

# SME internationalization research: Mapping the state of the art

Cláudia P. Ribau

University of Aveiro

António Carrizo Moreira\*

University of Aveiro

Mário Raposo

University of Beira Interior

## Abstract

*This paper offers a review of published conceptual and empirical studies indexed in the main academic search databases, covering literature on the internationalization of small and medium-sized firms. We analyzed a total of 554 papers covering the period between 1977 and 2014, and found the following general trends: empirical research focuses mainly on Europe and is characterized by a diversity that identifies 74 different topics. This study provides academics and practitioners with a clear perspective on future directions of SME internationalization and contributes to our understanding of the relevant research to date. Copyright © 2016 ASAC. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

**Keywords:** internationalization, SME, small firms, literature review, internationalization topics

## Résumé

*Le présent article propose un tour d'horizon des études empiriques et conceptuelles sur l'internationalisation des petites et moyennes entreprises répertoriées dans les principales bases de données de recherches scientifiques. L'analyse de 554 articles publiés entre 1977 et 2014 met en évidence les tendances suivantes : les études empiriques portent surtout sur l'Europe et couvrent soixante-quatorze sujets différents. L'étude propose aux chercheurs et aux praticiens des pistes claires pour les recherches futures sur l'internationalisation des PME en même temps qu'elle permet de mieux cerner les recherches pertinentes existantes. Copyright © 2016 ASAC. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

**Mots-clés :** Internationalisation, PME, petite entreprise, revue de la littérature, sujets sur l'internationalisation

The current trend of increasing integration and interrelationships in the international economy has had a pervasive influence on the internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). To date, although several studies have analyzed the literature on SME internationalization, a full understanding needs developing in several dimensions, as this literature is of significant importance to companies in the international economy and to academic research.

The study of internationalization, particularly of SMEs, has been of increasing interest to the research community (e.g., Etemad, 2004; Kuivalainen, Sundqvist, Saarenketo, & McNaughton, 2012b; McAuley, 2010) because of the relationship between SME competitiveness and increased productivity, flexibility, and an active presence in the global market. Although SME internationalization is a topic that

has already received special attention, it is still relatively new. Traditionally, research has extensively focused on large manufacturing firms, especially on the activities of multinational enterprises (MNEs), by mainly applying the transaction cost model, the eclectic paradigm, and the monopolistic advantage theory (Dana, 2001; Etemad, Wright, & Dana, 2001; McAuley, 2010; Wright & Dana, 2003). However, international markets are not only occupied by MNEs but also by SMEs, which differ extensively in terms of competences, market behaviour, and strategies followed. SMEs have created new opportunities and shown profitable growth (Lin & Chaney, 2007) while playing an important role in the contemporary global marketplace (Hessels & Parker, 2013; Javalgi, Todd, & Granot, 2011). If in the literature on SME internationalization, a contrast is drawn between the “traditional stages models” and “new” phenomena, born globals (BGs), or international new ventures (INVs) (D'Angelo, Majocchi, Zucchella, & Buck, 2013), the articles most often examine firms and ventures without specifying small or large firms.

\*Please address correspondence to: António Moreira, University of Aveiro, DEGEI, Campus Universitário de Santiago, Aveiro, 3810-193, Portugal. Email: amoreira@ua.pt

Previous reviews have found that the theoretical and methodological bases of SME internationalization knowledge are growing but that the field is still fragmented. While several researchers have attempted to put forward an integrative view of SME internationalization (e.g., Graves & Thomas, 2008; Mejri & Umemoto, 2010; Saarenketo, Puumalainen, Kuivalainen, & Kyläheiko, 2004), none of the models has been commonly accepted by the academic community.

Although previous studies have covered several topics within SME internationalization, the present study is unique in its depth and length of coverage. McAuley (1999, 2010) covered 20 years of research (1989–2009) but selects only some of the relevant work published (i.e., 24 papers) on SME internationalization, using a process view and failing to cover internationalization from other angles. Leonidou and Katsikeas (1996), Coviello and Martin (1999), Coviello and Jones (2004), and Rialp, Rialp, and Knight (2005) reviewed 10 years of research limited to early internationalizing firms. Fillis (2001) analyzed 33 papers on internationalization, covering the period 1975–2000, without applying a clear criterion for firm size, which therefore included MNEs in the study. Etemad (2004) and Kuivalainen et al. (2012) presented an overview of the conceptual frameworks and concepts relating to internationalization patterns of SMEs without including trends in the empirical literature on this area of research. Kontinen and Ojala (2010) focused on a review of the relevant research on internationalization of family businesses, in which only 56% of the studies were based on SMEs.

The following authors stand out for their emphasis on international entrepreneurship. Keupp and Gassmann (2009) reviewed 179 papers published in 16 journals. Although firm size was not considered or defined as a search criterion in their study on international entrepreneurship, their conclusions note that small, young firms have a propensity to internationalize. Jones, Coviello, and Tang (2011) reviewed 323 relevant articles, excluding SME internationalization papers that do not incorporate elements of entrepreneurship. Peiris, Akoorie, and Sinha (2012) analyzed 291 papers but excluded papers focusing on SME internationalization without entrepreneurial intervention and included papers that mix SMEs with large firms. Kiss, Danis, and Cavusgil (2012) analyzed 88 papers focusing on international entrepreneurship in emerging economies. They concluded that the research in emerging economies is still quite limited and argue for a stronger theoretical grounding and development, better contextual positioning, and greater methodological rigor and sophistication.

Based on these reviews, the growing interest in internationalization and SMEs is obvious. However, one can also conclude that several studies, while addressing internationalization, do not focus specifically on how SMEs behave. Rather, they focus on early internationalization, family business, internationalizing firms, international entrepreneurship,

BGs, INVs, and so on, without an obvious criterion for firm size that clearly separates SMEs from large firms. In this context, we seek to fill this gap in reviews on the internationalization of SMEs. For this reason, we systematically examine the literature on internationalization with the clear objective of analyzing only SMEs, the relevant topics studied, and the latter's theoretical or empirical nature—without any restrictions on time, journals, papers, or researchers. Rather than restricting the search to journals with the highest impact in their fields, we included all published and accessible journal papers that fit the selection criteria deployed. Based on these criteria, this literature review offers a unique contribution.

Evaluations of SME internationalization processes remain in high demand, with the following questions still needing answers. How much SME internationalization research has been published and in what kind of journals? What are the main characteristics of SME internationalization research? What is the current state of research and future opportunities for scholars? To explore these issues, we carried out an extensive literature review, seeking to provide an overview of published work focusing on SME internationalization. In addition to addressing the above-mentioned questions, this review also complements previous surveys of SME internationalization research that did not apply a systematic perspective. Through this in-depth look at SME internationalization patterns, the present study helps identify pathways, patterns, and trends, that provide insights into how knowledge may be developed in the future and, consequently, contributes to a better understanding of the SME internationalization field.

We categorize, summarize, synthesize, and interpret research on SME internationalization between 1977 and 2014. To this end, we reviewed and evaluated 554 studies published in international journals that, as a whole, can be considered representative of the present knowledge on SME internationalization. These papers were systematically analyzed in an effort to clarify the current state of knowledge about SME internationalization, focusing on the main topic studied, type of paper and methodology, principal methodological procedures, and countries analyzed. We conclude with a discussion of our findings, provide insights into the most important and challenging areas for the research community and practitioners, as well as offer a clearer perspective on future developments within this topic.

### **SME Internationalization**

The concept of SME internationalization is multifaceted, and the definition of SME varies significantly across countries. An SME in Europe is a firm that has fewer than 250 employees and a turnover not exceeding €50 million or a balance sheet total not exceeding €43 million (European Commission, 2014). However, in the US an SME can have

100 to 1,500 employees or a turnover from US\$2.5 to US\$21.5 million (US Small Business Administration, 2014). Although there are many working definitions of SME in Europe and the US as well as across the world, the economic status of small firms and the way they perceive the internationalization of their business is of most interest for this study.

SMEs' contribution to foreign trade is relatively insignificant. The Observatory of European SMEs (2007) concluded that 8% of EU SMEs have reported a value for exports as part of their turnover, which was significantly less than that of large enterprises (28%). Nonetheless, SMEs account for 90% of businesses and more than 50% of employment worldwide (IFC, 2012). SMEs represent 99% of all businesses in the EU, and, as in the rest of the world, are a key driver of economic growth, innovation, employment, and social integration (European Commission, 2014; World Bank Group, 2015). The internationalization of SMEs is an important asset in the growth and survival of the world economy (Dutot, Bergeron, & Raymond, 2014), especially when these businesses' resources are scarce compared to those of large multinational firms (Karlsen & Nordhus, 2011).

According to the mainstream literature, the concept of internationalization has evolved. It appears to be an ambiguous term in the literature, and its definition varies according to the phenomena under study (Chetty & Campbell-Hunt, 2003), such as exports, trade, cross-border clusters, cross-border collaborations, alliances, subsidiaries, branches, and joint ventures that extend beyond the home country environment (Singh, Gaur, & Schmid, 2010). Internationalization also includes a process of increasing involvement in international operations (Luostarinen, 1980; Ruzzier, Hisrich, & Antoncic, 2006; Welch & Luostarinen, 1988) or adapting business operations (Calof & Beamish, 1995), as well as de-internationalization phenomena (Benito & Welch, 1997; Calof & Beamish, 1995; Chetty & Campbell-Hunt, 2003). It varies according to several factors, including firm size, age, and type of management, among others.

In academic circles, internationalization has been intensively studied in recent decades. Research has examined this topic from different angles, including organizational theory, marketing, strategic management, international management, entrepreneurship, and small business management (O'Cass & Weerawardena, 2009; Ruzzier et al., 2006). The resulting increased volume of internationalization research includes diverse studies of foreign-market entry strategies, use of information on exports, marketing strategies, and performance in international markets (O'Cass & Weerawardena, 2009). SMEs seeking to grow revenues and to protect their domestic market position find exporting activities to be a common and relatively low-risk path by which to gain access to foreign markets (Bello & Gilliland, 1997; Peng & York,

2001; Salomon & Jin, 2008). However, in this context, SMEs face intense competition in international markets, confronting MNEs and national firms that are regionally dominant (Etemad, 2004).

There are several perspectives explaining what influences internationalization. From a historic viewpoint, the first economic studies focused on the national level, studying how various nations maintained decisive competitive advantages in international trade and discussing market factors. Over time, the focus changed from a country perspective to a microeconomic approach. The Uppsala school has extensively studied the concept of internationalization as a process (Bell, 1995; Cavusgil, 1980; Johanson & Vahlne, 1977, 1990). The latest approaches specifically related to the internationalization processes of SMEs take an entrepreneurial perspective (Jones & Nummela, 2008; O'Cass & Weerawardena, 2009; Oviatt & McDougall, 1994).

Strong criticisms of the traditional process-based view of internationalization have been put forward by more recent theories involving international business and entrepreneurship perspectives such as "INVs" or "global start-ups" (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994), "high-technology start-ups" (Jolly, Alahuhta, & Jeannet, 1992), "born globals" (Knight & Cavusgil, 1996, 2004; Madsen & Servais, 1997), or "infant MNEs" (Lindqvist, 1997). In fact, recent studies (Coviello, 2006; Oviatt & McDougall, 2005; Zahra, 2005) have identified an increasing number of firms that do not fit the traditional stages of the internationalization process, as these firms were born already with the goal of playing an active role in international markets.

The traditional theoretical models of internationalization, which focus mainly on large firms, are also applicable to SMEs. Both types of firms begin their international expansion after reaching a robust size in their domestic market—with competitive advantages arising from their products—and acquiring the accompanying technology, financial resources, or skills management (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994, 1999).

Since the beginning of this century, researchers have attempted to find an all-inclusive reason to explain why firms internationalize. As studies focus on particular aspects of internationalization, they neglect others. This has resulted in an increased number of frameworks and explanations for internationalization behaviour, with each trying to fit the various theories that reflect globalization, complexity of markets, and "new" businesses in an integrative view (e.g., Etemad, 2004; Kuivalainen, Saarenketo, & Puumalainen, 2012a; McAuley, 2010; Mejri & Umemoto, 2010).

Clearly, some features are only covered by internationalization theories. Among these, SMEs are one of the main driving forces in economic development that deserve in-depth analysis so that SME internationalization research can exploit the newly uncovered or still under-researched topics.

### Method: Data Gathering

We adopted the basic guidelines for a systematic review set out by Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003). Our review process, therefore, included three stages: (i) planning the review, with particular emphasis on the delimitation of the subject area; (ii) conducting the review, especially the definition of the review protocol, identification of key search terms, and data analysis; and (iii) reporting and dissemination or thematic analysis, with a cross-sectional approach. We performed a search to identify and analyze the multiple perspectives taken by research published on the internationalization of SMEs. This systematic electronic search was performed using the following electronic databases: EBSCO, Emerald, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect. These represent some of the most important databases covering management, economics, social sciences, and multidisciplinary areas—based on which we formed a combination of search keywords.

Contrary to most literature reviews, we decided not to restrict our analysis to a particular set of academic journals in the field. This decision reflected a desire to capture as much variability as possible in order to identify different perspectives, following Jones et al. (2011).

The methodological approach complied with two essential conditions. First, we only considered journal papers, excluding books, book chapters, reports, and conference papers, since journal publications are seen as having the highest impact in the management field and are regarded as containing validated knowledge (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Bachrach, & Podsakoff, 2005; Tahai & Meyer, 1999). No attention was paid to the notoriety/reputation of the researchers, despite a known tendency for new researchers to follow established researchers who have experience in their area. Also, rather than restricting the search to journals with the highest impact in their fields, we included all published and accessible journal articles that fit the selection criteria.

Second, we selected papers that included the key search terms “SME and internationaliz(s)ation,” “SME and internationa\*,” “small firm and internationaliz(s)ation,” “small firm and internationa\*,” “medium-sized firm and internationaliz(s)ation,” “medium-sized firm and internationa\*,” “medium firm and internationaliz(s)ation,” and “medium firm and internationa\*” in the title, abstract, and/or keywords. As the focal point of our research is on SME internationalization, it was essential that this focus be reflected in the survey conducted with the search engines. There are many studies covering the internationalization of firms without being clear whether they are SMEs or not. As such, to remove all doubt regarding the focus of this literature review, we decided to include “SME internationalization” in the title, abstract, and/or keywords to direct the search to the desired research niche of SMEs and to extend the scope to any subject within internationalization. The

general research areas covered up to December 2014 are management, marketing, economics, business, and social sciences.

Our first search resulted in a total of 707 papers from the four above-mentioned databases. However, a second selection removed inappropriate papers that did not match or fulfill the criteria defined, resulting in a total of 554 studies covering the period 1977–2014. This result was obtained without any kind of subjective intervention. We were surprised to note very few studies from the 1970s and 1980s. One possible explanation for the lack of more studies prior to the 1990s is that the vast majority of papers do not meet the criteria set out above. We therefore sought to determine if the criteria might be too restrictive by analyzing several papers that were not included and found that they examine export activities and that references to SMEs are not explicit.

A content analysis was then performed based on a matrix that was created by incorporating the following variables: (a) references of the selected published paper, (b) paper type (i.e., conceptual vs. empirical), (c) main topic covered, (d) main results and implications, (e) methodology used, (f) country of origin, (g) nature of SMEs analyzed, and (h) name of the publishing journal. These eight items allowed us to map the state of the art in SME internationalization, as well as to summarize and evaluate the SME internationalization literature and start identifying the focus and trends of internationalization research. This review method thus applied a systematic process involving inductive thematic analysis of search results (Braun & Clarke, 2006), and sought to organize the literature into patterns of topics.

Similar to Jones et al. (2011), we followed an interpretative synthesis in which—based on the articles’ focus, core ideas, and arguments—we inductively derived the topics based on our understanding of the articles. Then, after this identification, we organized and classified the articles, and created the different topics. Based on the topics generated, we aggregated them on higher order classes that we call categories. The list of authors, categories, and topics is in the Appendix.

### Findings

Table 1 shows the number of papers studying the internationalization of SMEs. Since 2006, output has increased markedly, with the output in 2012 and 2014 resulting in the highest number of studies published per annum on the subject. This change reflects the increasing importance and contemporary nature of the internationalization of SMEs and its increasing relevance for the research community over the last few years. The reasons for this may be the increasing number of internationalized SMEs and, on the other hand, the fact that—as shown in various

**Table 1**  
*Intensity of the Papers Published by Year*

Year	Number of papers	% papers	Accumulated number papers (%)	Conceptual article		Empirical article	
				No.	%	No.	%
1977	1	0.18	0.18			1	0.19
1980	1	0.18	0.36	1	2.70		
1994	1	0.18	0.54			1	0.19
1995	4	0.72	1.26			4	0.77
1996	4	0.72	1.99			4	0.77
1997	13	2.35	4.33	2	5.41	11	2.13
1998	6	1.08	5.42			6	1.16
1999	9	1.62	7.04	1	2.70	8	1.55
2000	13	2.35	9.39	2	5.41	11	2.13
2001	12	2.17	11.55			12	2.32
2002	8	1.44	13.00			8	1.55
2003	14	2.53	15.52	1	2.70	13	2.51
2004	20	3.61	19.13	2	5.41	18	3.48
2005	21	3.79	22.92	1	2.70	20	3.87
2006	29	5.23	28.16	4	10.81	25	4.84
2007	37	6.68	34.84	4	10.81	33	6.38
2008	32	5.78	40.61			32	6.19
2009	41	7.40	48.01	1	2.70	40	7.74
2010	49	8.84	56.86	4	10.81	45	8.70
2011	54	9.75	66.61	2	5.41	52	10.06
2012	64	11.55	78.16	6	16.22	59	11.41
2013	49	8.84	87.00	2	5.41	47	9.09
2014	72	13.00	100.00	4	10.81	69	13.35
Total	554	100.00	100.00	37	6.68	517	93.32

studies—the internationalization of SMEs not only appears to differ in many ways from that of MNEs but also has diversified its contextual underpinnings. Consequently, we divided the present analysis of the search results into two different timeframes (i.e., 1977–2005 and 2006–2014).

#### Paper Category, References, and Publication Medium

As shown in Table 1 above, 93% of the 554 studies follow an empirical methodology, whereas 6.7% are conceptual papers. A clear distinction can be made between the two types of publications: while empirical papers were published in all years between 1977 and 2014, conceptual papers were not only published less often but were also more concentrated between 2006 and 2014. Based on this analysis, research on SME internationalization has followed a more empirical approach. This may be a consequence of the increasing importance of SMEs in the international arena and, also, a result of the need to expand knowledge about the different antecedents and characteristics of the internationalization of SMEs, which is related to the contemporary nature referred to earlier.

The 554 studies were published in 194 different journals. Table 2 displays the most important top journals that published papers on SME internationalization between

1977 and 2014, which represent more than 45% of the total number of papers published (i.e., 554) in this period. As a result of the criteria used during the present research, *International Business Review* appears as the major reference publication in this research area, followed by the *International Marketing Review* and *Journal of World Business*. From the fourth place onwards, we began to note journals addressing small business topics.

#### Topics

In this review, topics represent the fundamental concepts and subjects of each paper. To analyze the topics of the 554 studies selected, we deployed a data matrix that grouped and aligned the references by year of publication, arranged by topics. We analyzed each paper using an interpretative and synthesizing approach (Noblit & Hare, 1988), in which key categories and topics were identified. We used a combination of thematic and content analysis (Weed, 2008) in order to capture the quantitative (i.e., frequency) as well as qualitative (i.e., explanatory value) aspects of the papers selected. We prepared a summary table in which each study was categorized systematically based on the topic identified. The topics were determined based on the content of each paper, its abstract, title, and keywords. We

**Table 2**  
**Top 13 Publication Outlets**

Year	Number of papers	Number of articles published													Total
		IBR	IMR	JWB	JSBM	JIE	JSBED	SBE	JBR	EMJ	ISBJ	JIBS	EJM	JIM	
1977	1											1			1
1980	1														0
1994	1								1						1
1995	4							1	2				1		4
1996	4	1			1										2
1997	13	3						2		1		1		1	8
1998	6			1	1										2
1999	9		1		1		1		1			1	1	2	8
2000	13	1	1	1	2									2	7
2001	12						1		1						2
2002	8						1	1	1	1				1	5
2003	14	1	1		2			1		1	1				7
2004	20	1	1				1				2	1	1	1	8
2005	21	3		1	3	1		2							10
2006	29	2	3	1	1	1	6	1				1			16
2007	37		1	4				1			1	1	1	1	10
2008	32	3	4	1	2	1				3			1		15
2009	41	3	3				2			3	1	2	2		16
2010	49	3		3	2	4		1	1	1			3		18
2011	54	6		2	1	3	2		1		2	2			19
2012	64	11	6	1	1	2		3	3	2	1	2		1	33
2013	49	2	3	5	2	3		1	1	1	1				19
2014	72	9	5	5	3	4	3	1	3	1	4	1		1	40
Total	554	49	29	25	22	19	17	15	15	14	13	13	10	10	251
%	100.00	8.84	5.23	4.51	3.97	3.43	3.07	2.71	2.71	2.53	2.35	2.35	1.81	1.81	45.31

**Legend:** International Business Review (IBR); International Marketing Review (IMR), Journal of World Business (JWB), Journal of Small Business Management (JSBM), Journal of International Entrepreneurship (JIE), Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development (JSBED), Small Business Economics (SBE), Journal of Business Research (JBR), European Management Journal (EMJ), International Small Business Journal (ISBJ), Journal of International Business Studies (JIBS), European Journal of Marketing (EJM), Journal of International Marketing (JIM).

found 74 topics on SME internationalization. The appendix shows the most important results of this analysis: the topics and the categories associated with each paper. The table only lists 73 topics, as the topic “literature review of internationalization research” was removed. We also found that, for example, nine papers might cover up to five different topics and four papers cover six topics. As such, the set of 546 papers—the number left after the papers covering the literature review were removed from the analysis—referred to the 73 topics 1,247 times.

The topics most commonly addressed by the researchers are the following: (a) performance—111 papers, representing 20.33% of papers and 8.90% of the total number of times to which the topic was referred; (b) internationalization process—93 papers, representing 17.03% of papers and 7.46% of the total number of times to which the topic was referred; (c) strategic perspective—90 papers, representing 16.48% of papers and 7.22% of the total number of times to which the topic was referred; (d) the entrepreneurship approach—85 papers, representing 15.57% of papers and 6.82% of the total

number of times to which the topic was referred; (e) the network approach—84 papers, representing 15.38% of papers and 6.74% of topics; and (f) the knowledge-based perspective—53 papers, representing 9.71% of papers and 4.25% of the total number of times to which the topic was referred. Altogether, these six topics cover 94.51% of the 546 papers and 41.38% of the 1,247 of times to which the topics were referred. The last three are the most common topics, confirming what was stated above regarding the attention given in the literature to theories about the internationalization of SMEs.

In order to gain a clearer view of how research has progressed in the field, we analyzed how the range of topics was covered within different timeframes. Accordingly, we analyzed research published from 1977 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2014, as shown in Table 3.

Between 1977 and 2005, 74.01% (i.e., 94 out of 127) of the papers covered only one or two topics out of the 73 topics identified, almost always within the same topic area (i.e., entry mode and market selection, stage models, and

**Table 3**  
*Topics/Themes Covered*

Year	1 topic	2 topics	3 topics	4 topics	5 topics	6 topics	Total of papers	(%)
1977	1						1	0.79
1980		1					1	0.79
1994	1						1	0.79
1995		2	1	1			4	3.15
1996		3	1				4	3.15
1997	4	5	3	1			13	10.24
1998	1	5					6	4.72
1999	3	3	2		1		9	7.09
2000	1	7	3	2			13	10.24
2001	4	4	4				12	9.45
2002	1	5	2				8	6.30
2003	4	8	2				14	11.02
2004	4	11	2	2	1		20	15.75
2005	5	11	3	2			21	16.54
Subtotal	29	65	23	8	2	0	127	22.92
(%)	22.83	51.18	18.11	6.30	1.57	0.00		
2006	10	13	5	1			29	6.79
2007	11	19	4	3			37	8.67
2008	8	11	11	1	1		32	7.49
2009	15	11	11	4			41	9.60
2010	10	18	17	2	1	1	49	11.48
2011	12	24	16	2			54	12.65
2012	12	24	20	5	2	1	64	14.99
2013	5	20	17	5		2	49	11.48
2014	7	29	23	10	3		72	16.86
Subtotal	90	169	124	33	7	4	427	77.08
%	21.08	39.58	29.04	7.73	1.64	0.94		
Total	119	234	147	41	9	4	554	100
(%)	21.48	42.24	26.53	7.40	1.62	0.72		

the internationalization process). For instance, Coviello and Munro (1997) covered four topics: market selection/entry mode/market entry, stage models, the network approach, and the internationalization process. Sinha, Akoorie, Ding, and Wu (2011) covered four topics: offshoring decisions/“backshoring,” cooperative strategy, transaction cost theory and network view. Coviello and Martin (1999) covered the following five topics: market selection/entry mode/market entry, stage models, foreign direct investment theory, the network approach, and the internationalization process. Hinson and Abor (2005) covered three topics: firms’ profile, performance, and online channel.

From 2006 to 2014, the results are quite different: 259 of the 427 papers (60.66%) addressed one or two topics, and 168 covered three or more topics (39.35%). For example, Karabulut (2013) and Freeman, Hutchings, Lazaris, and Zyngier (2010) covered six topics. Karabulut examined export intensity and capacity, internationalization theories, exporting and exports behaviour, stage models and the Uppsala model, foreign direct investment theory, and the internationalization process. Freeman et al. (2010) studied the internationalization process, the network

approach, the knowledge-based perspective, BGs, and rapid internationalization, as well as market selection/entry mode/market entry. Among researchers covering five topics, we found Armario, Ruiz, and Armario (2008)—market orientation and commitment, BGs, stage models, the knowledge-based perspective, and outcomes/performance—and Kalinic and Forza (2012)—international competencies, rapid internationalization, BGs, the entrepreneurship approach, and the network approach. For example, Eberhard and Craig (2013) covered the following three topics: internationalization of family firms, export intensity and capacity, and the network approach. The number of research papers covering three or more topics during the 2006–2014 period grew five times compared with the 1977–2005 period.

Over the course of the 37-year period reviewed, the diversity and complexity of research topics covered increased as new, more specific topics came to light (e.g., the stewardship perspective, trade fairs, enterprise and university cooperation, international business e-risk, effects of banks on internationalization trade, gender, innovation, INVs, BGs, environmental strategy, and brand

management—which partly reflect new societal complexities). During the first part of the period under analysis, there was a high level of concentration on traditional internationalization theories, such as the Uppsala and stage models, whereas from 2000 onwards, the entrepreneurial focus and global or international behaviour are more prevalent in SME internationalization. In a way, one can say that there was an increased focus on diversification over time. For example, in 2014, several studies focused on specific research topics: Hewerdine, Rummyantseva, and Welch (2014) investigated the international behaviour of high-tech SMEs; Rostamzadeh, Ismail, and Noubar (2014) studied the entrepreneurial intensity of Malaysian SMEs, and Kubickova and Prochazkova (2014) analyzed the impact of the internationalization process of Czech SMEs.

### Research Methods and Analytical Procedures

Researchers studying SME internationalization can benefit from understanding the research methods followed until now, as well as the analytical procedures implemented. Accordingly, after removing both conceptual and literature review papers, we used 510 papers in this phase of our analysis.

Researchers favoured quantitative over qualitative methodologies, as shown in Table 4. Moreover, the ratio of quantitative versus qualitative works increased during the 2006–2014 period. Cross-sectional studies were substantially more researched than longitudinal studies. The majority (70%) of the dual-approach method studies were carried out after 2006.

### Country of Origin

As shown in Table 5, only 14.5% of the research covers data from several countries. This is a clear consequence of the following factors: (a) the importance of an outward perspective for most researchers and countries, (b) a focus on a sectoral perspective and how the sectors were analyzed, (c) a focus on the firms' perspective and how it evolved, (d) the difficulty of doing research from a multicountry perspective, and (e) the influence of cultural differences that make it difficult to carry out research in different countries.

Europe is the most targeted continent in the literature, clearly reflecting the importance of SMEs across Europe. Within Europe, the United Kingdom (UK) is the most frequently studied country within SME internationalization research (i.e., 50 studies), followed by Italy, Spain, Finland, and Sweden with 32, 31, 29, and 28 papers, respectively.

**Table 4**  
*Number and Types of Analytical Approaches*

Year	Number of papers	Case studies	Longitudinal research	Cross-sectional research	Quantitative	Qualitative	Dual-approach (quantitative and qualitative)
1977	1				1		
1980							
1994	1				1		
1995	4		1	2	4	1	1
1996	4	1			2	1	
1997	11	2		1	6	2	
1998	6	1		1	3	1	
1999	8	4		2	4	4	
2000	11	2	1	3	9	2	
2001	11	7			6	7	2
2002	8	2	1	2	5	3	1
2003	13	3	1	5	9	3	
2004	16	3	2	1	9	4	2
2005	20		1	4	15	1	
2006	24	6	3	8	13	9	1
2007	33	14	1	10	19	10	
2008	32	10	2	9	20	12	4
2009	40	11	1	6	26	10	1
2010	43	16		5	27	16	2
2011	52	15	1	4	28	18	1
2012	57	19	8	11	36	19	
2013	46	6	5	8	36	6	3
2014	69	15	6	25	46	19	2
N°	510	137	34	107	325	148	20
Total (%)	100.00	26.86	6.67	20.98	63.73	29.02	3.92

**Table 5**  
*Regional Coverage*

Year	Number of papers	Multi countries	One country	Oceania	Europe	America	Asia	Africa
1977	1		1			1		
1980								
1994	1		1			1		
1995	4	1	2		5			
1996	4	1	3		3	2	1	
1997	11	3	8	1	8	4	0	
1998	6	2	4		4	3		
1999	8	1	6	2	6	3		
2000	11	1	9	1	6	4		
2001	11	2	6	2	5	2	1	
2002	8	3	5		11	1	2	
2003	13	2	9	2	7	4		
2004	16	3	15	1	16	3	2	
2005	20	1	19	1	11	5	2	2
2006	24	8	15	2	22	5	5	1
2007	33	8	25	6	29	5	9	1
2008	32	9	22	5	32	4	4	
2009	40	2	35	2	26	11	9	2
2010	43	3	37	3	27	9	6	1
2011	52	4	46	2	34	6	13	1
2012	57	8	51	4	38	13	8	1
2013	46	6	40	3	23	10	9	3
2014	69	6	58	7	34	14	14	2
Total	510	74	417	44	347	110	85	14
%	100	14.51	81.57	8.63	68.04	21.57	16.67	2.75

The UK (i.e., 50 studies) and the US (i.e., 46 studies) most often contributed to the SME internationalization research. The focus of US SME research is mainly on performance and the strategic perspective, followed by the network approach.

Interestingly, Asian countries received increasing attention from 2006 onwards, in which China stands out with 18 papers focusing on performance, the network approach, and the strategic perspective. One can also conclude that more than 90% of research on the internationalization of Asian SMEs took place after 2006.

On the American continent, 64.55% of the studies are from the US and Canada, with the US representing 41.82% of all publications on this continent. A full 68% of published studies on the American continent were carried out after 2006.

In total, 60.74% of the studies published between 1977 and 2005 were carried out in Europe and 24.44% in the Americas. The remaining 26% were spread over the rest of the world. During the 2006–2014 period, Europe's share of the studies dropped to 56.99%, as a consequence of the growth in the number of studies in Asia, North America, and Oceania. Regrettably, the African continent is lagging behind other continents on SME internationalization. There are two possible explanations for this. First, the lack of

factor endowment might compromise the internationalization path of African SMEs, and second, perhaps understaffed and/or underbudgeted academic research is hindering new research on the internationalization of African SMEs.

There were 74 papers analyzing a multiple-country perspective. Of those, 52.70% covered two countries, 18.92% covered three countries, and four country studies accounted for 12.16%. We identified 5.41% of the papers as including five and more countries. With the exception of one study (Hong, Kwon, & Roh, 2009) that involved three continents (i.e., North America, Asia, and Europe), most of the latter papers addressed European countries.

## Discussion

### Summary

This article uncovered a notable diversification in this field regarding the main topics, research methods, geographical variety, and theoretical background. One conclusion is that there is a growing breadth and depth of topics in this area, in which classic topics such as the internationalization process, the strategic perspective, and the network-based approach are the most covered. However, entrepreneurship

is a more recent topic that has been focused on more extensively than the knowledge-based or resource-based perspectives. SME internationalization scholars have examined topics such as BGs, INVs, rapid internationalization, early internationalization, international competencies, and market selection. These topics not only complement “classic” studies on SME internationalization but also give new life to the understanding of new challenges for SMEs.

Despite their importance, some topics or categories are under-researched, as is the case with financing, which was a surprise, given the difficulties experienced by SMEs when internationalizing. One possible explanation for this is that financing studies covering the internationalization of SMEs abroad might be “camouflaged” by studies covering capital structure, return on assets, return on sales, profitability, liquidity, and performance. Although INVs, rapid internationalization, and early internationalization are among the “most recent” topics found in this literature review, one cannot fail to notice that these topics are not among those most prevalent. This may be explained by the fact that we conducted our study using a specific review protocol that did not include new ventures, entrepreneurship, international entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial orientation, or new technology-based firms, among other keywords.

International marketing and innovation perspectives stand out as important categories addressing other “recent” studies, such as online channels, trade fairs, international marketing channels, corporate social responsibility, research and development, innovation, technological strategies, and intellectual property.

Cross-sectional perspectives are more frequently used vis-à-vis longitudinal studies due to the inherent difficulties of this type of research. In this respect, longitudinal studies would be of added value to better comprehend how firms’ behaviour changes across time.

In contrast to previous studies, the present paper covers studies from all continents. Nonetheless, Europe still dominates research on SME internationalization, which may be the result of the importance of SME internationalization for the European economy, in which SMEs are a dominant force. This is in contrast to the pattern in the US, where research traditionally focuses on MNEs. However, if SME internationalization research is to give a clear picture of what occurs across the business world, more studies from Africa, Latin America, and Asia are needed to develop a clearer understanding of SMEs from developing countries.

On their path toward understanding and conceptualizing how and why SMEs internationalize, researchers have extensively focused on the traditional approach of internationalization centred on the internationalization process, the network-based approach, entrepreneurial behaviour, strategic perspectives, and performance.

Moreover, in spite of all the literature that supports the conclusion that internationalization positively affects SMEs, there is a lack of substantive evidence that

internationalization has a positive impact on SME performance, in particular (Pangarkar, 2008). Ruigrok and Wagner (2003) argue that the link between internationalization and performance has triggered extensive interdisciplinary research in which researchers tried to empirically prove the theoretical argument that international expansion is a prerequisite for boosting the financial success of firms. One of the main challenges the research community faces is that, despite the vast array of research on internationalization, there is a need for a more universal understanding of how the features of SME internationalization influence performance. As such, the knowledge of how internationalization affects performance and how international performance supports the internationalization of SMEs is still limited and requires further research, so that all stakeholders, including academics, practitioners, policymakers, and national and regional governments, can benefit.

The number of topics analyzed in SME internationalization research has been increasing, although papers continue to be clearly anchored to core topics in internationalization theories and perspectives. Moreover, the topics are becoming interrelated, which indicates that scholars feel that the frontier of knowledge on SME internationalization must be expanded on several fronts. Although 74 different topics were identified, there are some that have not yet been deeply studied and deserve future research. Among these are how technological advances in transport systems, logistics, and communications facilitate SMEs doing business abroad and how the degree of economic integration—from preferential trade agreement to complete economic integration—of the country of origin influences SME internationalization patterns and outcomes. Other neglected topics are how SMEs behave, or differ, in the internationalization process, when entering a foreign market within the same, or different, economic block to which they belong, and how different cultural dimensions influence the internationalization path when SMEs internationalize across continents.

The same way BGs and INVs constitute a cornerstone to understanding the particularities of rapid internationalization (Knight & Cavusgil, 2004; Oviatt & McDougall, 1994), we found that when analyzing internationalization from a wider perspective—SME internationalization—a deeper and broader perspective is still in high demand, especially on under-researched topics such as (a) how de-internationalization, export withdrawal, divestitures, or re-internationalization might complement the evolutionary internationalization process of the firm; (b) how different family and nonfamily firms really behave and differ in internationalization patterns across geographical latitudes; (c) how online, e-commerce, and e-business internationalization is paving the way for SMEs’ competitiveness vis-à-vis offline internationalization processes; (d) how knowledge and organizational resources leverage SMEs (both high-tech and traditional low-tech firms) in their internationalization quest for superior performance; (e)

how public policies might facilitate the internationalization of SMEs and legitimize superior international performance; and (f) how founders, owners, and managers' prior experience and risk-taking proclivity might influence the internationalization of SMEs:

Based on the table of the appendix, one can conclude that, despite the considerable amount of research, the following areas need more study: trade credit and financing; venture funding; online, e-commerce, and e-business internationalization; trade fairs; enterprise-university cooperation; start-up patterns; service SMEs; and new product development capabilities. Others include the degree of innovation and innovation capabilities, brand management, collaborative strategies, supply chain alignment, nascent entrepreneurs, and family versus nonfamily firms, among others requiring examination in terms of how they influence SME internationalization. Moreover, a multitopic perspective is needed to gain a multidimensional perspective on how SMEs might thrive in the market despite the difficulties in competing in international environments.

There remains a clear gap in terms of an inward-outward perspective on SME internationalization. Generic research on SME internationalization has extensively focused on the outward rather than the inward perspective. While we included Knudsen and Servais' (2007) and Overby and Servais' (2005) perspective and although one can find several studies containing an inward perspective (e.g., Andersson & Servais, 2010; Rasmussen, Madsen, & Servais, 2012), studies including an inward-outward perspective are still quite rare. Failure to adopt a holistic perspective (Fletcher, 2001) can also be explained by the fact that the inward perspective is addressed through international purchasing and international sourcing or outsourcing, which are normally performed by large firms and examined by studies published in operations and supply chain journals. Nevertheless, if future research in this field is to evolve to a holistic level—as indeed theoretical refinements would demand—scholars need to elaborate on this strand of research.

The internationalization of SMEs has had a pervasive influence across the business world. Nevertheless, a more all-inclusive perspective is still required in order to understand all ramifications for academics and practitioners. This perspective needs to include both inward and outward perspectives and the de-internationalization process, as well as providing a dynamic perspective on this field. A universal understanding and accepted broader perspective are needed, including empirical validation and an interdisciplinary approach.

Finally, despite the studies found regarding de-internationalization (e.g., Crick, 2004; Vissak & Masso, 2015), there is a lack of research on export withdrawal, divestitures, backshoring, nearshoring, and re-internationalization. This is indeed a challenging topic to cover not only due to the intricacies of its definition (Benito & Welch, 1997; Calof & Beamish, 1995; Chetty, 1999; Welch & Luostarinen, 1988)

but also due to the problem of defining research methodologies capable of collecting data on the subject. Although scholars have had encounters with firms de-internationalizing their activities (e.g., Nummela, Saarenketo, & Loane, 2016) this topic would not only complement the academic knowledge on internationalization but also support the SME business community in their quest to compete in an expanded business arena.

Despite the abundance of research, there is insufficient research related to the distinction between family and non-family managers of SMEs, mainly in developing economies in which small family firms play a key role. There is a clear overlap between these two areas that calls for further study. Due to their economic importance in several different contexts, especially to policymakers, these two segments require additional analysis. In addition, one gap not addressed in the present paper relates to women and ethnic studies. In certain economies, these aspects are recognized as a major driving force. It is also our belief that it would be important to cover more deeply the African, Latin American, and Asian literature on these subjects, in order to understand these less researched, specifically constrained settings in terms of not only technological endowments but also socio-economic and political settings.

Although more empirical research is needed in this area, especially in developing countries, new conceptual perspectives are in high demand to help support new empirical research and its implications for practitioners and public policies. One can conclude that, despite the considerable amount of research, there are still open avenues to follow. Moreover, the research community must understand how and why SME internationalization differs across continents. As such, one of the challenges of new research is to welcome not only studies covering a broader perspective (e.g., African, Latin American, and Asian SMEs) but also comparative studies covering different regions, firms, and perspectives, so that researchers can better understand both the plurality of business communities and their internationalization patterns. From this perspective, it is quite challenging to include some settings, for example, Middle East SMEs, because of their unique cultural patterns, which are almost completely absent in this search.

Overall, the gaps identified in the literature represent promising opportunities for future research, which may contribute substantially to the development of the field. Studies employing different perspectives are needed in order to follow multiple lines of investigation and to develop theoretically sound perspectives for different research strands.

### Contributions to Scholarship

The influential papers of Oviatt and McDougall (1994) and Knight and Cavusgil (2004) challenged the traditional perspectives of internationalization business as a research area dominated by multinational firms. Based on the

concepts of early internationalization and international entrepreneurship theory, their INVs and BGs not only quickly spread out, but they also shifted the emphasis of international business to young, innovative, opportunity-driven firms. BGs account for 20% of new ventures in Europe (Eurofound, 2012), which means that the understanding of the intricacies of SME internationalization, following a wider perspective, is still important for international business scholarship, as the breadth and depth of the topics (found in the appendix) vary significantly, as do the analytical research approaches used.

We took a different approach from that of earlier reviews. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first academic paper to include contemporary research specifically on SME internationalization, as all previous studies (Coviello & Jones, 2004; Jones et al., 2011; Keupp & Gassmann, 2009; Kiss et al., 2012; etc.) focused on specific areas within internationalization, without using the term SME. This study contributes to a clearer understanding of the multifaceted perspectives of SME internationalization, covering 74 different topics and seven different categories. Moreover, the present review identified that internationalization theories cover 16 different topics (in 500 papers).

In addition to helping researchers and academics keep abreast of how the internationalization of SMEs has evolved, this study also provides an inventory of the different categories and topics found.

Although BGs have been an important milestone in international business scholarship, there are still underexplored topics on SME internationalization. The variety of categories and topics, as referred to above, call for an analysis of new research streams that are still underexamined, for example: de-internationalization as part of the internationalization process, family versus nonfamily firms, online/electronic internationalization, organizational resources, innovation capability/strategy, international market/entrepreneurship orientation, firm proactiveness, founders/owners/managers' risk-taking proclivity, new product development/imitation strategies, servitization in international markets, firm characteristics (industry, size, type, age, gender issues, performance objectives, financial issues), opportunity discovery/creation/exploitation, growth maintenance and competitive intensity in international markets, and funding and financial activities, among others.

Methodologically, it is important to set out more longitudinal studies that demonstrate the sustainability of international performance of SMEs. Geographically, studies on Latin America, Africa, Asia, and Middle East can be of added value in order to keep abreast of how SMEs that belong to different levels of development can legitimize (or improve) known theories, perspectives, and frameworks and improve our understanding of internationalization of SMEs.

The internationalization literature has made a significant attempt to develop integrative models depicting the core constructs in the SME internationalization process. Although we found strong support for international strategies, new research is still necessary to clarify how international expansion affects SME performance and how successful internationalization strengthens SME internal resources.

### Applied Implications

This paper is of added value for several stakeholders. It provides practitioners, policymakers, and academics with pragmatic evidence of a multifaceted perspective on the relevant topics covered across the world. It helps business managers keep abreast of the intricacies and complexities of the internationalization of SMEs. It also offers advantages to policymakers at the national or local level, as it provides them with substantial knowledge for how to design and promote more efficient SME internationalization policies based on multipolar, regulatory, cognitive, and normative perspectives.

For managers and academics, this paper uncovers several under-researched topics that need to be explored so that SME managers can take better advantage of SME-specific knowledge and become aware of the strengths of a multifaceted, polycentric perspective on the internationalization of SMEs. As a result, chief executive officers, entrepreneurs, and business owners can benefit if (a) policymakers become more aware of all the potential on the internationalization of SMEs for business communities, and (b) academics become more aware of the impacts of the internationalization of SMEs in terms of performance, sales, and international reach.

### Limitations and Future Research Directions

This review is not definitive. Rather, we aimed to make an inventory, summarize, synthesize, and interpret research on the internationalization of SMEs in order to provide an accurate picture of our present knowledge about this topic. Because we wanted to ensure that all the literature reviewed was clear in its categorization of firms (i.e., SME) and that it focused on internationalization, regardless of the topic addressed, we selected papers based on limited key search words. As such, considering the selection criteria defined above, the results could have been totally different had we used search criteria terms such as "small ventures," "new firms," "new ventures," and "export," to mention just a few. Regardless, it is clear that this research complements previous reviews, as explained above.

Given the 554 papers analyzed, the lack of studies in the 1970s and 1980s could appear perplexing. This gap might be explained by the fact that most studies carried out on internationalization did not explicitly mention SMEs and also used terms such as export activities instead of internationalization.

Based on the sample size, this study was based on “counting” the number of articles to categorize them in the categories and topics, which limited the richness of the debate of the different perspectives and topics on SME internationalization. However, the interconnectedness of the topics, although difficult to achieve with such a large sample size, deserves further attention in future research.

Another limitation of our research is the lack of information in certain papers regarding the size of firms, which hindered the identification of the type of firm studied (i.e., if an SME or not). In addition, although Google Scholar is quite popular, we decided not to use it because the output was unmanageable. Had we included it, the results would have been different.

Another limitation of our research is related to the key search words and journal titles. For example, certain journals are typical outlets for studies involving SMEs, as is the case of *JSBM*, *JSBED*, *SBE*, and *ISBJ*, among others. As a result, the titles, abstract, and keywords of papers might not include the words “small” or “SME,” as these topics are implicitly focused on in the journals in which these papers are published. This limitation can only be overcome by using a different research approach. In this context, it is also important to emphasize that this literature review comprised a set of topics that was thematically grouped and categorized, mapping all of them, which has never been done before.

In order to deepen the analysis, future reviews might assess SME internationalization using other search terms. Although it would be tempting to expand the search selection criteria, it should be done so with caution as the outcome exponentially increases, which can jeopardize the investigation. In addition, there are studies that refer to “new” ventures that include not only SMEs but also large firms (e.g., Peiris et al., 2012), which requires close scrutiny during the phase of paper selection in order to ascertain that they include only SMEs. Moreover, it would be advantageous to include non-English literature, which would help to understand the particularities, for example, of the Portuguese, Spanish, and French literature on the internationalization of South American and African firms. Due to the multidisciplinary and multitheoretical nature of SME internationalization—a complex phenomenon offering a high potential for fruitful analyses—the process of debating, testing, and theorizing is important for the development and consolidation of this research area.

**JEL Classifications:** M16, F23

## References

- Andersson, S., & Servais, P. (2010). Combining industrial buyer and seller strategies for international supply and marketing management. *European Business Review*, 22(1), 64–81.
- Armario, J., Ruiz, D., & Armario, E. (2008). Market orientation and internationalisation in small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(4), 485–512.
- Bell, J. (1995). The internationalisation of small computer software firms: a further challenge to stage theories. *European Journal of Marketing*, 29(8), 60–75.
- Bello, D., & Gilliland, D. (1997). The effects of output controls, process controls and flexibility on export channel performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(1), 22–38.
- Benito, G., & Welch, L. (1997). De-internationalisation. *Management International Review*, 37(2), 7–25.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Calof, J., & Beamish, P. (1995). Adapting to foreign markets: explaining internationalisation. *International Business Review*, 4(2), 115–131.
- Cavusgil, S. T. (1980). On the internationalisation process of firms. *European Research*, 8, 273–281.
- Chetty, S. (1999). Dimensions of internationalisation of manufacturing firms in the apparel industry. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(1/2), 121–142.
- Chetty, S., & Campbell-Hunt, C. (2003). Paths to internationalisation among small-to medium-sized firms: a global versus regional approach. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(5/6), 796–820.
- Chiarvesio, M., Di Maria, E., & Micelli, S. (2010). Global value chains and open networks: the case of Italian industrial districts. *European Planning Studies*, 18(3), 333–350.
- Coviello, N. (2006). The network dynamics of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 713–731.
- Coviello, N., & Jones, M. (2004). Methodological issues in international entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19, 485–508.
- Coviello, N., & Martin, K. (1999). Internationalisation of service SMEs: an integrated perspective from the engineering consulting sector. *Journal of International Marketing*, 7(4), 42–66.
- Coviello, N., & Munro, H. (1997). Network relationships and the internationalisation process of small software firms. *International Business Review*, 6(4), 361–386.
- Crick, D. (2004). U.K. SMEs’ decision to discontinue exporting: an exploratory investigation into practices within the clothing industry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(4), 561–587.
- Dana, L. P. (2001). Networks, internationalisation & policy. *Small Business Economics*, 16, 57–62.
- D’Angelo, A., Majocchi, A., Zucchella, A., & Buck, T. (2013). Geographical pathways for SME internationalisation: insights from an Italian sample. *International Marketing Review*, 30(2), 80–105.
- Dutot, V., Bergeron, F., & Raymond, L. (2014). Information management for the internationalization of SMEs: An exploratory study based on a strategic alignment perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 34(5), 672–681.
- Eberhard, M., & Craig, J. (2013). The evolving role of organisational and personal networks in international market venturing. *Journal of World Business*, 48(3), 385–397.

- Etemad, H. (2004). Internationalisation of small and medium-sized enterprises: a grounded theoretical framework and an overview. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 21(1), 1–21.
- Etemad, H., Wright, R., & Dana, L. (2001). Symbiotic international business networks: collaboration between small and large firms. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 43(4), 481–499.
- Eurofound (2012). *Born global: The potential of job creation in new international businesses*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission. (2014). Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/> (accessed 24 March 2014 at 19:34).
- Fillis, I. (2001). Small firm internationalisation: an investigative survey and future research directions. *Management Decision*, 39(9), 767–83.
- Fletcher, R. (2001). A holistic approach to internationalisation. *International Business Review*, 10(1), 25–49.
- Freeman, S., Hutchings, K., Lazaris, M., & Zyngier, S. (2010). A model of rapid knowledge development: the smaller born-global firm. *International Business Review*, 19(1), 70–84.
- Graves, C., & Thomas, J. (2008). Determinants of the internationalization pathways of family firms: an examination of family influence. *Family Business Review*, 21(2), 151–167.
- Hessels, J., & Parker, S. C. (2013). Constraints, internationalisation and growth: a cross-country analysis of European SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 48(1), 137–148.
- Hewerdine, J., Rummyantseva, M., & Welch, C. (2014). Resource scavenging: Another dimension of the internationalisation pattern of high-tech SMEs. *International Marketing Review*, 31(3), 237–258.
- Hinson, R., & Abor, J. (2005). Internationalizing SME nontraditional exporters and their internet use idiosyncrasies. *Perspectives on Global Development & Technology*, 4(2), 229–244.
- Hong, P., Kwon, H., & Roh, J. (2009). Implementation of strategic green orientation in supply chain: an empirical study of manufacturing firms. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 12(4), 512–532.
- Hsu, W., Chen, H., & Cheng, C. (2013). Internationalisation and firm performance of SMEs: The moderating effects of CEO attributes. *Journal of World Business*, 48(1), 1–12.
- International Finance Corporation (IFC), World Bank Group. (2012). *IFC and Small and Medium Enterprises* – [www.ifc.org](http://www.ifc.org).
- Jansson, H., & Sandberg, S. (2008). Internationalisation of small and medium sized enterprises in the Baltic Sea Region. *Journal of International Management*, 14(1), 65–77.
- Javalgi, R., Todd, P., & Granot, E. (2011). The internationalisation of Indian SMEs in B-to-B markets. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 26(7), 542–548.
- Johanson, J., & Vahlne, J.-E. (1977). The internationalisation process of the firm: A model of knowledge development and increasing foreign market commitments. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8(1), 23–32.
- Johanson, J., & Vahlne, J.-E. (1990). The mechanism of internationalisation. *International Marketing Review*, 7(4), 11–24.
- Jolly, V., Alahuhta, M., & Jeannot, J.-P. (1992). Challenging the incumbents: how high technology start-ups compete globally. *Strategic Change*, 1(2), 71–82.
- Jones, M., & Nummela, N. (2008). International entrepreneurship: expanding the domain and extending our research questions. *European Management Journal*, 26(6), 349–353.
- Jones, M., Coviello, N., & Tang, Y. (2011). International entrepreneurship research (1989-2009): a domain ontology and thematic analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26, 632–659.
- Kalinic, I., & Forza, C. (2012). Rapid internationalisation of traditional SMEs: Between gradualist models and born globals. *International Business Review*, 21(4), 694–707.
- Karabulut, A. T. (2013). Internationalisation of Turkish SMEs: an empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(6), 68–88.
- Karlsen, A., & Nordhus, M. (2011). Between close and distanced links: firm internationalisation in a subsea cluster in Western Norway. *Norwegian Journal of Geology*, 65(4), 202–211.
- Keupp, M., & Gassmann, O. (2009). The past and the future of international entrepreneurship: a review and suggestions for developing the field. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 600–633.
- Kiss, A., Danis, W., & Cavusgil, S. (2012). International entrepreneurship research in emerging economies: a critical review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27, 266–290.
- Knight, G., & Cavusgil, S. (1996). The born global firm: a challenge to traditional internationalisation theory. *Advances in International Marketing*, 8, 11–26.
- Knight, G., & Cavusgil, S. (2004). Innovation, organizational capabilities, and the born-global firm. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(2), 124–141.
- Knudsen, M., & Servais, P. (2007). Analyzing internationalisation configurations of SMEs: The purchaser's perspective. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 13(2), 137–151.
- Kontinen, T., & Ojala, A. (2010). The internationalisation of family businesses: a review of extant research. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1, 97–107.
- Kubickova, L., & Prochazkova, L. (2014). Success evaluation of small and medium-sized enterprises in terms of their participation in the internationalization process. *Ekonomie A Management*, 17(2), 131–145.
- Kuivalainen, O., Saarenketo, S., & Puumalainen, K. (2012a). Start-up patterns of internationalisation: a framework and its application in the context of knowledge-intensive SMEs. *European Management Journal*, 30(4), 72–385.
- Kuivalainen, O., Sundqvist, S., Saarenketo, S., & McNaughton, R. (2012b). Internationalisation patterns of small and medium-sized enterprises. *International Marketing Review*, 29(5), 448–465.
- Leonidou, L., & Katsikeas, C. (1996). The export development process: an integrative review of empirical models. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(3), 517–551.
- Lin, K. H., & Chaney, I. (2007). The influence of domestic interfirm networks on the internationalisation process of Taiwanese SMEs. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 13(4), 565–583.
- Lindqvist, M. (1997). Infant multinationals: internationalisation of small technology-based firms. In Jones-Evans, D. & Kloften, M. (Eds), *Technology, innovation and enterprise: The European experience*, pp. 303–324, Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Luostarinen, R. (1980). *The Internationalisation of the firm*. Helsinki: Helsinki School of Economics.

- Madsen, T., & Servais, P. (1997). The internationalisation of born globals: an evolutionary process? *International Business Review*, 6(6), 561–583.
- McAuley, A. (1999). Research into the internationalisation process: advice to an alien. *Journal of Research in Marketing Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 11–17.
- McAuley, A. (2010). Looking back, going forward: reflecting on research into the SME internationalisation process. *Journal of Research in Marketing Entrepreneurship*, 12(1), 21–41.
- Mejri, K., & Umemoto, K. (2010). Small and medium-sized enterprise internationalisation: towards the knowledge-based model. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 8(2), 156–167.
- Noblit, G., & Hare, R. (1988). *Meta-ethnography: synthesising qualitative studies*. London: Sage.
- Nummela, N., Saarenketo, S., & Loane, S. (2016). The dynamics of failure in international new ventures: a case study of Finnish and Irish software companies. *International Small Business Journal*, 34, 51–69.
- Observatory of European SMEs (2007). *Analytical Report*. Eurobarometer.
- O’Cass, A., & Weerawardena, J. (2009). Examining the role of international entrepreneurship, innovation and international market performance in SME internationalisation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(11/12), 1325–1348.
- Overby, J., & Servais, P. (2005). Small and medium-sized firms’ import behaviour: the case of Danish industrial purchasers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 34(1), 71–83.
- Oviatt, B., & McDougall, P. (1994). Toward a theory of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(1), 45–64.
- Oviatt, B., & McDougall, P. (1999). Accelerated internationalisation: why are new and small ventures internationalizing in greater numbers and with increasing speed? In Wright, R. (Ed.), *Research in global strategic management* (pp. 23–40). Stanford: JAI Press.
- Oviatt, B., & McDougall, P. (2005). *Toward a theory of international new ventures* *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36, 29–41.
- Pangarkar, N. (2008). Internationalisation and performance of small and medium sized enterprises. *Journal of World Business*, 43, 475–485.
- Peiris, I., Akoorie, M., & Sinha, P. (2012). International entrepreneurship: a critical analysis of studies in the past two decades and future directions for research. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 10, 279–324.
- Peng, M., & York, A. (2001). Behind intermediary performance in export trade: transactions, agents and resources. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(2), 327–346.
- Podsakoff, P., Mackenzie, S., Bachrach, D., & Podsakoff, N. (2005). The influence of management journals in the 1980s and 1990s. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(5), 473–488.
- Rasmussen, E. S., Madsen, T. K., & Servais, P. (2012). On the foundation and early development of domestic and international new ventures. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 16(4), 543–556.
- Rialp, A., Rialp, J., & Knight, G. (2005). The phenomenon of early internationalizing firms: what do we know after a decade (1993–2003) of scientific inquiry? *International Business Review*, 14, 147–166.
- Rostamzadeh, R., Ismail, K., & Noubar, H. (2014). An application of a hybrid MCDM method for the evaluation of entrepreneurial intensity among the SMEs: a case study. *The Scientific World Journal*. Article ID 703650. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/703650>
- Ruigrok, W., & Wagner, H. (2003). Internationalisation and performance: an organizational learning perspective. *Management International Review*, 43, 63–83.
- Ruzzier, M., Hisrich, R., & Antoncic, B. (2006). SME internationalisation research: past, present, and future. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 13(4), 476–497.
- Saarenketo, S., Puumalainen, K., Kuivalainen, O., & Kyläheiko, K. (2004). Dynamic knowledge-related learning processes in internationalizing high-tech SMEs. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 89(3), 363–378.
- Salomon, R., & Jin, B. (2008). Does knowledge spill to leaders or laggards? Exploring industry heterogeneity in learning by exporting. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(1), 132–150.
- Singh, D., Gaur, A., & Schmid, F. (2010). Corporate diversification, TMT experience, and performance: evidence from German SMEs. *Management International Review*, 50(1), 35–57.
- Sinha, P., Akoorie, M., Ding, Q., & Wu, Q. (2011). What motivates manufacturing SMEs to outsource offshore in China?: comparing the perspectives of SME manufacturers and their suppliers. *Strategic Outsourcing: An International Journal*, 4 (1), 67–88.
- Tahai, A., & Meyer, M. (1999). A revealed preference study of management journals’ direct influences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(3), 279–296.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14, 207–222
- US Small Business Administration (SBA). (2014). Available at: <https://www.sba.gov> (accessed 25 November 2014 at 12:14).
- Vissak, T., & Masso, J. (2015). Export patterns: typology development and application to Estonian data. *International Business Review*, 24(4), 652–664.
- Weed, M. (2008). A potential method for the interpretative synthesis of qualitative research: issues in the development of ‘meta-interpretation’. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(1), 13–28.
- Welch, L., & Luostarinen, R. (1988). Internationalisation: evolution of a concept. *Journal General Management*, 14(2), 34–55.
- World Bank Group (2015). Available at: <http://ieg.worldbank.org/> and <http://www.worldbank.org/> (accessed 19 September 2015 at 20:49).
- Wright, R. W., & Dana, L. P. (2003). Changing paradigms of international entrepreneurship strategy. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 1, 135–152.
- Zahra, S. A. (2005). A theory of international new ventures: a decade of research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(1), 20–28.

## Appendix References by categories and topics/themes

Category	Topic/Theme	References	Topics*
	Internationalization theories	(Andersson, Gabriellsson & Wictor, 2004; Barbosa, González-Campo & Vargas, 2013; Bell, 1995; Brouthers, Brouthers & Werner, 1996; Chiao, Yang & Yu, 2006; Crick & Spence, 2005; Dan, 2012; Dias & Lopes, 2014; Hilmersson, 2013; Johnson, Arya & Mirchandani, 2013; Karabulut, 2013; Ojala, 2008; Ojala & Tyrvaainen, 2008; Olejnik & Swoboda, 2012; Orser, Spence, Riding & Carrington, 2010; Pangarkar, 2008; Schulz, Borghoff & Kraus, 2009; Sandberg, 2014; Segaro, 2012; Styles, Wilkinson & Chandra, 2009; Thai & Chong, 2013; Tabares, Anzo & Estrada, 2014; Torrens, Amal & Tontini, 2014; Zarei, Nasseri & Tajeddin, 2011)	24
	International new ventures	(Cabrol & Nlemvo, 2009; Cancino & La Paz, 2010; Crick, 2009; Hallböck & Gabriellsson, 2013; Kaur & Sandhu, 2014; Manolova, Manev & Gysoshev, 2010; McGaughey, 2007; Nowinski & Rialp, 2013; Park, Whitehead & Gitroud, 2009; Prashantham & Floyd, 2012; Riding, Orser, Spence & Belanger, 2012; Ripollés, Blesa & Monferrer, 2012; Sasi & Arenius, 2008; Schwens & Kabst, 2011; Spence, Orser & Riding, 2011; Tang, 2011; Tolstoy & Agndal, 2010)	17
	Born global	(Armario, Ruiz & Armario, 2008; Barbosa & Ayala, 2014; Barbosa, González-Campo & Vargas, 2013; Bell, McNaughton & Young, 2001; Cancino & Coronado, 2014; Chandra, Styles & Wilkinson, 2012; Chetty & Campbell-Hunt, 2004; Crick, 2009; Freeman, Hutchings, Lazaris & Zyngier, 2010; Gabriellsson, Kirpalani, Dimitratos, Solberg & Zucchella, 2008; Gassmann & Keupp, 2007; Gerschwski, Rose & Lindsay, 2014; Laanti, Gabriellsson & Gabriellsson, 2007; Li, Qian & Qian, 2012b; Kalinic & Forza, 2012; Kaur & Sandhu, 2014; Kocak & Abimbola, 2009; Kránsnicka & Glód, 2013; Kuivalainen, Saarenketo & Puimalainen, 2012; Thai & Chong, 2008; Moen & Servais, 2002; Mort & Weerawardena, 2006; Rialp-Criado, Galván-Sánchez & Suárez-Ortega, 2010; Schueffel, Baldeger & Amann, 2014; Sui & Baum, 2014; Sui, Yu & Baum, 2012; Taylor & Jack, 2012; Uner, Kocak, Cavusgil & Cavusgil, 2013; Zhang, Sarker & Sarker, 2013; Zhou, Wu & Luo, 2007)	31
Internationalization theories	Stage models/ Uppsala model	(Armario, Ruiz & Armario, 2008; Boeche, 2009; Coviello & Martin, 1999; Coviello & Munro, 1997; Gankema, Snuf & Zwart, 2000; Kamakura, Ramón-Jerónimo & Gravel, 2012; Karabulut, 2013; Karlisen & Nordhus, 2011; Korsakienė & Tvaronavicienė, 2012; Moen, Gavlen & Endresen, 2004; Westhead, Wright & Binks, 2004)	11
	Foreign direct investment theory	(Berra, Piatti & Vitali, 1995; Chen, Ding & Wu, 2014; Coviello & Martin, 1999; De Maesseneire & Claeys, 2012; Huett, Baum, Schwens & Kabst, 2014; Ivarsson & Alvstam, 2013; Karabulut, 2013; Lauridsen, 2004; Steinmann, Kumar & Wasner, 1980; Svetličič, Jaklič & Burger, 2007; Lee, Lee & Kwak, 2013; Li & Hu, 2002; Lu & Beamish, 2006; Ruokonen, 2008; Todo & Sato, 2014; Vachani, 2005)	16
	Resource-based view	(Boeche, 2009; Camison & Villar - Lopez, 2010; Chetty & Wilson, 2003; Ciszewska-Mlinarić & Mlinarić, 2010; D'Angelo, Majocchi, Zucchella & Buck, 2013; Dhanaraj & Beamish, 2003; Fernández-Olmos & Díez-Vial, 2013; Fernández-Ortiz & Lombardo, 2009; Freeman & Styles, 2014; Freeman, Styles & Lawley, 2012; Garg & Kumar, 2014; Graves & Thomas, 2006; Hessels & Parker, 2013; Hessels & Terjesen, 2010; Huett, Baum, Schwens & Kabst, 2014; Ioan, 2012; Javalgi & Todd, 2011; Kahiya & Dean, 2014; Knight & Kim, 2009; Kuhlmeier & Knight, 2010; Lee & Marvel, 2009; Libaers & Meyer, 2011; Maranto-Vargas & Rangel, 2007; O' Cass & Weerawardena, 2009; Olmos, 2011; Martín-Tapia, Aragón-Correa & Rueda-Manzanares, 2010; Pett & Wolff, 2003; Rabino, Simoni & Zanni, 2008; Segaro, 2012; Stoian, Rialp & Rialp, 2011; Serra, Poynton & Abdou, 2012; Todd & Javalgi, 2007; Toledo, Hernández & Griffin, 2010; Tolstoy & Agndal, 2010; Torrens, Amal & Tontini, 2014; Xie & Suh, 2014; Westhead, Wright & Ucbasaran, 2001; Westhead, Wright & Ucbasaran, 2004; Wilkinson & Brouthers, 2006)	39
	Entrepreneurship approach	(Acs, Morck & Yeung, 2001; Amal & Filho, 2010; Basile, 2012; Barbosa & Ayala, 2014; Bhatti & Kumar, 2012; Boeche, 2009; Chandra, Styles & Wilkinson, 2012; Cravegna, Lopez & Kundu, 2014; Cravegna, Majano & Zhan, 2014; Chelliah, Sulaiman & Munusamy, 2011; Crick & Spence, 2005; Dai, Maksimov, Gilbert & Fernhaber, 2014; De Clercq, Sapienza & Crijns, 2005; Di Gregorio, Musteen & Thomas, 2009; Dimitratos, Amorós, Etebarne & Felzensztein, 2014; Dimitratos, Plakoyiannaki, Pitsoulaki & Tüselmann, 2010; Dimitratos, Voudouris, Plakoyiannaki & Nakosd, 2012; Filser, Eggers, Kraus & Mátovics, 2014; Fletcher & Harris, 2012; George, Wiklund & Zahra, 2005; Gerschwski, Rose & Lindsay, 2014; Glavas & Mathews, 2014; Glavas, Pike & Mathews, 2014; Goxe, 2010; Hallböck & Gabriellsson, 2013; Hunkeler, 2003; Hutchinson, Quinn & Alexander, 2005; Islam, 2010; Javalgi & Todd, 2011; Javalgi, Todd, Johnston & Granot, 2012; Jones, 1999; Jones, Coviello & Tang, 2011; Jørgensen, 2014; Kaur & Sandhu, 2014; Kalinic & Forza, 2012; Keen & Etamad, 2012; Ketkar & Acs, 2013; Khatun, 2012; Knight, 2000; Knight, 2001; Knight & Cavusgil, 2004; Kocak & Abimbola, 2009; Koladkiewicz, 2013; Kontinen & Ojala, 2011; Korsakienė &	85

Appendix (Continued)

Category	Topic/Theme	References	Topics*
		<p>Tvaronavičienė, 2012; Loane, Bell &amp; Cunningham, 2014; Löfgren, 2014; Lu &amp; Beamish, 2001; Manolova, Manev &amp; Gyoshev, 2010; Matlay, 2006; Mort &amp; Weerawardena, 2006; McGaughey, 2007; Mligwe, 2005; Musteen &amp; Datta, 2011; Musteen, Datta &amp; Butts, 2014; Nakos, Brouthers &amp; Dimitratos, 2014; Naldi &amp; Davidsson, 2014; Nkongolo-Bakenda, Anderson, Ito &amp; Garven, 2010; Nowinski &amp; Bakinowska, 2012; O' Cass &amp; Weerawardena, 2009; Omri &amp; Becuwe, 2014; Orser, Spence, Riding &amp; Carrington, 2010; Rao, 2007; Ripollés, Blesa &amp; Monferrer, 2012; Rundh, 2011; Rostamzadeh, Ismail &amp; Bodaghi, 2014; Ruzzier, Hisrich &amp; Antoncic, 2006; Schneffel, Baldeger &amp; Amann, 2014; Schwens &amp; Kabst, 2011; Sciascia, D'Oria, Bruni &amp; Larrañeta, 2014; Sommer, 2010; Sommer &amp; Haug, 2011; Spence &amp; Crick, 2006; Styles, Wilkinson &amp; Chandra, 2009; Subrahmanya, 2007; Todd &amp; Javalgi, 2007; Tolstoy, 2010; Tolstoy, 2014; Tseng &amp; Johnsen, 2011; Volček, Jantunen &amp; Saarenketo, 2013; Williams, Rodgers &amp; Baric, 2012; Wolff &amp; Pett, 2006; Wright, Westhead &amp; Ubasaran, 2007; Yang, 2012; Zhou, 2007)</p> <p>(Anderson, Boocock &amp; Graham, 2001; Armario, Horriilo &amp; Robles, 2009; Armario, Ruiz, &amp; Armario, 2008; Basly, 2007; Burpitt &amp; Rondinelli, 1998; Carlsson &amp; Dale, 2011; Chelliah, Pandian, Sulaiman, &amp; Munusamy, 2010; Chetty, Eriksson &amp; Lindbergh, 2006; Dai &amp; Liu, 2009; Davenport, 2005; De Clercq, Sapienza &amp; Crijns, 2005; Deligianni, Voudouris &amp; Lioukas, 2014; Dimitratos, Amorós, Etchebarne &amp; Felzensztein, 2014; Dimitratos, Lioukas, Ibeh &amp; Wheeler, 2010; Descotes &amp; Walliser, 2011; Elenurm, 2008; Gassmann &amp; Keupp, 2007; Eliasson, Hansson &amp; Lindvert, 2012; Fletcher &amp; Harris, 2012; Freeman, Hutchings, Lazaris &amp; Zyngier, 2010; Grtzy, Baker &amp; Grinstein, 2014; Haahiti, Madupu, Yavas &amp; Babakus, 2005; Hilmerston, 2014; Jonsson &amp; Lindbergh, 2010; Knight &amp; Cavusgil, 2004; Knight &amp; Liesch, 2002; Kuivalainen, Puumalainen, Sintonen &amp; Kyläheiko, 2010; Kuivalainen, Saarenketo &amp; Puumalainen, 2012; Kuivalainen, Sundqvist, Puumalainen &amp; Cadogan, 2004; Liesch &amp; Knight, 1999; Lindstrand, Melén &amp; Nordman, 2011; Maelkelburger, Schwens &amp; Kabst, 2012; Mejri &amp; Umemoto, 2010; Mets, Kaarna &amp; Kelli, 2010; Musteen &amp; Datta, 2011; Musteen, Datta &amp; Butts, 2014; Naldi &amp; Davidsson, 2014; Nordman &amp; Tolstoy, 2014; Nummela, Puumalainen &amp; Saarenketo, 2005; Ojala, 2009; Park, Whitelock &amp; Giroud, 2009; Pittiglio, Sica &amp; Villa, 2014; Nummela, Prashantham &amp; Floyd, 2012; Saarenketo, Puumalainen &amp; Kyläheiko, 2004; Saarenketo, Puumalainen, Kyläheiko &amp; Kuivalainen, 2008; Sandberg, 2013; Sandberg, 2014; Scott-Kennel &amp; von Batenburg, 2012; Sciascia, D'Oria, Bruni &amp; Larrañeta, 2014; Thai &amp; Chong, 2013; Tolstoy, 2010; Zahra, Neubaum &amp; Naldi, 2007)</p>	53
	Knowledge-based view	<p>(Abban, Omta, Aheto &amp; Scholten, 2013; Agndal &amp; Chetty, 2007; Amal &amp; Filho, 2010; Andersen, 2006; Anderson, Boocock &amp; Graham, 2001; Babakus, Yavas &amp; Haahiti, 2006; Bagchi-Sem &amp; Kuechler, 2000; Berra, Piatti &amp; Vitali, 1995; Bradley, Meyer &amp; Gao, 2006; Boehe, 2013; Boojithawon, 2007; Cancino &amp; Coronado, 2014; Chetty &amp; Campbell-Hunt, 2003; Chetty &amp; Holm, 2000; Chetty &amp; Stangl, 2010; Chetty &amp; Wilson, 2003; Chiarvesio, Di, &amp; Micelli, 2010; Child &amp; Hsieh, 2014; Child &amp; Rodrigues, 2008; Ciravegna, Lopez &amp; Kundu, 2014; Ciravegna, Majano &amp; Zhan, 2014; Coviello &amp; Munro, 1997; D'Angelo, Majocchi, Zucchella &amp; Buck, 2013; Dai &amp; Liu, 2009; Deprey, I Lloyd-Reason &amp; Ibeh, 2012; Dias &amp; Lopes, 2014; Dimitratos, Amorós, Etchebarne &amp; Felzensztein, 2014; Dimitratos, Voudouris, Plakoyiannaki &amp; Nakos, 2012; Eberhard &amp; Craig, 2013; Echeverri-Carroll, Hunnicutt &amp; Hansen, 1998; Evers &amp; Knight, 2008; Farinha, Ferreira &amp; Gouveia, 2010; Guerrieri &amp; Pietrobelli, 2004; Hadjikhani &amp; Ghauri, 2001; Hayer &amp; Ibeh, 2006; Hilmerston, 2014; Hilmerston, 2013; Hilmerston &amp; Jansson, 2012; Ibeh &amp; Kasem, 2011; Isidor, Schwens &amp; Kabst, 2011; Johnsen, 2007; Jansson &amp; Sandberg, 2008; Kalinic &amp; Forza, 2012; Karlson &amp; Nordhus, 2011; Kaur &amp; Sandhu, 2014; Kontinen &amp; Ojala, 2011; Korsakienė &amp; Tvaronavičienė, 2012; Kreivi, Wang, Muthos &amp; Kess, 2012; Leonidou &amp; Katsikeas, 2003; Lin &amp; Chaney, 2007; Löfgren, 2014; Manolova, Manev &amp; Gyoshev, 2010; Meyer &amp; Skak, 2002; Mort &amp; Weerawardena, 2006; Musteen, Datta &amp; Butts, 2014; Musteen, Francis &amp; Datta, 2010; Ojala, 2009; Park, Han, Rojars, Son &amp; Jung, 2011; Ruokonen, Nummela, Puumalainen &amp; Saarenketo, 2008; Ruzzier &amp; Antoncic, 2007; Sandberg, 2013; Sandberg, 2014; Sasi &amp; Arenius, 2008; Seifriz, Gondim &amp; Pereira, 2014; Semk, Scott-Ladd, Entrekim &amp; Adham, 2011; Spence, 2004; Sinha, Akkoore, Ding &amp; Wu, 2011; Tang, 2011; Tikkanen, 1998; Tolstoy, 2014; Tolstoy &amp; Agndal, 2010; Tolstoy, 2010; Torckkeli, Puumalainen, Saarenketo &amp; Kuivalainen, 2012; Ural, 2009; Westhead, Wright &amp; Binks, 2004; Witkowski &amp; Thibodeau, 1999; Zarei, Nasserri &amp; Tajeddin, 2011; Zhou, Wu &amp; Luo, 2007; Zimmermann, Barsky &amp; Brouthers, 2009)</p>	84
	Network view		
	Psychic distance countries	(Brock, Johnson & Zhou, 2011; Child, Rodrigues & Fynas, 2009; Nordman & Tolstoy, 2014; Ojala, 2008; Ojala, 2009)	5

## Appendix (Continued)

	<p>Geographic proximity/diversity/scope 12 (D'Angelo, Majocchi, Zucchella &amp; Buck, 2013; Davenport, 2005; Cieřlik, Kaciak &amp; Welsh, 2012; Fernández-Olmos &amp; Díez-Vial, 2013; Kamakura, Ramón-Jerónimo &amp; Gravel, 2012; Li, Qian &amp; Qian, 2012a; Li, Li &amp; Shi, 2011; Ojala &amp; Tyrväinen, 2007; Sandulli, Fernández-Menéndez, Rodríguez-Duarte &amp; Lopez-Sanchez, 2012; Singh, Gaur &amp; Schmid, 2010; Teixeira, Santos &amp; Brochado, 2008; Zimmermann, Barsky &amp; Brouthers, 2009)</p>
	<p>Regional development theory 1 (Westhead, Wright &amp; Binks, 2004)</p>
	<p>Transaction cost theory 3 (Brouthers &amp; Nakos, 2004; Khemakhem, 2010; Sinha, Akoorie, Ding &amp; Wu, 2011)</p>
	<p>Internationalization process 93 (Agndal &amp; Elbe, 2007; Agndal, Chetty &amp; Wilson, 2008; Alajoutsijärvi, Mannermaa &amp; Tikkanen, 2000; Anderson, Boocock &amp; Graham, 2001; Armario, Horrillo &amp; Robles, 2009; Barbosa &amp; Ayala, 2014; Basile, 2012; Bello-Martínez, 2006; Benkraiem &amp; Miloudi, 2014; Boter &amp; Holmquist, 1996; Chadwick, Ghafour, Khail, Khan &amp; Hassan, 2011; Cambra-Fierro &amp; Vazquez-Carrasco, 2010; Carazo, 2007; Carazo, 2009; Chelliah, Sulaiman &amp; Yusoff, 2010; Chetty &amp; Campbell-Hunt, 2003; Chetty &amp; Stangl, 2010; Chiarvesio et al., 2010; Cieřlik, Kaciak &amp; Welsh, 2012; Ciszewska-Mlinarić &amp; Mlinarić, 2010; Cortezia &amp; Souza, 2011; Coviello &amp; Martin, 1999; Coviello &amp; Munro, 1997; Dalli, 1995; Dias &amp; Lopes, 2014; Evers &amp; Knight, 2008; Fink &amp; Kraus, 2007; Frąckiewicz &amp; Grzesiuk, 2013; Francioni, Mussoa &amp; Vardiabasisb, 2013; Freeman, Hutchings, Lazaris &amp; Zyngier, 2010; Gabrielsson, Kirpalani, Dimitratos, Solberg &amp; Zucchella, 2008; Gankema, Snuif &amp; Zwart, 2000; Gashi, Hashi &amp; Pugh, 2014; Goxe, 2010; Graves &amp; Shan, 2013; Gurău &amp; Merdji, 2008; Hessels &amp; Parker, 2013; Hewerdine, Rumyantseva &amp; Welch, 2014; Hilmersson, 2013; Hutchinson, Quinn &amp; Alexander, 2005; Hutchinson, Quinn &amp; Alexander, 2006; Jansson &amp; Sandberg, 2008; Kalinic, Sarasvathy &amp; Forza, 2014; Karabulut, 2013; Kennedy &amp; Keeney, 2009; Ketkar &amp; Acs, 2013; Koladkiewicz, 2013; Kontinen &amp; Ojala, 2012; Krařnicka &amp; Glód, 2013; Kreivi, Wang, Muhos &amp; Kess, 2012; Kubickova &amp; Peprny, 2011; Kubickova &amp; Prochazkova, 2014; Kuhlmeier &amp; Knight, 2010; Kuivalainen, Puumalainen, Sintonen &amp; Kyläheiko, 2010; Laudal, 2011; Lee, Lee &amp; Kwak, 2013; Liesch &amp; Knight, 1999; Lin &amp; Chaney, 2007; Lindstrand, Melén &amp; Nordman, 2011; Lloyd-Reason &amp; Mughan, 2002; London, 2010; Meyer &amp; Skak, 2002; Middleton, Liesch &amp; Steen, 2011; Miocevic &amp; Crnjak-Karanovic, 2010; Mockaitis, Vaiginienė &amp; Giedraitis, 2006; Moler, 1998; Moreira, 2007; Mligwe, 2005; Neupert, Baughm &amp; Dao, 2006; Nkongolo-Bakenda, Anderson, Ito &amp; Garven, 2010; Nummela, Loane &amp; Bell, 2006; O' Cass &amp; Weerawardena, 2009; Peurseem &amp; Jiang, 2006; Pillmayer &amp; Scherle, 2014; Prashantham &amp; McNaughton, 2006; Rialp-Criado, Galván-Sánchez &amp; Suárez-Ortega, 2010; Rodriguez, 2007; Ruokonen, Nummela, Puumalainen &amp; Saarenketo, 2008; Ruzzier, Hisrich &amp; Antonic, 2006; Saarenketo, Puumalainen, Kuivalainen &amp; Kyläheiko, 2004; Sasi &amp; Arenius, 2008; Schweizer, 2012; Schwens &amp; Kabst, 2011; Singh, Pathak &amp; Naz, 2010; Spence, Orser &amp; Riding, 2011; Steinmann, Kumar &amp; Wasner, 1980; Suh, Bae &amp; Kundu, 2007; Thai &amp; Chong, 2013; Tunisini &amp; Bocconcelli, 2009; Torrens, Amal &amp; Tontini, 2014; Wang, Muhos &amp; Kess, 2011; Zapata &amp; Barrientos, 2013; Zucchella &amp; Siano, 2014)</p>
	<p>Cognitive perspective: decision-making process 19 (Acedo &amp; Galan, 2011; Baldauf, Cravens &amp; Wagner, 2000; Child &amp; Hsieh, 2014; Dimitratos, Lioukas, Ibeh &amp; Wheeler, 2010; Dimitratos, Petrou, Plakoyiannaki &amp; Johnson, 2011; Fabian, Molina &amp; Labianca, 2009; Hutchinson, Quinn &amp; Alexander, 2006; Javalgi, Todd, Johnston &amp; Granot, 2012; Kalinic, Sarasvathy &amp; Forza, 2014; Kowatzki, Walter, Floyd &amp; Lechner, 2013; Mikhailitschenko &amp; Lundstrom, 2006; Miocevic &amp; Crnjak-Karanovic, 2011; Schweizer, 2012; Serra, Pinton &amp; Abdou, 2012; Sommer &amp; Haug, 2011; Stoian &amp; Rialp-Criado, 2010; Williams, 2013)</p>
	<p>Internationalization patterns; Export patterns; Start up patterns 7 (Hewerdine, Rumyantseva &amp; Welch, 2014; Jones, 1999; Lee, Kelley, Lee &amp; Lee, 2012; McGaughey, 2007; Richardson, 2014; Taylor &amp; Jack, 2012; Testa, 2011)</p>

Appendix (Continued)

Category	Topic/Theme	References	Topics*
	Offshoring decisions/ "backshoring"	(Aspelund & Butsko, 2010; Canham & Hamilton, 2013; Di Gregorio, Musteen & Thomas, 2009; Sinha, Akoorie, Ding & Wu, 2011)	4
	Quality management systems	(Đorđević, Bešić, Milošević & Bogetić, 2010; Imbriani, Morone & Testa, 2014)	2
	Cooperative strategy (joint ventures, partnership, alliances)	(Bradley, Meyer & Gao, 2006; Bontempi & Prodi, 2009; Chadwick, Ghafoor, Khaif, Khan & Hassan, 2011; Dias & Lopes, 2014; Fink, Harms & Kraus, 2008; Fink & Kraus, 2007; Globberman & Nielsen, 2007; Harrigan, Ramsey & Ibbotson, 2009; Karim, 2009; Kennedy & Keeney, 2009; Kirby & Kaiser, 2003; Klingler-Vidra, 2014; Kock, Nisuls & Söderqvist, 2010; Lee, Kelley, Lee & Lee, 2012; Leonidou & Katsikeas, 2003; Li, Li & Shi, 2011; Li, Yi & Chang, 2013; Lopez-Navarro, Callarisa-Fiol & Moliner-Tena, 2013; Lopez-Perez, & Rodriguez-Ariza, 2013; Nakos & Brouthers, 2008; Nakos, Brouthers & Dimitratos, 2014; Shin, Park & Ingram, 2012; Sinha, Akoorie, Ding & Wu, 2011; Spence, 2004; Swoboda, Meierer, Foscht & Morschett, 2011; Tabares, Anzo & Estrada, 2014; Tumisini & Bocconcelli, 2009; Ulubasoglu, Akdis & Kok, 2009)	29
	Inward perspective/ international purchasing	(Agndal, 2006; Holmlund, Kock & Vanyushyn, 2007; Knudsen & Servais, 2007; Möller & Salminen, 2006; Overby & Servais, 2005; Yu & Lindsay, 2011; Zhou, Wu & Luo, 2007)	7
International strategy	Environmental strategy	(Andersson, Gabrielson & Wictor, 2004; Andzelic, Dzakovic, Lalic, Zmic & Palcic, 2011; Campbell, 1996; Camiato, Caridi, Crippa & Moretto, 2012; Hadjikhani & Ghauri, 2001; Hunkeler, 2003; Kouznetsov, Dass & Schmidt, 2014; Kuivalainen, Sundqvist, Puimalainen & Cadogan, 2004; Martín-Tapia, Aragón-Correa & Rueda-Manzanares, 2010; Martín-Tapia, Aragón-Correa & Senise-Barrio, 2008; Westhead, Wright & Ucbasaran, 2001; Zhang, Sarker & Sarker, 2013)	12
	Strategic perspective	(Agndal & Chetty, 2007; Amal & Filho, 2010; Anderson, 2011; Bagchi-Sem & Kuechler, 2000; Bell, Crick & Young, 2004; Bello, 2009; Belich & Dubinsky, 1995; Berra, Piatti & Vitali, 1995; Campbell, 1996; Cancino & La Paz, 2010; Chen, Hsu & Chang, 2014; Chetty & Campbell-Hunt, 2004; Chiarvesio, Di Maria & Micelli, 2010; Crick & Spence, 2005; Cui, Walsh & Zou, 2014; Deligianni, Voudouris & Lioukas, 2014; Dhanaraj & Beamish, 2003; Dimitratos, Petrou, Plakoyiannaki & Johnson, 2011; Evangelista, 2000; Fernández & Bustamante, 2005; Fernandez & Nieto, 2005; Fernandez-Ortiz & Lombardo, 2009; Francis & Collins-Dodd, 2004; Francioni, Musso & Vardiabasisb, 2013; Frey, Iraldo & Testa, 2013; Galbraith, Rodriguez & DeNoble, 2008; Gemser, Brand & Sorge, 2012; Gnizy, Baker & Grinstein, 2014; Golovko & Valentini, 2011; Graves & Thomas, 2008; Gorton & White, 2009; Haahiti, Madupu, Yavas & Babakus, 2005; Hagen, Zucchella, Cerchiello & De Giovanni, 2012; Hatonen, 2010; Hessels & Parker, 2013; Hollenstein, 2005; Hutchinson, Quinn & Alexander, 2006; Johnson, Arya & Mirchandani, 2013; Karlson & Nordhus, 2011; Keen & Etamad, 2012; Kennedy & Keeney, 2009; Knight, 2001; Knight & Liesch, 2002; Kock, Nisuls & Söderqvist, 2010; Kownatzki, Walter, Floyd & Lechner, 2013; Kumar, Singh & Shankar, 2014; Kuuluvainen, 2012; Lages, Abrantes & Lages, 2008; Lindell & Karagozlu, 1997; Li & Dimitratos, 2014; Löfgren, 2014; Li, Yi & Chang, 2013; London, 2010; Lu & Beamish, 2006; Mairdifiassi & Chacón, 2014; Merrilees, Tiessen & Miller, 2000; Mikhailitchenko & Lundstrom, 2006; Miocevic & Crnjak-Karanovic, 2012; Moen, 2000; Musso & Francioni, 2014; Naidu & Prasad, 1994; Nguyen, Le & Bryant, 2013; Nowinski & Rialp, 2013; Patel, Pieper & Hair, 2012; Pena-Vinces, Cepeda-Carrion & Chin, 2012; Pisoni, Fratocchi & Onetti, 2013; Prater & Ghosh, 2005; Rabino, Simoni & Zanni, 2008; Raymond & St-Pierre, 2013; Raymond, St-Pierre, Uwizeyemungu & Le Dinh, 2014; Rialp-Criado, Galván-Sánchez & Suárez-Ortega, 2010; Robertson, 2003; Rodriguez, 2007; Shih & Wickramasekera, 2011; Shin, Park & Ingram, 2012; Solberg & Durrieu, 2008; Spence & Crick, 2006; Sui & Baum, 2014; Tang, 2011; Taylor & Jack, 2012; Stewart & McAuley, 2000; Valdés, 2009; Volchek, Jantunen, & Saarenketo, 2013; Tolstoy, 2014; Westhead, Wright & Ucbasaran, 2004; Williams, 2007; Xie & Suh, 2014; Yang, 2012; Yu & Lindsay, 2011; Zhang, Ma, Wang & Wang, 2014)	90

## Appendix (Continued)

Internationalization/ Export barriers, uncertainties, challenges, motivations	(Acedo & Galan, 2011; Acs, Morek, Shaver & Yeung, 1997; Al-Hyari, Al-Weshah & Alnsour, 2012; Altıntaş, Tokol & Harcar, 2007; Anderson, 2011; Artega-Ortiz & Fernandez-Ortiz, 2010; Babakus, Yavas & Haahiti, 2006; Baldauf, Cravens & Wagner, 2000; Bell, 1997; Burpitt & Rondinelli, 2000; Cardoza & Fomes, 2011; Hutchinson, Fleck & Lloyd-Reason, 2009; Hutchinson, Quinn, Alexander & Doherty, 2009; Katsikeas & Morgan, 2003; Korskakienė & Tvaronavicienė, 2012; Li, Tan & Hida, 2011; Loane, Bell & Cunningham, 2014; Morgan & Katsikeas, 1997; Nkongolo-Bakenda, Anderson, Ito & Garven, 2010; Patel, Pieper & Hair, 2012; Ruthinda, 2008; Sass, 2012; Shah, Javed & Syed, 2013; Singh, Pathak & Naz, 2010; Shih & Wickramasekera, 2011; Suarez-Ortega, 2003; Uner, Kocak, Cavusgil & Cavusgil, 2013; Xie & Suh, 2014; Zhang, Sarker & Sarker, 2008)	29
International competencies	(Chetty, Eriksson & Lindbergh, 2006; Chetty, Johanson & Martin, 2014; Child & Hsieh, 2014; Cortezia & Souza, 2011; D'Angelo, Majocchi, Zucchella & Buck, 2013; Deprey, Lloyd-Reason & Ibeh, 2012; Floriani & Fleury, 2012; Garg & Kumar, 2014; Globerman & Nielsen, 2007; Grosse, Mudd & Cerchiarri, 2013; Hilmersson, 2014; Huett, Baum, Schwens & Kabst, 2014; Isidor, Schwens & Kabst, 2011; Ivarsson & Alivstam, 2013; Kalinic & Forza, 2012; Knight & Kim, 2009; Kula & Tatoglu, 2003; Lal, 1996; Lal, 2002; Lal, 2005; Majocchi, Bacciocchi & Mayrhofer, 2005; Nowinski & Bakinowska, 2012; Nummela, Saarenketo & Puumalainen, 2004; Prater & Ghosh, 2006; Sandberg, 2014; Reuber & Fischer, 1997; ST-Pierre, Defays, Benezech & Garcia, 2014; Steinerowska-Streb, 2012; Zhou, 2007)	29
Perceived cost	(Suh, Bae & Kundu, 2007)	1
Country-level vs firm-level	(Beleska-Spasova & Glaister, 2009)	1
International business risks/e-risk	(Dahles, 2007; Dai, Maksimov, Gilbert & Fernhaber, 2014; Matthee & Heymans, 2013; Pezderka & Sinkovics, 2011; Todo & Sato, 2014)	5
Stewardship perspective	(Segaro, 2012; Segaro, Larimo & Jones, 2014)	2
Export's promotion/ Government assistance	(Acs, Morek & Yeung, 2001; Alvarez, 2004; Ayob & Freixanet, 2014; Bannò, Piscitello & Amorim Varum, 2014; Burpitt & Rondinelli, 1998; Carazo, 2007; Crick & Jones, 2000; Durmusoglu, Apfelfhaler, Nayir, Alvarez & Mughan, 2012; Francis & Collins-Dodd, 2004; Freixanet, 2012; Moini, 1998; Regnier, 2009; Shamsuddoha, Ali & Ndubisi, 2009; Toledo, Hernández & Griffin, 2010; Wilkinson & Brouthers, 2006; Wilkinson, Keillor & d'Amico, 2005)	16
Globalization	(Garg & Kumar, 2014; Garcia, 2009; Kamakura, Ramón-Jerónimo & Gravel, 2012; Khapne, 2012; Miocevic & Crnjak-Karanovic, 2012; Pangarkar, 2008; Prater & Ghosh, 2006; Rao, 2007; Reuber & Fischer, 1997; Winch & Bianchi, 2006)	10
Rapid internationalization	(Barbosa, González-Campo & Vargas, 2013; Bell, 1995; Bell & Loane, 2010; Bell, McNaughton & Young, 2001; Cancino & La Paz, 2010; Chandra, Styles & Wilkinson, 2012; Chetty, Johanson & Martin, 2014; Dias & Lopes, 2014; Freeman, Hutchings, Lazaris & Zyngier, 2010; Kalinic & Forza, 2012; Keen & Etemad, 2012; Loane, Bell & McNaughton, 2007; Nowinski & Bakinowska, 2012; Ruokonen, 2008; Taylor & Jack, 2012)	15
Early internationalization	(Cheng & Yu, 2008; Gallego & Casillas, 2014; Jones, 1999; Kaur & Sandhu, 2014; Knight & Cavusgil, 2004; Lee, Kelley, Lee & Lee, 2012; Li, Qian & Qian, 2012b; London, 2010; Murray & Ron, 2010; Nowinski & Bakinowska, 2012; Nowinski & Rialp, 2013; Preece, Miles & Baetz, 1999; Sui, Yu & Baum, 2012; Zhou, 2007)	14

Appendix (Continued)

Category	Topic/Theme	References	Topics#
	Social apital	(Abban, Omta, Aheto & Scholten, 2013; Agndal, Chetty & Wilson, 2008; Ellis & Pecotich, 2001; Lindstrand, Melén & Nordman, 2011; Nowiński & Bakinowska, 2012; Park, Han, Rojas, Son & Jung, 2011; Prashantham & Floyd, 2012; Prashantham & McNaughton, 2006; Qiao, Fung & Ju, 2013; Rodrigues & Child, 2012; Ruzzier & Antoncic, 2007; Ulubasoglu, Akdis & Kok, 2009)	12
	Exporting/Exports behavior	(Abor, Agbloyora & Kuipo, 2014; Acedo & Galan, 2011; Barletta, Pereira & Yogue, 2013; Benkraiem & Miloudi, 2014; Bilkey & Tesar, 1977; Campbell, 1996; Cassiman & Golovko, 2011; Descotes & Walliser, 2011; Ellis & Pecotich, 2001; Gashi, Hashi & Pugh, 2014; Golovko & Valentini, 2011; Holmlund, Kock & Vanyushyn, 2007; Karabulut, 2013; Katsikeas & Morgan, 2003; Khemakhem, 2010; Lopez-Navarro, Callarisa-Fiol & Moliner-Tena, 2013; Lu & Beamish, 2006; Moen & Servais, 2002; Olmos, 2011; Parhizkar, Smith & Miller, 2009; Ruiz-Fuensanta, 2011; Subrahmanya, 2007; Teo, Chan & Tan, 2007; Wilkinson, Keillor & d'Amico, 2005; Williams & Chaston, 2004; Zhang, Sarker & Sarker, 2013)	26
	Market selection/Entry mode/market entry	(Agndal, Chetty & Wilson, 2008; Bangara, Freeman & Schroder, 2012; Bontempi & Prodi, 2009; Brouthers, Brouthers & Werner, 1996; Brouthers & Nakos, 2004; Brouthers & Nakos, 2005; Ciravegna, Lopez & Kundu, 2014; Chadwick, Ghafoor, Khalil, Khan & Hassan, 2011; Coviello & Martin, 1999; Coviello & Munro, 1997; Cui, Walsh & Zou, 2014; Dalli, 1995; Dimitratos, Plakoyiannaki, Pitsoulaki & Tüselmann, 2010; Eliasson, Hansson & Lindvert, 2012; Ellis & Pecotich, 2001; Francioni, Musso & Vardiabasisb, 2013; Freeman, Hutchings, Lazaris & Zyngier, 2010; Gallego & Casillas, 2014; Hutchinson, Quinn & Alexander, 2006; Jansson & Sandberg, 2008; Kouznetsov, Dass & Schmidt, 2014; Maelkelburger, Schwens & Kabst, 2012; Martín Martín & Drogendijk, 2014; Melia, Perez & Dobon, 2010; Mockaitis, Vaigimienė & Giedraitis, 2006; Moen, Gavlen & Endresen, 2004; Moini, Kalouda & Tesar, 2008; Morgan & Katsikeas, 1997; Musso & Francioni, 2014; Ojala, 2008; Ojala, 2009; Ojala & Tyrväinen, 2007; Ojala & Tyrväinen, 2008; Pillmayer & Scherle, 2014; Pinho, 2007; Sandberg, 2013; Rasheed, 2005; Ripollés, Blesa & Montferrer, 2012; Rundh, 2011; Westhead, Wright & Ucbasaram, 2002)	40
	Cross-cultural management	(Brock, Johnson & Zhou, 2011; Dahles, 2007; Swift & Lawrence, 2003; Dimitratos, Petrou, Plakoyiannaki & Johnson, 2011; Ojala & Tyrväinen, 2007; Richardson, 2014; Teixeira, Santos & Brochado, 2008; Zapata & Barrientos, 2013)	8
	Competitiveness	(Andzelic, Dzakovic, Lalic, Zmic & Palcic, 2011; Arze & Svensson, 1997; Barbosa, González-Campo & Vargas, 2013; Dan, 2012; Evangelista, 2000; Di Gregorio, Musteen & Thomas, 2009; Farinha, Ferreira & Gouveia, 2014; Fernández & Bustamante, 2005; Freixanet, 2012; Gassmann & Keupp, 2007; Isaksen, 1997; Johnson, Arya & Mirchandani, 2013; Lindell & Karagozlu, 1997; Maranto-Vargas & Rangel, 2007; Pena-Vinces, Cepeda-Carrion & Chin, 2012; Preece, Miles & Baetz, 1999; Raymond, St-Pierre, Uwizeyemungu & Le Dinh, 2014; Smallbone, Piasecki, Venesaar, Todorov & Labrianidis, 1999; Todd & Javalgi, 2007; Valdés, 2009; Williams, 2007)	21
	Host-home country	(Cui, Walsh & Zou, 2014)	1
	Free trade agreements	(Álvarez & Vergara, 2013; Battisti, Jurado & Perry, 2014)	2
	Demand/supply factors	(Caniato, Caridi, Crippa & Moretto, 2012; Charkaoui, Ouahman & Bouayyad, 2012; Frey, Iraldo & Testa, 2013; Kumar, Singh & Shankar, 2014; Rettab & Rao, 2009; Robertson, 2003)	6
	Re/De-internationalization	(Crick, 2004)	1
	Location decisions	(Freeman & Styles, 2014; Freeman, Styles & Lawley, 2012; Galbraith, Rodriguez & DeNoble, 2008; Sass, 2012; Huett, Baum, Schwens & Kabst, 2014; Li & Htu, 2002)	6

## Appendix (Continued)

Financing	Banks' effects on internationalization trade	(Abor, Agbloyora & Kuipo, 2014; Arslan & Karan, 2009; Benkraiem & Miloudi, 2014; Klingler-Vidra, 2014; Chen, Ding & Wu, 2014; Gupta, Wilson, Gregoriot & Healy, 2014; Lindstrand & Lindbergh, 2011; Matthee & Heymans, 2013; Miloudi, 2014; Riding, Orser, Spence & Belanger, 2012)	9
	Equity based-funding methods	(Smolarski & Kut, 2011)	1
International Marketing	Online channel	(Bell & Loane, 2010; Frąckiewicz & Grzesiuk, 2013; Glavas & Mathews, 2014; Glavas, Pike & Mathews, 2014; Hamill & Gregory, 1997; Harrigan, Ramsey & Ibbotson, 2008; Harrigan, Ramsey & Ibbotson, 2009; Hinson & Abor, 2005; Hinson & Sorensen, 2006; Javalgi, Todd, Johnston & Granot, 2012; Kula & Tatoglu, 2003; Lal, 2002; Lal, 2005; Moen, Madsen & Aspelund, 2008; Moini & Tesar, 2005; Pezderka & Sinkovics, 2011; Sinkovics, Sinkovics & Ruey-Jer, 2013; Tiessen, Wright & Turner, 2001; Tseng & Johnsen, 2011)	19
	Trade fairs	(Kreivi, Wang, Muhos & Kess, 2012)	1
	Export marketing research and information	(Belich & Dubinsky, 1995; Crick & Chaudhry, 1997; Elenurm, 2008; Hart & Tzokas, 1999; Williams, 2003)	5
	International marketing channels	(Alajoutsijärvi, Mannermaa & Tikkanen, 2000; Battisti, Jurado & Perry, 2014; Cui, Walsh & Zou, 2014; Gnizy, Baker & Grinstein, 2014; Hallböck & Gabrielsson, 2013; Madsen, Moen & Hammervold, 2012; Khemakhem, 2010; Knight, 2000; Lages, Abrantes & Lages, 2008; Merrilees & Tiessen, 1999; Merrilees, Tiessen & Miller, 2000; Moen, 2000; Mohammadzadeh, 2012; Parhizkar, Smith & Miller, 2009; Park, Whitelock & Giroud, 2009; Rundh, 2011; Tikkanen, 1998; Stewart & McAuley, 2000; Williams & Chaston, 2004; Witkowski & Thibodeau, 1999)	20
	Brand management	(Spence & Essoussi, 2010)	1
	Corporate social responsibility	(Boehe & Cruz, 2010; Laudal, 2011; Lopez-Perez, & Rodriguez-Ariza, 2013)	3
	Market orientation and commitment	(Armario, Ruiz & Armario, 2008; Bagchi-Sem & Kuechler, 2000; Chetty, Johanson & Martín, 2014; Dimitratos, Voudouris, Plakoyiannaki & Nakosd, 2012; Filser, Eggers, Kraus & Málóvics, 2014; Javalgi, Todd & Granot, 2011; Ripollés, Blesa & Monferer, 2012; Ruokonen, 2008; Ruiz-Fuensanta, 2011; Ruokonen, Nummela, Puumalainen & Saarenketo, 2008; Shin, Park & Ingram, 2012)	11
	Customer behavior	(Frąckiewicz & Grzesiuk, 2013)	1
	Institutional view	(Chen, Hsu & Chang, 2014; Cheng & Yu, 2008; Cheng & Yu, 2012; Hessels & Terjesen, 2010; Jonsson & Lindbergh, 2010; Li, Yi & Chang, 2013; Vachani, 2005)	7

Appendix (Continued)

Category	Topic/Theme	References	Topics*
Innovation perspective	Innovation	(Acs, Morek & Yeung, 2001; Acs, Morek, Shaver & Yeung, 1997; Alvarado & Granados, 2013; Barbosa & Ayala, 2014; Boter & Holmquist, 1996; Brines, Shepherd & Woods, 2013; Chang & Hughes, 2012; Chetty & Stangl, 2010; Chiarvesio, Di Maria & Micelli, 2010; Maranto-Vargas & Rangel, 2007; Dai, Maksimov, Gilbert & Fernhaber, 2014; D'Angelo, 2012; D'Angelo, Majocchi, Zuechella & Buck, 2013; Di Gregorio, Musteen & Thomas, 2009; Farinha, Ferreira & Gouveia, 2014; Fernández-Ribas, 2010; Frey, Iraldo & Testa, 2013; Frybourg, 1997; Golovko & Valentini, 2011; Hallböck & Gabrielsson, 2013; Hatonen, 2010; Hollenstein, 2005; Ion & Victor, 2013; Imbriani, Morone & Testa, 2014; Islam, 2010; Knight & Cavusgil, 2004; Libaers & Meyer, 2011; Löfgren, 2014; Melia, Perez & Dobon, 2010; Micelli, 2010; Molero, 1998; Murray & Ron, 2010; Musteen & Datta, 2011; Narula, 2002; Nordman & Tolstoy, 2011; O'Casey & Weerawardena, 2009; Pittiglio, Sica & Villa, 2009; Schilirò, 2000; Raymond, St-Pierre, Uwizeyemungu & Le Dinh, 2014; Seifriz, Gondim & Pereira, 2014; Volchek, Jantunen & Saarenketo, 2013; Zuechella & Siano, 2014)	41
	R&D investment	(Buckley, 1997; D'Angelo, 2012; Esteve-Perez & Rodriguez, 2013; Farinha, Ferreira & Gouveia, 2014; Ion & Victor, 2013; Lee, Kelley, Lee & Lee, 2012; Lee & Marvel, 2009; Lindell & Karagozlu, 1997; Narula, 2002; Qian & Li, 2003; Qiao, Fung & Ju, 2013; Sass, 2012; Teixeira, Santos & Brochado, 2008)	13
	Product diversity/ product innovation	(Bell, Crick & Young, 2004; Boehe & Cruz, 2010; Cassiman & Golovko, 2011; Esteve-Perez & Rodriguez, 2013; Hong & Roh, 2009; Imbriani, Morone & Testa, 2014; Katsikeas, Deng & Wortzel, 1997; Li, Qian & Qian, 2012a; Nordman & Tolstoy, 2011; Singh, Gaur & Schmid, 2010; Tolstoy, 2014)	11
	Technology strategies	(Buckley, 1997; Crick & Jones, 2000; Galbraith, Rodriguez & DeNoble, 2008; Hatonen, 2010; Isidor, Schwens & Kabst, 2011; Lee, Kelley, Lee & Lee, 2012; Musteen & Datta, 2011; Nordman & Tolstoy, 2011; Park & Ghauri, 2011; Pena-Vinces, Cepeda-Carrion & Chin, 2012)	10
	Enterprise-university cooperation	(Conlon & Humphreys, 2007; Swift & Lawrence, 2003; Wang, Muhs & Kess, 2011)	3
	Intellectual property	(Mets, Kaarna & Kelli, 2010)	1
	Patents	(Fernández-Ribas, 2010)	1
	Firms' profile (size, type, age)	(Álvarez & Vergara, 2013; Andersson, Gabriellson & Wictor, 2004; Baldauf, Cravens & Wagner, 2000; Chelliath, Pandian, Sulaiman & Munusamy, 2010; Crick & Chaudhry, 1997; Hinson & Abor, 2005; Katsikeas, Deng & Wortzel, 1997; Laudal, 2011; Majocchi, Bacchiocchi & Mayrhofer, 2005; Martin-Tapia, Aragon-Correa & Rueda-Manzanares, 2010; Pisoni, Fratocchi & Onetti, 2013; Svetličić, Jaklič & Burger, 2007; Westhead, Wright & Ucbasaran, 2002)	13
	Management skills/ Top executive attributes	(Bangara, Freeman & Schroder, 2012; Eyre & Smallman, 1998; Fernandez-Ortiz & Lombardo, 2009; Graves & Thomas, 2006; Hsu, Chen, & Cheng, 2013; Hutchinson, Quinn & Alexander, 2006; Loane, Bell & McNaughton, 2007; Middleton, Liesch & Steen, 2011; Mitter, Duller, Feldbauer-Durstmüller & Kraus, 2014; Mohammadzadeh, 2012; Nowinski & Bakinowska, 2012; Omri & Becuwe, 2014; Pinho, 2007; Qiao, Fung & Ju, 2013; Segaro, Larimo & Jones, 2014; Shih & Wickramasekera, 2011; Reuber & Fischer, 1997; Ruzzier, Antoncic, Hisrich & Konecnik, 2007; Todo & Sato, 2014; Westhead, Wright & Ucbasaran, 2001; Williams & Chaston, 2004; Zahra, Neubaum & Naldi, 2007)	22
	Expatriate selection	(Cheng & Lin, 2009)	1
Human capital/ Skilled workers	(Aidis & Mickiewicz, 2006; Belich & Dubinsky, 1995; Loane, Bell & Cunningham, 2014; Monks, Scullion & Creaner, 2001; Robertson, 2003; ST-Pierre, Defays, Benezech & Garcia, 2014)	6	
Degree of internationalization	(Floriani & Fleury, 2012; Pangarkar, 2008; Zhang, Ma, Wang & Wang, 2014)	3	
Firms' characteristics			

Appendix (Continued)

	<p>Internationalization of family firms 8 (Brines, Shepherd &amp; Woods, 2013; Eberhard &amp; Craig, 2013; Fernandez &amp; Nieto, 2005; Graves &amp; Thomas, 2008; Koladkiewicz, 2013; Kontinen &amp; Ojala, 2012; Mitter, Duller, Feldbauer-Durstmüller &amp; Kraus, 2014; Segaro, 2012)</p>
	<p>Export manager's rewards 1 (Coudounaris, 2011)</p>
	<p>Gender 2 (Orser, Spence, Riding &amp; Carrington, 2010; Williams, 2013)</p>
	<p>Impact on SME survival 6 (Krašnicka &amp; Glód, 2013; Kubickova &amp; Prochazkova, 2014; Lee, Kelley, Lee &amp; Lee, 2012; Malfiassi &amp; Chacón, 2014; Parhizkar, Smith &amp; Miller, 2009; Suh &amp; Kim, 2014)</p>
	<p>Multi-dimensional internationalization 2 (Chetty, 1999; Ruzzier, Antoncic &amp; Hisrich, 2007)</p>
	<p>Industrial districts 5 (Belso-Martínez, 2006; Berra, Piatti &amp; Vitali, 1995; Echeverri-Carroll, Humnicutt &amp; Hansen, 1998; Guerrieri &amp; Pietrobelli, 2004; Tunisini &amp; Boconcelli, 2009)</p>
<p>Performance</p>	<p>(Abban, Omita, Aheto &amp; Scholten, 2013; Abor, Agbloyora &amp; Kuipo, 2014; Altıntaş, Tokol &amp; Harecar, 2007; Alvarez, 2004; Álvarez &amp; Vergara, 2013; Amal &amp; Filho, 2010; Armario, Horrillo &amp; Robles, 2009; Armario, Ruiz &amp; Armario, 2008; Babakus, Yavas &amp; Haathi, 2006; Baldauf, 2006; Baldauf, Cravens &amp; Wagner, 2000; Bannò, Piscicello &amp; Varum, 2014; Barletta, Pereira &amp; Yague, 2013; Belso-Martínez, 2006; Boehe &amp; Cruz, 2010; Burpitt &amp; Rondinelli, 2000; Brouthers &amp; Nakos, 2005; Carnison &amp; Villar-Lopez, 2010; Charkakoui, Ouahman &amp; Bouayyad, 2012; Chang &amp; Hughes, 2012; Chelliah, Sulaiman &amp; Yusoff, 2010; Cheng &amp; Lin, 2009; Chetty, Johanson &amp; Martín, 2014; Chiao, Yang &amp; Yu, 2006; Chiarvesio, Di Maria &amp; Micelli, 2010; Cieslik, Kaciak &amp; Welsh, 2012; Ciszewska-Mlinaric &amp; Mlinaric, 2010; Coudounaris, 2011; Crick, Walsh &amp; Zou, 2014; Dai &amp; Liu, 2009; D'Angelo, Majoocchi, Zucchella &amp; Buck, 2013; Dhanaraj &amp; Beamish, 2003; Durmusoglu, Apfelthaler, Nayir, Alvarez &amp; Mughan, 2012; Fernandez-Ortiz &amp; Lombardo, 2009; Filser, Eggers, Kraus &amp; Málóvics, 2014; Floriani &amp; Fleury, 2012; Freeman &amp; Styles, 2014; Freeman, Styles, &amp; Lawley, 2012; Freixanet, 2012; Gerschewski, Rose &amp; Lindsay, 2014; Gorton &amp; White, 2009; Graves &amp; Shan, 2013; Haathi, Madupu, Yavas &amp; Babakus, 2005; Hagen, Zucchella, Cerchello &amp; De Giovanni, 2012; Hart &amp; Tzokas, 1999; Hinson &amp; Abor, 2005; Hong &amp; Roh, 2009; Hsu, Chen &amp; Cheng, 2013; Javalgi, Todd &amp; Granot, 2011; Jonsson &amp; Lindbergh, 2010; Kahiya &amp; Dean, 2014; Knight &amp; Cavusgil, 2004; Knight &amp; Kim, 2009; Kocak &amp; Abimbola, 2009; Knight, 2000; Krašnicka &amp; Glód, 2013; Kuhlmeier &amp; Knight, 2010; Kuivalainen, Puimalainen, Sintonen &amp; Kyläheiko, 2010; Kuivalainen, Sundqvist, Puimalainen &amp; Cadogan, 2004; Kumar, Singh &amp; Shankar, 2014; Lal, 1996; Lee, Kelley, Lee &amp; Lee, 2012; Lee &amp; Marvel, 2009; Li, Qian &amp; Qian, 2012b; Li, Qian &amp; Qian, 2012a; Li, Li &amp; Shi, 2011; Lu &amp; Beamish, 2001; Lu &amp; Beamish, 2006; Madsen, Moen &amp; Hammervold, 2012; Martin-Tapia, Aragon-Correa &amp; Senise-Barrio, 2008; Merrilees, Tiessen &amp; Miller, 2000; Majoocchi, Bacchocchi &amp; Mayrhofer, 2005; Miocevic &amp; Crnjak-Karanovic, 2011; Miocevic &amp; Crnjak-Karanovic, 2012; Moen, 2000; Moeni, 1998; Musteen, Datta &amp; Butts, 2014; Musteen, Francis &amp; Datta, 2010; Nakos &amp; Brouthers, 2008; Nakos, Brouthers &amp; Dimitratos, 2014; Nazar &amp; Shaikh, 2011; Nguyen, Le &amp; Bryant, 2013; Nummela, Saarenketo &amp; Puimalainen, 2004; Pangarkar, 2008; Qian &amp; Li, 2003; Rasheed, 2005; Raymond &amp; St-Pierre, 2013; Raymond, St-Pierre, Uwizeyemungu &amp; Le Dinh, 2014; Ruthinda, 2008; Sandulli, Fernández-Menéndez, Rodríguez-Duarte &amp; López-Sánchez, 2012; Schilirò, 2000; Sciascia, D'Orta, Bruni &amp; Larrañeta, 2014; Singh, Gaur &amp; Schmid, 2010; Sinkovics, Sinkovics &amp; Ruey-Jer, 2013; Smolanski &amp; Kut, 2011; Solberg &amp; Durrieu, 2008; Steinerowska-Sreb, 2012; Stoian, Rialp &amp; Rialp, 2011; Torkkeli, Puimalainen, Saarenketo &amp; Kuivalainen, 2012; Torrens, Amal &amp; Tontini, 2014; Ural, 2009; Volček, Jantunen &amp; Saarenketo, 2013; Westhead, Wright &amp; Ucbasaran, 2002; Wilkinson &amp; Brouthers, 2006; Wolff &amp; Pett, 2006; Yu &amp; Lindsay, 2011; Zhang, Ma, Wang &amp; Wang, 2014; Zhang, Sarker &amp; Sarker, 2008; Zhang, Sarker &amp; Sarker, 2013; Zhou, Wu &amp; Luo, 2007; Zucchella &amp; Siano, 2014)</p>
<p>Export intensity/capacity</p>	<p>(Dan, 2012; D'Angelo, 2012; Eberhard &amp; Craig, 2013; Esteve-Perez &amp; Rodriguez, 2013; Grosse, Mudd &amp; Cerchiari, 2013; Hinson &amp; Sorensen, 2006; Ioan, 2012; Karabulut, 2013; Lal, 2005; Malfiassi &amp; Chacón, 2014; Martin-Tapia, Aragon-Correa &amp; Rueda-Manzanares, 2010; Majoocchi, Bacchocchi &amp; Mayrhofer, 2005; Martin-Tapia, Aragon-Correa &amp; Senise-Barrio, 2008; Moen, 2000; Moen &amp; Servais, 2002; Morgan &amp; Katsikeas, 1997; Preece, Miles &amp; Baetz, 1999; Su &amp; Adams, 2010; Teo, Chan &amp; Tan, 2007; Zhang, Sarker &amp; Sarker, 2008)</p>
	<p>Total number of times the topic was referred 1247</p>

\*Number of articles for each topic.  
Source: Own preparation.