10 15.9	63 61.8
	COLUMN TOTAL	15 14.7	20 19.6	30 29.4	20 19.6	17 16.7	102 100.0

APPENDIX 3 - LIST OF THE FIRMS AND NAMES OF PEOPLE CONTACTED

Cankurtaran Holding A.Ş.
Ergin Güz - Export Manager

Asil Çelik A.Ş.
Lütfü Şahin - Assistant General Manager

Plastel Plastik ve Kauçuk Sanayi A.Ş.
Demirhan Turhan - Export Manager

Atabay Kimya Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Rıza Köksal - Assistant General Manager

Bakırsan Bakır Sanayi Mamulleri ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Galip Yılmaer - Foreign Trade Manager

Farglass Kimyevi Maddeler Sanayi A.Ş.
Kemal Sümer - Marketing Assistant General Manager

Istanbul Segman ve Gömlek Sanayi A.Ş.
Ahmet Güner - Export Coordinator

Ardem Pişirici ve Isıtıcı Cihazlar Sanayii A.Ş.
Ergin Derkunt - Export Manager

Beko Teknik Sanayi A.Ş.
Yılmaz Can - Export Manager

Tat Konserve Sanayi A.Ş.
Ahmet Toygar - Export Manager

Izocam Ticaret ve Sanayi A.Ş.
Uğur Göçük - Export Manager

Mutlu Akü ve Malzemeleri Sanayi A.Ş.
Canip Altay - Export Manager

Nasaş Alüminyum Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Armağan Vardarlı - Export Manager

Kordsa Kord Bezi Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Melih Bilgin - Export Coordinator

Uniroyal Endüstri Türk A.Ş.
Behzat Azeri - Export Manager

Ivaliz Holding
Orhan Onur - Assistant General Manager

Pabalk Ticaret ve Perlit Sanayi A.Ş.
Sinan Erdem - General Manager

Tozmetal Ticaret ve Sanayi A.Ş.
Sadettin Can - Sales Manager

Bürosan Büro Sanayi A.Ş.
Yalçın Diril - Sales Manager

Ege Kimya A.Ş.
Kamil Başar - Assistant Export Manager

Beytaş Karacabey Gıda Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Fahrettin Otluoğlu - General Manager

Sunjüt Suni Jüt Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Yusuf Leba - Export Manager

Topkim Topkapı İlaç Premiks Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Saadettin Tuğ - Sales Manager

Kavi Kablo ve Emaye Bobin Teli Sanayi A.Ş.
Hüsamettin Kavi - General Manager

Çuhadaroğlu Aluminyum Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Natık Buda - Export Manager

Arıkol Aerosol Ambalaj Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
Metin Bayhan - Assistant Export Manager

Haznedar Ateş Tuğla Sanayi A.Ş.
Hüsamettin Kanbur - Sales Manager

Türk Demir Döküm Fabrikaları A.Ş.
Bülent Ünlü - Export Manager

Arçelik A.Ş.
Ali Yalçın - Export Manager

Basf Sümerbank Türk Kimya Sanayi A.Ş.
Metin Çınar - Sales Manager