

The role of context in SME internationalization – A review

John Child (University of Birmingham, UK), Joanna Karmowska (Oxford Brookes University, UK), Oded Shenkar (Ohio State University, United States)

Abstract

This article reviews how context has been considered in studies on SME internationalization. It examines 333 articles published during the period 2010–2020 in leading international business, entrepreneurship, strategy and international marketing journals. It identifies their key findings, discusses the theoretical perspectives informing this literature, analyzes conceptual and methodological challenges, and suggests paths for theory development and future research. The review also provides a platform from which to address some of the limitations in international business [IB] theories when applied to SMEs, including organizational size as a boundary condition.

Keywords: Context, Internationalization, Review, SMEs

1. Introduction

Over the last two decades, interest in the internationalization of small and mid-sized enterprises (SMEs) has grown rapidly (Ribau, Moreira & Raposo, 2018) as their potential to undertake international business has come to be recognized (HSBC, 2016). SME internationalization is influenced by its context – both of targeted foreign countries and its home economy – as well as by characteristics of the firm itself. One reason for this sensitivity to context is that many internationalizing SMEs are likely to require external support, particularly from domestic institutions. Unlike MNEs, SMEs often face a ‘liability of smallness’ manifested in a lack of resources such as finance and detailed foreign market information (Buckley, 1989; Kahiya & Dean, 2016; Knight, 2001; OECD, 2018). To compensate, SMEs undertaking internationalization typically rely on networking with external resource providers (Acs & Terjesen, 2013; Lu & Beamish, 2001; Musteen, Datta & Butts, 2014; Paul, Parthasarathy & Gupta, 2017). Although internationalizing SMEs may benefit from their leaders’ personal connections and international experience, these are also context-dependent (Jones & Casulli, 2014; Masango & Marinova, 2014; Musteen et al., 2014). Moreover, SMEs may have to accept institutional and cultural conditions in foreign markets as contextual givens insofar as they have little power or understanding of how to negotiate them (Child & Rodrigues, 2011; Vendrell-Herrero, Gomes, Mellahi & Child, 2017).

Despite the significance of context in SME internationalization, and its recognition by an increasing number of authors, no comprehensive review has been published on the subject to date. The present paper aims to fill this void through a review of how context has been considered in studies on SME internationalization that have appeared during the past decade in leading journals devoted to IB, entrepreneurship, strategy and marketing. Cataloging these studies, our review identifies their key findings, discusses the theoretical perspectives informing this literature, analyzes conceptual and methodological challenges that are still outstanding, and suggests paths for theory development and future research. The review also provides a platform from which to address some of the limitations in international business [IB] theories when applied to SMEs, including organizational size as a boundary condition. It discusses the implications of firm size for the theorization of SME

internationalization in its context, and offers recommendations for the future development of theorizing relevant to SMEs.

Three concepts establish the parameters of the review – SME, internationalization, and context. These are clarified and discussed in this introductory section. The methodology of the review is then explained along with justification of its criteria for article inclusion. Following that, we present our findings, starting with the basic characteristics of the reviewed articles and continuing with the main themes that emerged and their theoretical implications. These are illustrated with detailed findings and representative references. There is then a detailed discussion of methodological and theoretical issues raised by the review, how these might be addressed, and scope for theory development. The paper concludes with recommendations for future work.

1.1. Types of SME and internationalization

As Zahoor, Al-Tabbaa, Khan and Wood (2020) indicate, definitions of SME are based on the number of employees, revenues or both. While the number of employees has been the most commonly applied criterion, the maximum thresholds vary between the US, the European Union (EU), China and other nations from which research samples are drawn. In the EU and the UK, the threshold is 250 employees and an annual turnover not exceeding 50 million Euros (European Commission, 2015). In the US, the upper limit is 500 employees, and in China it can be as high as 2000. Within the employee size range, the EU distinguishes between micro (< 10), small (10–49) and medium (50–250) SMEs, whilst the US National Center for the Middle Market defines mid-sized firms as those with revenues between US\$ 10 million and 1 billion, but divides them into three subgroupings. The US Small Business Administration (SBA)'s definition of a small firm extends to some seventy pages, mostly to accommodate industry disparities, which in turn indicates context variety. Internationally, a firm with, say, \$900 million in revenue, will be considered as mid-sized in the US but viewed as large in smaller nations. A comprehensive summary of the dynamic definitions and classifications of SMEs can be found in Zahoor et al. (2020), p. 431.

Another complication is that studies have focused on diverse firm categories that may fall within the SME definition. One is the international new venture (INV), which denotes a globally focused firm undertaking IB from its foundation or soon thereafter (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994). Another is the 'born global' (BG), a firm that from launch has been seeking competitive advantage from foreign markets (Knight & Cavusgil, 1996). The breadth of some SMEs' international operations, often underpinned by networks and overseas investment, has given rise to the concept of the 'micromultinational' (Dimitratos, Johnson, Slow & Young, 2003). INVs and BGs almost always start small but may grow rapidly. Another category is the family-owned firm, though 'family SME' is operationalized in diverse ways (Roffia, Moracchiato, Liguori & Kraus, 2021).

Internationalization has been defined both as a process and in terms of the activities firms undertake to access foreign markets (Ribau et al., 2018). Welch and Luostarinen (1988:36) describe internationalization as 'the process of increasing involvement in international operations.' As a process, SME internationalization does not necessarily follow a set pattern of stages; rather different cases have been found to exhibit contrasting sequences of events (Jones, 1999). It can be achieved through a range of activities extending beyond the domestic economy: exports of products and R&D, FDI including foreign production, foreign affiliates, and cross-border alliances. Exports have been the most common form of SME internationalization, though a growing number serve foreign markets via 'constellation and investment modes', i.e., interorganizational networks, alliances and subsidiaries (Dimitratos et al., 2003; Stoian, Dimitratos & Plakoyiannaki, 2018). Contextual factors such as foreign

trade regulations, the presence of niche markets, and the development of information technologies have been shown to impact SMEs' internationalization mode (Laufs & Schwens, 2014).

1.2. Context

Calls for greater sensitivity to 'context' proliferate in the IB literature (e.g., Meyer, 2014; Michailova, 2011; Reuber, Dimitratos & Kuivalainen, 2017; Shepherd & Rudd, 2014; Teagarden, Von Glinow & Mellahi, 2018) and, increasingly, in the literature on international entrepreneurship [IE] (e.g., Baker & Welter, 2020; Zahra, Wright & Abdelgawad, 2014). Nevertheless, it is a major challenge to capture context, which literally refers to all aspects of a situation within which something exists. The search for context is not unique to IB (Johns, 2006). In management, calls to 'bring the environment back in' (Pfeffer, 1987: 119) and 'bring the context back in' (Sorenson & Stewart, 2008: 266) are also common.

The challenge of defining and operationalizing context is greater in IB, where one deals with multiple environments and a great variety of contextual elements, and where actors, by definition, cross national boundaries and establish a variety of mixed-context hybrids, such as joint ventures. The task is still tougher in the case of SMEs. Since they normally lack market power, SMEs cannot be simply studied via the MNE-government, OLI and other common IB lenses, and their limited visibility adds to the blurring of contextual elements and processes. Across countries, SMEs vary in size, sectoral distribution and national weight, among other features, challenging global comparison of their strategies and operations, not to mention interaction, and in turn limiting our ability to decipher the impact of context. It is perhaps not a surprise, as Jones, Coviello and Tang (2011) note, that research on internationalization by small and entrepreneurial firms often fails to account for their context or to conceptualize it consistently.

The context of firms presents complexities and subtleties that derive both from its multi-faceted composition and from the way it spans different levels of analysis (Baker & Welter, 2020). Context is multidimensional, comprising diverse sub-contexts – ecological, economic, cultural, institutional, political, social, and technological – that are interlaced with one another (Cheng, 1994). This has given rise to the notion of 'polycontextuality': the existence of qualitatively different facets of context, each contributing to people's enactment of their situation, or by extension, that of their organization (Shapiro, Von Glinow & Xiao, 2007). Key SME staff are likely to interact with actors located in diverse contextual sectors, construing a complex network of interactions, the dynamics of which shape international opportunity recognition, decision-making and implementation (Chandra & Wilkinson, 2017). For example, Mainela, Puhakka & Sipola (2018) found that international opportunity recognition by SME entrepreneurs in Finland and Israel was informed not just by structural support for internationalization but also by the historical cultural beliefs rife in those nations. Polycontextuality complicates the methodology of comparing contexts and a firm's interactions with them (Child, 2009). Consequently, there has been a tendency to look at one contextual variable at a time, even in instances where they are obviously connected, as in the case of culture and institutions (Guiso, Sapienza & Zingales, 2015).

The context of firms is also a multi-level phenomenon (Hitt, Beamish, Jackson & Mathieu, 2007). Our review considers two levels of context, each of which impacts internationalization decisions and processes. The macro level reflects the environment in which a firm is located, particularly its home and host countries, and its industry. The meso level refers to the immediate organizational context in terms of factors such as a firm's ownership and technology. While focusing on these two contextual levels, we recognize that many SMEs are centered on their leading entrepreneurs which has encouraged interest in what may be called the context of the entrepreneur. This acknowledges

that entrepreneurs' personality traits and formative backgrounds can be significant antecedents for decisions and policies on internationalization. Entrepreneurial characteristics and experience feature prominently in prior reviews of IE research (e.g., Jones et al., 2011; Reuber, Knight, Liesch & Zhou, 2018), but it is only recently that scholars have come to appreciate the significance of the broader macro and meso levels of firm context for entrepreneurship (Welter, Baker & Wirsching, 2019), and these have not yet been given much attention in reviews of SME internationalization research (e.g., Ribau et al., 2018). This consideration informed our decision to confine the scope of the review to the macro and meso contexts of SMEs as firms. Moreover, these two levels accounted for the great majority of analyses in the articles reviewed. Entrepreneurs will enter the picture as the actors whose decisions shape the disposition of firms vis-à-vis those contexts.

At the macro level, most theorizing has been based on studies conducted in developed economies, and its transfer to other economies needs to be treated with caution (Meyer & Peng, 2005). Developing country SMEs operate in a different institutional framework, often suffering from institutional voids where the enactment of laws and regulations is problematic and supporting systems inadequate (Adomako, Amankwah-Amoah, Dankwah, Danso & Donbesuur, 2019; Mesquita & Lazzarini, 2008; World Bank, 2020). The internationalization of SMEs is likely to be more negatively affected by these inefficiencies than is the internationalization of larger firms (LiPuma, Newbert & Doh, 2013). Negative institutional effects can also be found in transition economies. In economies such as China and Russia, large, state-owned firms continue to dominate 'strategic sectors' even as large private or quasi-private firms emerge. Both groups benefit from state support for internationalizing by way of cheap capital and other subsidies while accepting the strings that come with it, whereas SMEs are left to their own devices in international markets.

Most studies have taken the nation as the unit of analysis for macro context (Tsui, 2004). This is not only for convenience, but also because nation states establish institutions, enact trade regulations, and socialize the citizenry, all of which are IB relevant. By comparison, the potential relevance of industry as a macro-level context for SME internationalization has received less attention. Reuber et al. (2017): 415) point out that 'contextual variation in entrepreneurial processes has been studied across countries to a greater extent than across industries, and a focus on industries is likely to yield valuable insights on how firms pursue international opportunities.' Jones et al. (2011) at several places in their review encouraged IE researchers to investigate the relevance of industry in context. The UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) ranks industries by their level of 'transnationality', showing wide variance across industries even within a sector (manufacturing, services). The industry in which an SME is located identifies its knowledge domain and signifies attributes such as market(s), regulatory environment, relevant external networks, and identity (Boter & Holmquist, 1996). In this respect, industry is itself a polycontextual phenomenon likely to have significant implications for SMEs' internationalization (Child et al., 2017).

At the meso level, organizational factors impact how an SME conducts its international business. For example, there is a large body of research on family firm internationalization, and how it might differ from that of firms with other ownership types (Hennart, Majocchi & Forlani, 2019; Kontinen & Ojala, 2010). Family firms are especially vital in developing and emerging economies, and a great many are SMEs (Björnberg, Elstrodt & Pandit, 2014). Key research questions include how SME internationalization may be affected by the agency conflict, risk orientation and richness of network links associated with different ownership configurations (Classen, Carree, Van Gils & Peters, 2014). Moreover, it is conceded that account has to be taken of how macro context, including cultural norms, government policies, and industry conditions, affects family firms' behavior and performance (Sharma & Chua, 2013).

In addition to its constituents and their relevance to SME internationalization, there is the question of how context differs from related concepts, in particular embeddedness. In the highly socialized interpretation of human behavior, embeddedness has been taken to mean that human actions and decisions, particularly those of an economic nature, are heavily influenced by the social structures, institutions and cultures in which they are located (Granovetter, 1985). Embeddedness is not an attribute of context itself but rather of the relationship between a unit of study and its context. As a variable factor, embeddedness is particularly relevant to the latitude SMEs enjoy or can create in adjusting to their contexts. This raises the key question of how dependent SME activities are on their context, and whether they represent a unique case in this respect. For instance, compared to MNEs, SMEs normally have less ability to shape certain contextual elements, such as getting institutional provisions amended through lobbying governments (Schiffer & Weder, 2001a).

Considerations of embeddedness raise the question of what drives the relationship between an SME and its context that internationalization brings into play, with opinions ranging across the contrasting theoretical stances of strategic choice and environmental determinism. These are echoed in the differences between the perspectives prominent in IE and IB (Verbeke & Ciravegna, 2018). In practice, while most SMEs possess relatively little power and must take much of their context as given, they may for purposes of internationalization be able to exercise leverage proactively via collaboration with MNEs and some, e.g., technology innovators, may have a substantial impact on markets and industries. Moreover, SMEs may not respond to contextual constraints and limitations in the same way. For example, some SMEs in resource-poor environments adopted creative solutions such as compositional strategy (Luo & Child, 2015). A review of evidence on nuances in the relationship between context and SME internationalization is overdue.

2. Methodology

In response to calls to strengthen the methodology of reviews in business and management (Tranfield, Denyer & Smart, 2003; Keupp, Palmié & Gassmann, 2012), we systematically reviewed core literature, following strict procedures for search, selection and inclusion (see Appendix 1). We also consulted best practice in prior reviews (e.g., Post, Sarala, Gatrell & Prescott, 2020). In particular, the reviews by Jones et al. (2011) and Pisani, Kourula, Kolk and Meijer (2017) guided our methodological approach, structure and presentation of findings.

Our review has the characteristics of a systematic review, understood as a reproducible and reliable scientific overview of extant research on a subject (Tranfield et al., 2003). The process is transparent, with established criteria for article search, selection and exclusion (Jones et al., 2011). Snyder (2019) distinguishes between fully systematic reviews (represented mainly in medical science, predominantly quantitative and relevant for a focused topic) and semi-systematic reviews (broader narrative reviews, often employing thematic analysis, suitable for topics that have been conceptualized differently in different disciplines). The present paper belongs to the latter group as it covers a wide range of studies and is aimed at detecting themes, identifying theoretical perspectives, and offering a critical evaluation of the state of work on the topic and developing an agenda for further research.

The review included articles published in top and mid-tier journals, which are the most likely to garner significant advances in knowledge (Keupp et al., 2012; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Bachrach & Podsakoff, 2005). For reasons already stated, the review focused on the macro and meso levels of SME context. Journals were identified using the British Association of Business Schools 2018 (ABS 2018) ranking. We checked for consistency with rankings published by the Australian Business Deans

Council 2019 (ABCD), the center National de la Recherche Scientifique 2020, and Anne-Wil Harzing's Journal Quality List 2020. All journals ranked as 3, 4 or 4* in the ABS 2018 ranking within the thematic categories 'Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management', 'International Business and Area Studies', and 'Strategy' were included. The Journal of International Marketing was also included because among highly ranked Marketing journals it focuses explicitly on international business. These thematic areas were considered to be the most relevant to the subject of the review. While we are aware that relevant papers have been published in general management journals, or those not ranked in ABS 2018, it was necessary to set boundaries to the review. This and the lack of journals published in languages other than English, is a necessary limitation of the study.

We followed a systematic process in journal and article sampling and identified 333 papers, which represent a considerable body of knowledge in the field. This process built on the example of best practice provided by Jones et al. (2011) and is detailed in Appendix 1 'Methodological procedures for search, selection and exclusion'. Table 1 lists the journals included in our review.

Table 1. List of Academic Journals Included in the Review.

Entrepreneurship & Small Business Management	IB & Area Studies	International Marketing	Strategy
<i>Entrepreneurship and Regional Development</i>	<i>African Affairs</i>	<i>Journal of International Marketing</i>	<i>Business Strategy and the Environment</i>
<i>Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice</i>	<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Management</i>		<i>Global Strategy Journal</i>
<i>Family Business Review</i>	<i>International Business Review</i>		<i>Long Range Planning</i>
<i>International Small Business Journal</i>	<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>		<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>
<i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>	<i>Journal of International Management</i>		<i>Strategic Organization</i>
<i>Journal of Small Business Management</i>	<i>Journal of World Business</i>		
<i>Small Business Economics</i>	<i>Management International Review</i>		
<i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>	<i>Management and Organization Review</i>		

We searched every issue of journals in the sample from January 2010 to November 2020, inclusive. We selected 2010 as the start date since much of the prior literature has been usefully summarized by Terjesen, Hessels and Li (2016), with other insights provided by Jones et al. (2011) and Szyliowicz and Galvin (2010). In each selected journal, we identified articles which met both of the following criteria: (1) they were explicitly concerned with SMEs, and (2) they focused on any mode of internationalization. We adopted a broad approach to the identification of SMEs. The criteria we applied were that (1) authors define the focus of their article as SMEs (even though data on firm size may not be provided); (2) articles sample born global firms, INVs, start-ups, nascent internationals, or micro-multinationals, and the firms sampled employ less than 500 people; (3) on reading the article it was clear that it concerned smaller firms. We listed all such papers in a table. The three

authors then considered each of them individually, and a final decision about their inclusion in the review was taken in a collective discussion.

Initially, we intended to conduct only a search of electronic databases and keywords, but found that these methods do not permit identification of a considerable number of relevant articles which do not use 'SME' or similar in their title, abstract or keywords. We hence abandoned reliance on a keyword search and embarked on a systematic and detailed manual examination of each journal issue, considering the title and abstract of every published paper. For papers likely to meet the selection criteria, introductory as well as methodology sections were examined, and, when necessary, we read the whole paper in detail. Borderline cases for inclusion were resolved via discussion between the authors.

Selected papers were subsequently coded according to journal, main topic investigated, levels and aspects of context considered, methodology (including SME definition, sampling and method of analysis), host and home countries covered, key findings, and principal theories deployed. Certain basic dimensions were applied from the beginning of the coding process, such as the journal, levels of context, and the main theories referred to. Other aspects such as methodologies, qualitative aspects of context, home countries, and key findings, emerged from the analysis. Notes were taken of how context was conceptualized, how it was measured, and how its relevance for SME internationalization had been theorized. Subsequently, the key findings from all the papers were coded. The main areas of context that emerged are presented below in Table 5 together with key findings relevant to SME internationalization, their theoretical implications, and illustrative references. In addition, we consulted relevant reviews and meta-analytical papers published in the sampled outlets; these are listed in Online Appendix 1.

While the articles were analyzed separately by each author, weekly online meetings and email exchanges were conducted during data analysis in order to assure consistency. In the concluding months of the process, the authors met at least once a week to discuss the interpretation of findings and conceptual development. Our systematic review was complemented by a perusal of a broader range of readings from journals on General Management as well as from adjacent fields such as International Relations, Economics or Sociology to inform the discussion and recommendations contained later in this paper. This included reading articles which did not directly concern SMEs or their internationalization, but which contributed conceptually to the review's domain – for example, earlier reviews that discussed aspects of context.

3. Results

3.1. Basic characteristics

Altogether, 333 articles were identified (see Table 2). The full list can be found in Online Appendix 2. The articles adopted a quantitative methodology about three times more often than a qualitative approach, and only a few employed mixed methods. This profile may be partly related to the limited way context is treated in the literature. While mixed methods and qualitative studies are potentially more conducive to surfacing and exploring new contextual dimensions, it can be argued that a quantitative approach is more useful for testing the relevance of already identified areas of context. As a result, articles generally refer to only a limited range of contextual factors, and offer few new developments. The International Business Review was by far the most popular outlet for articles about SME internationalization, with 92 papers during the review period, while almost half of all the qualitative studies (30) have been published in that journal. Other IB journals also actively engaged with the subject, in particular the Journal of World Business and Management International Review.

Among Entrepreneurship journals, the International Small Business Journal (42) and Small Business Economics (32) published the most papers. The Journal of International Marketing published 13 articles, while the topic is under-represented in Strategy journals.

Table 2. Article distribution across academic journals.

	Methodology				Total No.
	Theoretical	Empirical			
		Quantitative	Qualitative	Multiple	
<i>African Affairs</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Management</i>	1	4	1	1	7
<i>Business Strategy and the Environment</i>	0	1	0	1	2
<i>Entrepreneurship and Regional Development</i>	3	6	3	1	13
<i>Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice</i>	3	6	2	0	11
<i>Family Business Review</i>	0	1	0	0	1
<i>Global Strategy Journal</i>	2	3	0	0	5
<i>International Business Review</i>	6	49	30	7	92
<i>International Small Business Journal</i>	3	31	7	1	42
<i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>	6	5	1	0	12
<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>	3	5	1	0	9
<i>Journal of International Management</i>	1	3	1	0	5
<i>Journal of International Marketing</i>	1	5	6	1	13
<i>Journal of Small Business Management</i>	0	19	4	1	24
<i>Journal of World Business</i>	3	18	5	2	28
<i>Long Range Planning</i>	0	1	3	1	5
<i>Management International Review</i>	4	13	7	2	26
<i>Management and Organization Review</i>	0	0	2	0	2
<i>Small Business Economics</i>	3	26	1	2	32
<i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>	1	2	0	0	3
<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>	0	1	0	0	1
<i>Strategic Organization</i>	0	0	0	0	0
Total	40	199	74	20	333

China and Spain were the home countries most often addressed, with the UK, Italy, Sweden and the US coming next (see Table 3). While the high level of academic interest in China may be explained by its growing economic and political standing, the choice of other national contexts seems to reflect the presence of large scholarly communities with a tradition of publishing in the high impact journals

identified for the review, or the availability of datasets (e.g., the Business Strategies Survey Ecueta Sobre Estrategias Empresariales [ESEE] in Spain), or the presence of a prolific scholar working in collaborative networks (which accounts for the high number of studies relative to size of country that are located in Finland and Greece). There were scarcely any studies from high population countries like Brazil and Indonesia. However, few studies referred to the host country context and even less considered the relationship between partners from home and host country. A study by Galkina and Chetty (2015) about Finnish firms entering the Russian market, and work by Puthusserry, Child and Rodrigues (2014) exploring international collaborations between Indian and UK firms, are notable exceptions.

Table 3. Home Countries Most Frequently Represented in Sampled Articles.

Country	No of articles examining
China	34
Spain	29
UK	26
Italy	23
Sweden	21
US	18
Finland	14
Australia	14
India	13
New Zealand	12
Germany	11
France	10
Canada	8
Greece	8

To synthesize the data about national contexts, we used the country classification by the Development Policy and Analysis Division (DPAD) in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat (UN/DESA). As can be seen in Table 4, high-income countries are overwhelmingly overrepresented across disciplines. The under-representation of research about the countries in the next two categories becomes even more pronounced when we take into account that 34 out of 61 studies in upper middle-income countries involved a single country – China, and 13 out of 22 studies in the lower middle-income category involved India. These results show how strongly our knowledge about SME internationalization is based on studies conducted within a very limited context.

Table 4. Countries Examined According to UN Classification*

IB and Area Studies	Entrepreneurship	International Marketing	Strategy	TOTAL	
High-income	139	103	11	9	262
Upper middle income	29	24	5	3	61**
Lower middle income	11	8	1	2	22***
Low-income	2	2	0	0	4
Multiple	13	12	0	0	25

*

https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf

** 34 articles in this group were about China

*** 13 articles in this group were about India

3.2. Key findings from the literature and their theoretical implications

This section presents the results of a thematic analysis of articles on SME internationalization which relate primarily to each of the two levels of context: macro and meso. Within each level, the key findings of articles were categorized according to the aspect of context to which they refer. Table 5 illustrates each category with specific findings and examples of relevant articles.¹ The Table also summarizes the theoretical implications of the categorized key findings

Table 5. Key findings from the literature and theoretical implications. (The references cited in this table are Catanzaro et al., JSBM, 2019; Nasra and Dacin, ETP, 2010; Narooz and Child, IBR, 2017; Felzensztein et al., JSBM, 2019; Oparaocha, IBR, 2015; Williams and Spielmann, IBR, 2019; Adomako et al. JIMgmt, 2019; Autio et al. ETP, 2011; Manolopoulos et al. IBR, 2018; Onuklu et al. JIMkt, 2021; Cardoza and Fornes APJM, 2011; Delerue and Lejeune, JIM, 2011; Del Bosco and Bettinelli MIR, 2020; Lo et al., MIR 2016; Puthusserry et al., MIR, 2014; Eisend, Evanschitzky and Calantone JIMkt, 2016; Dimitratos et al. JWB, 2011; Li et al., JWB, 2019; Richardson, JWB, 2014; Kurt et al., JWB, 2020; Amoako and Lyon, ISBJ, 2014; Freeman et al., MIR, 2012; Urbano et al., ISBJ, 2011; Assadinia et al. ISBJ, 2019; Safari and Chetty, IMR, 2019; Puthusserry et al., MIR, 2014; Yan et al., IBR, 2020; Obadia, Vida, & Pla-Barber JIMark, 2017; Ottaviano and Martincus, SBE, 2011; Albarran et al., SBE, 2013; Rashid and Waqar, SBE, 2017; De Maeseneire and Claeys, IBR, 2012; Adomako et al., IBR, 2020; Thanos et al., ISBJ, 2017; Bonini and Alkan, SBE, 2012; Qian et al., MIR, 2018; Odlin, JWB, 2019; Tajeddin and Carney, ETP, 2019; Stoian et al. JSBM, 2017; Jonsson and Lindbergh, IBR, 2010; Goerzen, JIM, 2018; Francioni et al., IBR, 2017; Bai et al., IBR, 2017; Boehe, JSBM, 2013; Felzensztein et al., JSBM, 2015; Tolstoy, ERD, 2010; Stoian et al. JSBM, 2017; Musteen et al., JWB, 2010; Lindstrand et al., IBR, 2011; Puthusserry et al., GSJ, 2020; Berger et al., MIR, 2017; Zahoor et al., 2020; St. Pierre et al., JSBM, 2018; Nakos et al., SEJ, 2014; Prashantham et al., MOR, 2019; Prashantham and Dhanaraj, APJM, 2015; Tasavori et al., ISBJ, 2018; Zaefarian et al., IBR, 2016; Eberhard & Craig, 2013; Xu & Hitt, 2020; Tasavori et al., ISBJ, 2018; Chen et al., JSBM, 2014; Alayo et al., IBR, 2019; Pongelli et al. SBE, 2016; Idris and Saridakis, IBR, 2018; Kalantaridis and Vassilev, JSBM, 2011; Golovko and Valentini, GSJ, 2014; Lee, Jiménez & Devinney, 2020; Puig et al., ISBJ, 2018; Uner et al., IBR, 2013; Jiang et al., IBR, 2016; Safari and Chetty, IMR, 2019; Lindstrand et al., IBR, 2011; Puthusserry et al., GSJ, 2020; Gabrielsson and Gabrielsson, IBR, 2011; Jean & Kim, JIM, 2020;

Pergelova et al., JSBM, 2019; Freeman et al., IBR, 2010; Jean et al., JWB, 2020; Lo et al., MIR, 2016; Cui, Walsh, & Zou JIMark, 2014).

Macro-level of context	Aspect of context	Theoretical implications NB. While not listed separately, considerations raised by the RBV and resource-dependency theory (resource needs, SME capabilities), and by TCE (costs of governing SME interactions with context, including risk reduction) furnish a rationale for many of the theoretical propositions set out below regarding contextual effects on SMEI
	Institutions and Quasi-institutions	Institutional theory <i>Home country institutions have both direct and indirect influence on propensity for SME internationalization [SMEI]</i> <i>Direct effects</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home country institutions support SMEI through provision of resources, information, network connections High state involvement in business can hinder SMEI <i>Indirect effects:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home country institutions can foster international market orientations Home country institutional voids stimulate compensatory actions supporting SMEI <i>Interactions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With entrepreneurial perceptions of institutional contexts With domestic cultural norms - institutional effects are moderated by culturally informed means of developing social capital.
	Home country <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home country institutions can assist SME internationalization [SMEI] - e.g. via funding and information [Catanzaro et al., JSBM, 2019], provision of international legitimacy [Nasra and Dacin, ETP, 2010], internationally experienced industry associations [Narooz and Child, IBR, 2017; Felzensztein et al., JSBM, 2019]. Institutional network relationships have a positive effect on the internationalization process [Oparaocha, IBR, 2015]. National and international institutional pressures influence international market orientation [Williams and Spielmann, IBR, 2019] 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home country institutional voids can stimulate compensatory behaviour (e.g. entrepreneurial learning [Adomako et al. JIMgmt, 2019]; and capability development [Autio et al. ETP, 2011]). Responses to domestic institutional voids of SMEs seeking to export are culturally contingent [Narooz and Child, IBR 2017] 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resourcing decisions for exporting are contingent upon entrepreneurial perceptions of the home institutional context. Formal and informal institutional dimensions affect SMEs' export activity significantly, but differently [Manolopoulos et al. IBR, 2018; Onuklu et al. JIMkt, 2021] 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In countries like China with high state involvement in business and preference for large SOEs, institutional barriers can hinder SMEI [Cardoza and Fornes APJM, 2011] 	
	Host country <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attributes of the foreign institutional environment – especially the socio-cultural environment - explain managerial use of secrecy among biotech SMEs [Delerue and Lejeune, JIM, 2011] 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Host country institutional environment (especially distance from home environment) influences market entry mode [Del Bosco and Bettinelli MIR, 2020]. Effect of distance also depends on type of perceived distance (economic/industrial policy or cultural) [Lo et al, MIR 2016] 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMEs adopt different modes of coping with host country institutional and cultural distance [Puthusserry et al., MIR, 2014] The contribution made by different SME capabilities (marketing, technological) to internationalization depends on host country institutional context (rule of law, self-expression values) [Eisend, Evanschitzky and Calantone JIMkt, 2016] 	Host country institutions and modes of SMEI <i>Direct effects:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On market entry mode and coping mechanisms <i>Interactions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of host country institutional features is a function of on the level of risk they pose to SMEs and their capabilities to cope with it. <i>Overall: The influence of institutions on SMEI is conditional on SME' resource dependencies/needs and on entrepreneurial interpretations of action possibilities in specific cultural contexts.</i>
	National culture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National culture impacts the SMEI decision-making process [Dimitratos et al. JWB, 2011] Shared ethnicity reduces cultural friction in SMEI [Li et al., JWB, 2019] Shared religion reduces cultural distance and (in the case of Islam) assists foreign market penetration [Richardson, JWB, 2014; Kurt et al., JWB, 2020] Internationalization policies vary according to host country cultural context - e.g., use of secrecy to protect IP [Delerue and Lejeune, JIM, 2011]; methods of settling export disputes [Amoako and Lyon, ISBJ, 2014]; proactive use of technological knowledge and networks is greater when SMEs enter culturally non-proximate markets [Freeman et al., MIR, 2012] Different socio-cultural factors within home country impact transnational entrepreneurship (e.g. attitudes) and transnational activities (implementation) [Urbano et al., ISBJ, 2011] Psychic distance: PD has varying impacts [Assadinia et al. ISBJ, 2019] – PD at country and business levels has differential impact on different phases of SMEI [Safari and Chetty, IMR, 2019]; SMEs adopt different modes of coping with it, including learning and reliance on trading partners [Puthusserry et al., MIR, 2014]; its influence can be overridden by institutional factors [Yan et al., IBR, 2020] Relational bilateral (exporter/distributor) norms help protect exporting SMEs in contexts with psychic distance and competitive intensity [Obadia, Vida, & Pla-Barber JIMark, 2017] 	Cultural perspective <i>Home country culture:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influences international entrepreneurship orientation and practices <i>Host country culture:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influences SMEI practices, especially to reduce risk and compensate for cultural unfamiliarity <i>Cultural distance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tends to create uncertainty for internationalizing SMEs but its effect can be mitigated by shared social identity, institutional safeguards, and coping modes
Economic context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home country level of development influences SME internationalization business models, especially their reliance on innovation [Child et al., JWB, 2017]. SME exporting aided by (1) high domestic employment, investment in product improvement and sourcing from abroad [Ottaviano and Martinus, SBE, 2011]; (2) investment in domestic transport infrastructure [Albarran et al., SBE, 2013]; 	<i>Home country economic strength and level of development provide support for SMEI, especially for innovation-led internationalization</i>	

	(3) financial support [Catanzaro et al., JSBM, 2019]; (4) exchange rate depreciation (in case of Pakistan manufacturing SMEs) [Rashid and Waqar, SBE, 2017]	
	• Lack of finance for FDI hinders small firms' international development [De Maeseineire and Claeys, IBR, 2012]	
	Political Context	
	• Political connections can moderate impact of domestic institutional impediments on SMEI from developing economies [Adomako et al., IBR, 2020]	Limited evidence on relevance of the political perspective, but indications that:
	• Higher politicization and international hostility diminish the effects of International Entrepreneurial Orientation on international performance [Thanos et al., ISBJ, 2017]	• Political connections can facilitate SMEI (see also networking theory)
	• Favourable socio-political environment supports international VC investment once effects of legal variations are controlled for [Bonini and Alkan, SBE, 2012]	• Political risk is an impediment to SMEI <i>The close link between institutions, politics and networking calls for an integration of these theoretical perspectives as applied to SMEI.</i>
	Industry	Industry-based view
	• Industry shapes SMEI business models due to the institutional (especially regulatory), technological, and social systems it denotes [Child et al., JWB, 2017].	Industry as an institutionalized social-technical system is a significant contextual referent for SMEI.
	• Industry conditions can promote SMEI - industry dynamism drives the speed of the internationalization [Qian et al., MIR, 2018]; pioneering internationalizing SMEs act as reference competitors for other firms in same industry [Odlin, JWB, 2019].	Informing theories are: <i>Institutional theory:</i> industry identifies markets and regulatory regimes relevant to SMEI <i>Networking theory:</i> industry identifies scope of significant socio-commercial networks relevant to SMEI <i>Technological implications theory:</i> industry identifies dominant technologies, key knowledge bases, and role of innovation
	• Need for IP protection is key for SMEs in knowledge-based industries like biotech – use of secrecy as protection varies by home country institutional (cultural) context, with implications for IP policies in foreign environments [Deleue and Lejeune, JIM, 2011]	
Meso-level of context	Networks/ boundary-spanning/collaboration	Networking perspective <i>(It is important to distinguish between networking theory and theories of networks)</i>
	Different forms of networking can assist exporting and SMEI. E.g. belonging to business groups [Tajeddin and Carney, ETP, 2019] and inter-organizational networks increases export intensity [Stoian et al. JSBM, 2017]. More specifically:	Networking assists SMEI through:
	• Investment in business relationships can help overcome institutional impediments and improve SMEI performance [Jonsson and Lindbergh, IBR, 2010].	• Providing relevant market knowledge and other resources
	• Boundary-spanning through alliances by resource-poor small firms is a way of achieving innovation and internationalization [Goerzen, JIM, 2018].	
	• Network relationships with tourists help promote exporting by Italian wine-producing SMEs [Francioni et al., IBR, 2017].	
	• [Chinese] returnees' international experience and contacts assist SMEI [Bai et al., IBR, 2017].	• Stimulating innovation by providing access to relevant technical knowledge and market outlets for innovation
	• Access to local network resources via industry associations predicts export propensity [Boehe, JSBM, 2013].	• Providing legitimacy – offsetting liability of smallness and of origin
	• Network spread: The greater the number of networks utilized the more are entrepreneurs likely to target diverse world regions [Felzensztein et al., JSBM, 2015].	• Overcoming institutional and political impediments
	• Family ownership negatively moderates relationship between networking (inter-organizational and interpersonal) and SMEs' international success [Eberhard & Craig, JWB, 2013]	• Promoting foreign sales
	Forms of networking assistance to SMEI:	<i>Need to distinguish different forms of networking (intensity, durability, formality, functionality); also between networking and collaboration</i>
	• Network development increases foreign market knowledge [Tolstoy, ERD, 2010; Stoian et al. JSBM, 2017].	Collaborations can assist SMEI to exploit knowledge and other resources acquired, also to benefit from scale effects through specialization, subject to the benefit of managerial experience and firm capabilities
	• Different aspects of networking can increase speed of SMEI, while network building is associated with initial entry speed and international scope speed [Musteen et al., JWB, 2010].	Different network connections (forms of social capital) assist different phases of SMEI
	• Contribution of social capital, and of its constituent dimensions to SMEI varies at different points in the SMEI process [Lindstrand et al., IBR, 2011; Puthusserry et al., GSJ, 2020].	
	• Closed nature of foreign networks (e.g., Russia) can impede SMEI [Berger et al, MIR, 2017].	<i>Interactions affecting SMEI:</i>
	Collaboration:	• Benefit of network ties increases with quality of social capital
	• SME collaboration with external organizations, characteristics of collaboration (e.g. intensity), and social capital support can all assist SMEI and its success, subject to moderators (esp. firm level) [Zahoor et al., 2020]	• Benefit of collaborations increases with managerial pro-activeness
	• Domestic collaboration helps exports [St. Pierre et al., JSBM, 2018]. Alliances with non-competitors help internationalization, but alliances with competitors impede it [Nakos et al., SEJ, 2014].	• Family ownership tends to negatively moderate relationship between networking and SMEs' international success
	• Ties with MNEs: (1) People (interpersonal diaspora ties) within pipelines (interorganizational MNE ties) help emerging economy INVs to gain legitimacy for internationalization [Prashantham et al., MOR, 2019]; (2) Building ties with MNEs is necessary but not sufficient for new ventures to internationalize; they require managerial action to exploit the knowledge acquired [Prashantham and Dhanaraj, APJM, 2015].	
	Ownership/Family Firms	Family ownership perspective <i>(It is important to distinguish between family ownership and entrepreneurial ownership. The former tends to be associated with traditional SMEs while the latter is associated with INVs and BGs)</i>
	The relationship of SME family ownership [FO] and internationalization varies from positive to negative depending on the level of family influence on strategic decisions and presence of mediating/moderating factors. Some of these factors lead FO to encourage internationalization while others lead FO to discourage internationalization	Arguments regarding effects of family ownership on SMEI conflict between (1) positive – e.g. social capital and (2) negative – e.g. risk aversion
	Positive effect of FO on internationalization is facilitated/supported by:	
	• internal social capital of family relationships (Turkish SMEs) [Tasavori et al., ISBJ, 2018]	
	Negative effect of FO on internationalization is encouraged by:	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> family firm risk aversion [Zaefarian et al., IBR, 2016] autocratic and paternalistic family firm culture [Eberhard & Craig, 2013] high internal (organizational) financial slack, high home country capital availability and low host country capital availability (sample not confined to SMEs) [Xu and Hitt, 2020]. <p>International entrepreneurship is maximized when family ownership stands at moderate levels (US family firms) [Sciascia et al., SBE, 2012].</p> <p>Effects of family ownership on internationalization are mediated/moderated positively by governance capability [Tasavori et al., ISBJ, 2018]; by institutional ownership [Chen et al., JSBM, 2014]; presence of non-family managers [Alayo et al., IBR, 2019], and negatively by paternalistic family firm culture [Eberhard & Craig, JWB, 2013].</p> <p>Family ownership impacts entry mode decisions [Pongelli et al. SBE, 2016].</p>	<p>Moderating factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> governance and strategic capability – this can be enhanced by presence of non-family managers negative effect of paternalistic family firm culture
<p>Size of Firm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As SME size increases, so formal interpersonal network links (e.g. with accountants) become more important for assisting internationalization than informal ones (e.g. family) [Idris and Saridakis, IBR, 2018]. Globally integrated small firms do not differ markedly from larger firms in the nature of their international relationships [Kalantaridis and Vassilev, JSBM, 2011]. Firm size affects innovation in internationalization, larger firms are more inclined to pursue product rather than process innovations [Golovko and Valentini, GSJ, 2014]. 	<p>Despite the argument that internationalization of SMEs differs from that of larger MNEs, there is insufficient evidence to show clear scale effects within the size range of SMEs.</p>
<p>Temporal Context (Organizational learning and phases of internationalization)</p> <p>Relevance of phase of internationalization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progression of SMEI is a learning process, including learning about context. Learning comes from (1) experience including success and failure and (2) from and with network partners [Lee et al., 2020] Higher firm mortality at early period of internationalization [Puig et al., ISBJ, 2018] Perceived barriers to exporting vary at different points in their internationalization [Uner et al., IBR, 2013] Early internationalization may offset liability of ethnicity of immigrant-started new ventures [Jiang et al., IBR, 2016]. Psychic Distance at country and business levels has differential impact at different periods of SMEI [Safari and Chetty, IMR, 2019] Contribution of social capital, and of its constituent dimensions, to SMEI varies at different points in the SMEI process [Lindstrand et al., IBR, 2011; Puthusserry et al., GSJ, 2020]. 	<p>Organizational learning theory</p> <p>The SMEI process is one of learning and knowledge accumulation</p> <p>The firm's ability to learn has implications for external support required at different phases of SMEI</p>
<p>Technological Context</p> <p>Positive effects of (new) technology on SMEI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Platform and web capabilities enhance SME export marketing and performance [Gabrielsson and Gabrielsson, IBR, 2011; Jean & Kim, JIM, 2020] Digital technology helps internationalization of women owned SMEs [Pergelova et al., JSBM, 2019] Shared technological knowledge allows rapid transfer and development of new knowledge and the drive to commercialize a product before a competitor; this speeds internationalization [Freeman et al., IBR, 2010] 	<p>Technological implications theory</p> <p>Technological capabilities facilitate SMEI - via innovation and via ICT assistance for new market access</p>
<p>But:</p> <p>Digital platform risk reduces scope of SMEI because it increases transaction costs [Jean et al., JWB, 2020]</p>	
<p>Home-host country distance/similarity (see also entries under "institutions: host country" and "national culture")</p> <p>Distance and ownership mode:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural, geographic, and institutional distance affect the choice of ownership mode of SME foreign subsidiaries in different ways, and family control moderates the relationship between distance and foreign ownership mode [Del Bosco & Bettinelli, MIR, 2020] Perceived differences in the macro-economic and industrial-policy environment of a host country encourage new market entry via wholly-owned subsidiaries; perceived socio-cultural difference in a host country encourages entry via JVs [Lo et al., MIR, 2016] <p>Distance, strategy & international performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Host-home country similarity has a positive impact on an SME's international performance when the firm adopts an exploitation strategy. Conversely, host-home country similarity has a negative impact on an SME's international performance when it adopts an exploration strategy [Cui, Walsh, & Zou JIMark, 2014] 	<p>For relevance also see entries under other sections</p> <p>TCE perspective:</p> <p>Home-host country distance/dissonance effects on SMEI imply greater need for control and hence higher transaction costs</p>

Several aspects of macro context emerge as consequential for SME internationalization: institutions and quasi-institutions (e.g., finance agencies), industry, economic context (especially of the home country), national culture, and political environment. Of these, institutions attracted the most attention and the political environment the least. While in practice it has always exercised a significant influence on the terms of doing international business, the role of political context is under-researched. Its relevance has been recognized recently in studies of non-market strategies, although these have so far focused on MNEs rather than SMEs.

Institutional theory was referred to most often, frequently in differing combinations with other perspectives. The articles reviewed point to a number of institutional consequences for SME internationalization. Home country institutions can exert both a direct and indirect influence on the propensity of SMEs to internationalize, primarily via resource provision and the effect of institutional voids on stimulating compensatory actions that support internationalization. Institutional effects may be moderated by entrepreneurial perceptions and cultural norms. These are examples of how institutional theory interfaces with the cultural, the interpretative, as well as with networking and learning aspects. Host country institutions have been found to influence market entry modes and methods of coping with psychic distance. Again, the actions taken by SMEs may depend on a

number of other factors including the level of perceived risk that institutional uncertainty in foreign markets poses for SMEs and their ability to cope with that risk. Overall, the influence of institutions on internationalization tends to be conditional on SMEs' level of external resource dependence and on entrepreneurial interpretations of action possibilities vis-à-vis institutions in specific cultural contexts

Home country culture carries theoretical significance via its impact on the strength of SMEs' international orientation and on the practices adopted to foster internationalization, such as reliance on social capital. In turn, host country culture shapes SME internationalization, especially practices aimed at reducing risk and compensating for cultural unfamiliarity. While cultural differences between home and host countries tend to create uncertainty for internationalizing SMEs, their effects can be mitigated when suppliers and customers share a social (often ethnic) identity, and when institutional safeguards are in place. SMEs may also proactively adopt various modes of coping with cultural differences.

Economy, polity and industry also emerge as aspects of context that are theoretically relevant to SME internationalization. Home country economic strength and level of development can provide greater support (e.g., financing) and channels (e.g., venture capital) for SME internationalization, whether innovation-led or not. Political connections can facilitate SME internationalization, while political risk is an impediment to SME internationalization. Industry has emerged as a significant contextual referent for SME internationalization, including the business model adopted for it. As an institutionalized social-technical system (a polycontextual phenomenon), the relevance of industry is informed by institutional, networking and technological implications theories.

Certain factors can link the firm's immediate meso (organizational) context to its wider macro environment. One is networking or boundary-spanning with organizations and other actors external to the firm. Its relevance for SME internationalization has been the theme of many studies, especially regarding the provision of requisite information and resources. Networks of external organizations and people constitute a significant part of an SME's context and the wider network connections of an SME's external links may bear on the quality of support they can offer. Nevertheless, it is how the SME relates to external parties and uses those relationships to provide assistance for its internationalization that is of more immediate relevance. In other words, it is the theory of networking with external parties rather than of networks per se that illuminates context and SME internationalization. The studies reviewed indicate that networking can assist SME internationalization and promote foreign sales in a number of ways. Networking provides germane knowledge and other resources, including those which enhance global competitiveness by stimulating innovation. The support of institutional agencies and collaboration with MNEs can provide legitimacy that offsets an SME's liability of smallness or of origin. Networking with key contacts may also help to overcome institutional and political impediments.

Comparison of different studies clarifies the need to distinguish between different networking forms, with respect both to its qualities and to parties involved. Networking can vary in intensity, durability, quality of relationship (e.g., the degree of trust), and functions performed for an internationalizing SME. This can range from the occasional or ad hoc contact to close, continuing collaboration. SMEs are increasingly involved in collaborations and alliances, including as participants in global value chains. This field has developed its own literature and contributory theories which are of increasing relevance to SME internationalization. The salience of different network connections, sometimes conceptualized as discrete forms of social capital, has been found to vary at different steps in SME internationalization, suggesting the need for a contingency theory of networking support. Some of the reviewed articles suggest the presence of interactions with

other factors that affect the contribution of networking to SME internationalization. For example, the benefits of collaboration increase when accompanied by a management that actively exploits them, while family ownership may negatively moderate the relationship between networking and SMEs international success. It has also been found that family SMEs lacking existing network ties can recognize international market opportunities through weak ties formed in international exhibitions.

Technology links a firm's immediate context to the wider macro environment. While there are fast-moving and highly significant technological advances in that environment, their application to specific SMEs becomes a feature of those firms' immediate meso-level contexts. There has been a growing number of studies on the use of information technology to aid and accelerate SME internationalization.

At the meso level of context, studies have taken into account family ownership, firm size and the contrast between traditional and new venture SMEs (as indicated by firm age at the start of internationalization). However, conflicting findings emerge, especially concerning the consequences of different ownership profiles, including governance capabilities, risk aversion and owner-managers' culture. Ownership effects on SME internationalization may be moderated by factors such as the presence of non-family managers and institutional ownership, giving rise to a non-linear relationship (Liang, Wang & Cui, 2014; Sciascia, Mazzola, Astrachan & Pieper, 2012).² Moreover, the relation between ownership and internationalization is highly dependent on context, including formal and informal institutions (Arregle, Duran, Hitt & van Essen, 2017). Some of the divergent findings on meso-context may also result from the definitional inconsistencies noted earlier, and they merit further attention to clarify their theoretical implications.

3.3. Divergent findings

Our review surfaces a number of divergent or ambiguous findings, also listed in Table 5, which identify a need for further research. For example, different effects on SME internationalization can emanate from the same contextual domain. In the case of institutions, it has been reported that institutional voids limit support from domestic agencies for SME internationalization, but such voids have also been found to stimulate compensatory learning and networking by entrepreneurs that assist internationalization. Diverse aspects of differences between home and host countries – cultural, geographic and institutional – have been found to have contrasting implications for issues such as the choice of ownership mode for SME foreign subsidiaries. Some studies suggest that religion can serve as a bridge to reduce the cultural differences otherwise generated by different national identities. Another example of diverse effects arising from the same contextual domain is that of political risk. Political understandings and agreements reached by home and foreign country governments can ease the path of internationalization, while political upheavals can disrupt it. Certain concomitants of SMEs' industry membership may have divergent consequences. For example, it has been found in studies of the biotechnology sector that while an open exchange of information between SMEs and external institutions such as universities generates innovation, the competitive importance of IPO protection in foreign contexts encourages secrecy, albeit to varying extents depending on the degree of host country institutional IP protection. While many studies conclude that networking can assist SME internationalization, other research suggests that this depends on with whom SMEs network. Thus, alliances with non-competitors have been found to encourage SMEs' expansion into foreign markets, while collaboration with competitors discourages it.

In some instances, the divergence between findings of different studies may become less puzzling when account is taken of interaction between variables at different levels. In particular, the effects

of macro contextual variables can depend on their interpretation by SME decision-makers and the actions they may take to accommodate to them. This raises a more general issue that requires future research, namely the relative significance of environmental versus firm-specific characteristics.

4. Discussion – outstanding issues and ways forward

As we noted in the Introduction, IB and IE are by definition concerned with the development and conduct of business undertaken across different national environments, and there have been a growing number of calls to take context seriously. Though historically SMEs have been less internationally engaged than large firms, the imbalance is rapidly changing. Increasingly SMEs, including born globals and international new ventures, are active competitors in global markets and participants in global supply chains. Given these ongoing trends, our review of published work during the past ten years indicates that the context of SME internationalization merits further attention in future research. It is also apparent that many articles continue to display conceptual and methodological limitations, including procedures that marginalize treatment of context.

This section discusses issues that need to be addressed if research into the role of context in SME internationalization is to progress, and also how the existing research we have reviewed contributes to the development of IB theory. We begin with conceptual and methodological issues, then consider questions that remain under-researched, followed by a discussion of theoretical contributions.

4.1. Conceptual and methodological issues

Inconsistencies in the conceptualization of the three key concepts – SME, internationalization and context – have seriously hindered comparison between the findings of different studies and handicapped the accumulation and consolidation of knowledge. In the case of context, much of the problem stems from difficulties in theorizing and operationalizing its complex multi-faceted nature. Consequently, authors have focused on an aspect of context they deem theoretically relevant, such as institutions, resources, or networks. Other aspects, such as the political environment, have been addressed less often (De Villa, Rajwani & Lawton, 2015). However, even single contextual attributes or domains have not been defined in a consistent manner. One of the most frequently studied – institutions – is subject to different interpretations partly due to the breadth of the concept which encompasses both formal and informal institutions, as well as governmental, public and commercial agencies. Moreover, informal institutions overlap with another aspect of context – national culture. The separation of the two, and the primacy of the former, dates back to the seminal work of North (e.g., 1989). Though more recent work in institutional economics attempted to restore the relation and the balance between the two (e.g., Guiso, Sapienza & Zingales, 2009), there is no evidence that this has been rigorously considered in the reviewed papers.

Indeed, it was disappointing to see that while quite a few studies did use culture, or ‘informal institutions’ in North’s language, as a contextual layer, their treatment by and large lacked sophistication and was unaware of recent advances in the field. Thus, almost all of the studies that included culture as an explanatory variable deployed the ‘cultural distance’ formula with hardly a reference to the controversial state of the construct in the IB literature, and the emergence of substitute frameworks such as cultural friction (Shenkar, 2001; Shenkar, Luo & Yehekel, 2008). For instance, Shenkar (2001) makes it clear that cultural differences are asymmetric, an observation confirmed in latter research, and it seems reasonable to expect, for instance, large multinationals to exert the greater cultural heft in an alliance with an SME. The same is true for the exclusive use of national culture and the absence in the reviewed articles of other levels of culture that have been

shown empirically to be material for foreign market entry, modal choice, and performance, namely the regional, corporate, industrial, and sectorial (see Ronen & Shenkar, 2017, for a review). In so doing, not only are we forfeiting an opportunity for a finer and deeper understanding of how culture, as a multilevel construct, impacts SMEs, but we are also giving up the chance to observe from a close range how those various levels intersect, a rarely accomplished feat (Weber, Shenkar & Raveh, 1996).

Leveraging advances in culture research could also assist us in better understanding of a fundamental issue raised earlier, namely the extent to which an SME, or for that matter any firm, is embedded in various contextual elements. Recent research on culture shows variations in how tight (i.e., tolerant towards deviant behavior) cultures are at the national level (Gelfand, 2011), and how the varied centrality of values impacts operations in a cross-border joint venture where a 'third culture' is possible (Koch, Koch, Menon & Shenkar, 2016). Both refinements would go a long way towards improved conceptualization and measurement of culture and its impact on SMEs. Finally, virtually all the studies reviewed have used cultural data based on surveys done in large MNEs. One wonders whether SMEs would show similar values given low bureaucratization which implies, for instance, a more flexible hierarchy. INVs in particular may not show values similar to national means, because entrepreneurship is about breaking the mode, and founding CEOs are known to set new norms. This brings us back to a broader question, that is, whether the SME is simply a miniaturized version of its larger brethren or altogether a different subspecies. As we shall reiterate, only a direct comparison of SMEs and MNEs may answer that question.

Overall, it seems that the time lag between concepts, theories and methodologies developed with large multinationals in mind and the timing of their implementation in SMEs is perhaps understandable, but we seem to be forfeiting an opportunity to not only better understand SMEs but also to leverage their size in order to observe in greater detail how cultural differences come into play. This could in turn contribute to broader theory development by benefitting from the greater visibility of cognition and decision-making in a smaller enterprise and the ability to employ a qualitative methodology. However, progress, especially but not only by way of a direct comparison, requires a resolution of the ambiguity surrounding the very term 'SME'. Among various national and regional definitions, the EU criteria are the most frequently applied by the reviewed articles, but there are many exceptions. The varied definitions of SME militate against precise comparisons between studies, and this contributes to apparently inconsistent findings. In the case of the third key concept internationalization, its variety of forms presents less of a problem insofar as exporting is the most common mode among SMEs (Tan, Brewer & Liesch, 2018).

Conceptual confusion and inconsistent definitions encourage methodological imprecision, a feature of many of the reviewed studies. While most studies state SMEs' home country, they often justify the choice in terms of data availability or sampling convenience rather than in theoretically relevant terms. Contextual complexity is often sidestepped, even in the case of a single contextual feature, e.g., country or industry, via its reduction to a dummy variable. The dummies are treated as control variables, further diluting attention to contextual influences. Nielsen and Raswant (2018) argue that IB scholars should use research designs that take full account of contextual variables rather than devaluing them as control variables. This means they should enhance the rigor of sampling decisions when studying international phenomena and employ sampling frameworks that highlight contextualization (Poulis, Poulis & Plakoyiannaki, 2013). Equally important, they should contextualize the interpretation of their results. Having said this, the inclusion of contexts into research designs and the operationalization of specific multiple contextual features unquestionably poses a significant challenge. We consider some possible solutions below.

Similarly, confusion over the status of the firms included in studies of SME internationalization has often added to the difficulty of interpreting the findings of different studies. The problem has been compounded by a lack of sampling rigor or absence of precise sampling information. Some articles have claimed that sampled firms are SMEs even when falling well outside the normal boundaries of the category. For example, one article stated that all 31 firms sampled were SMEs, even though one had as many as 2214 employees. Another article reported that all 29 firms studied had 'less than 100 employees' but included a table showing 3 firms with more than 100 people each. Further confusion arises because of the potential overlap between the categories of SME and 'born global' [BG] or 'international new venture' [INV]. This can arise because BG and INV researchers tend to be primarily interested in their internationalization over a period of time during which they grow from being SMEs to larger firms. They do not therefore consider it necessary to provide details of firm size.

One of the principal concerns with the operationalization of internationalization is the infrequency with which studies specify the host countries to which SMEs internationalize. While this presents data-recording difficulties when a large number of countries are involved, the absence of such information comes at a cost. For example, it precludes comparisons between home and host countries in terms of the institutional or cultural differences between them, which may be relevant to the ease or difficulty of SME internationalization. It also limits our ability to address such questions as whether the entry of foreign SMEs into an emerging economy aids or compromises the development of local firms. This removes the opportunity to gauge the impact of experience gained in one country on operations and performance in another, and a consideration of a 'portfolio impact', where a combination of host countries provides opportunities or create constraints vis-à-vis the treatment of a focal location.

4.2. Under-researched areas

Various aspects of the context of SME internationalization remain under-researched, and this neglect is aided by the aforementioned conceptual and methodological problems. In addition, ongoing changes in the international business environment are generating new issues requiring attention. SMEs along with other firms are now facing fundamental contextual changes such as technological disruption, de-globalization, enhanced governmental intervention, rising social tension, and political instability. Certain contextual developments, such as heightened socio-political risk in some foreign environments or expectations that they contribute to sustainability, have intensified specific challenges confronting SMEs. These changes bring to the fore aspects of the social and political context that have previously received relatively little attention. There is also a growing appreciation that many of the changes are inter-connected, reinforcing the point that context is a complex multi-dimensional construct.

Many of the under-researched aspects of context and SME internationalization can be grouped under three headings. These are (1) the contingent relevance of context for SME internationalization and options for researching it, (2) how context impacts on SME internationalization, and (3) the interactions of SME decision-makers with the actors and organizations in their contexts.

4.2.1. The contingent relevance of context and options for researching it

Our review of research has identified contingencies for SME internationalization or for its various facets. Even though available studies have normally only investigated the relevance of a single contextual attribute, they have served to demonstrate the contingent influence of context. Illustrative findings were listed in Table 5.

If context is a contingency for SME internationalization, what does this imply for research strategy? The approach that studies of SME internationalization have most often adopted is to incorporate context into a preferred theory or model as a boundary condition. The supposition here is that the effects of a key driver – the independent variable – in a chosen theory of internationalization may be modified by context, but that those effects will continue to be salient. It is assumed that, for the purposes of both theoretical development and practical policy recommendations, the primary focus should remain as the key driver. This assumption, together with the practical difficulties of achieving research designs that systematically incorporate contextual variation, has encouraged the practice of relegating context to the status of a control variable. Another common feature is to sample SMEs from just one context, normally their home country, but with the researchers appearing not to be aware of, or interested in, the implications of that locational choice. When they do justify this selection of context, it is usually in terms of its supposed typicality and/or suitability for testing their preferred non-contextual theory.

The alternative is to develop context-based theories and explanations, and to place them center-stage in research investigations. Contexts would have to be conceptualized and operationalized with reference to the different facets of context, such as institutional, cultural, political or technological, and their positioning in various theories. The presence of polycontextuality would have to be recognized and with it the requirement to apply multiple theoretical streams (cf. Denk, Kaufmann & Roesch, 2012). Research designs and sampling are often based on home country, industry, or (rarely) host country. Each of those domains is itself polycontextual. If SME domains are polycontextual, this implies that their associated contexts are polymorphic and have to be identified as different configurations of specific contextual variables. Johns (2018: 21) observes that ‘although context enables a demarcation of what is distinctive about situations, it also permits integration across research areas and levels of analysis, identifying what they have in common as settings for organizational behavior’.

The theorizing of a context's relevance for an SME should therefore refer to the particular configuration of contextual variables that characterize its domain. In principle, different configurations of SMEs' contexts could be compared, and the consequences for their internationalization examined. The study of contextual implications for an SME's internationalization needs to take account of both home and host environments. In this vein, Child and Marinova (2014) argued that the extent to which a firm is likely to possess the institutional knowhow and resources required for successful foreign market entry depends on similarities and differences between its home and host countries, as well as on interactions between the two contexts, including institutional accommodations between their governments. In practice, the assessment of differences between multidimensional home and foreign contexts would be highly complex and extremely challenging (Ronen & Shenkar, 2017).

There are several possible ways to cope with the complexity that arises from acknowledging polycontextuality. One is to fall back on a unidimensional approach by arguing that a particular aspect of context within a polycontextual portfolio is likely to be more critical for SME internationalization than other aspects, and or that this may vary by location – for example, government in China and religion in the Middle East. In these circumstances, allocating an equal weighting to the hypothesized influence of every contextual feature on SME internationalization is likely to be misleading. However, the assignment of primacy to one aspect of context would need to be strongly justified, because the a priori selection of supposedly key contextual features runs the risk of returning us to the over-simplifications of the limited one-dimensional view of context that has handicapped much extant research.

Another way forward, already alluded to, would be to explore the possibility that a limited number of major contextual configurations will emerge from empirical inquiry, in the expectation that, taken together, these may account for a large proportion of observable contextual variance (Fainshmidt, Judge, Aguilera & Smith, 2018; George, 2015). If a limited number of contextual configurations were identified, these could be usefully applied to research on SME internationalization in a way that would reduce the complexity of designing and conducting empirical studies. The consolidation of multiple dimensions into configurations, or clusters, has been employed as a way to reduce complexity in comparative studies of cultures (e.g., Ronen & Shenkar, 2017), capitalist systems (Hall & Soskice, 2001), and organizational structures (Pugh, Hickson & Hinings, 1969).

A third possibility for dealing with contextual complexity lies in adopting a subjective view of SME context and its consequences. This means that what constitutes a relevant context and its influence on SME internationalization would be investigated via the lens of SME decision-makers. Reliance on the interpretations of key actors should simplify the research task. IB scholars have tended to treat contexts as comprising objective features. As well as the problem of how to measure these features, there is also the need to understand how and why they have outcomes for SME internationalization. While contextual features constitute external conditions that can have real consequences, how SMEs respond to them is mediated by how they are interpreted by firms' decision-makers (Seifert, Child & Rodrigues, 2012). In some instances, those actors may even have some leverage over their context when, for example, they possess an innovative resource of sufficient value and uniqueness to furnish a strong competitive advantage and open up new foreign markets. This creates some strategic choice for the firm as has been evident in the internationalization of many INVs and BGs. It is, of course, more than likely that some SME decision-makers misinterpret their contexts with negative consequences for firm performance. This matters if the aim of research is to account for internationalization performance, but it is of less consequence if the aim is to explain internationalization behavior. A focus on key SME actors raises the question of how their 'enactment' of context is embedded in the relationships they have with counterparts in their environment. This is another under-researched area to which we shall return.

4.2.2. How does context impact SME internationalization?

Given that context is consequential for SME internationalization, the next question is which contextual features have an impact and how? Our review shows an accumulation of evidence that distinct facets and levels of SME contexts can impinge on their internationalization in different ways. Nevertheless, this evidence is far from complete and we have noted that there are areas of disagreement or inconsistency across findings. Moreover, certain aspects of context received more attention than others, with some being relatively neglected in existing studies. For example, little is known about an influence of the sustainability agenda on SME internationalization, such as the role environmental standards play in the choice of international partners. The not-for-profit sector is another contextual area that is under-researched. The relatively new phenomenon of international digital firms needs to be explored further. Also, most studies provide little or no information on the processes whereby context impacts on SME internationalization – how for instance account is taken of context in decisions on internationalization or whether the relevance of given contextual factors changes during the process of internationalization.

Table 5 showed that a range of theories and perspectives referring to different levels of context have been applied across the articles reviewed. It is doubtful that each theory on its own can account fully or consistently for SME internationalization. However, the potential interaction of different contextual variables, both at the same level and across levels, has so far scarcely been researched at all. The case for taking account of multiple contextual factors is strengthened by our review which

indicates that each theoretical perspective tends to focus on how different contextual factors affect specific aspects of internationalization. For instance, some studies suggest that, while institutional support in the home economy may stimulate SMEs to initiate internationalization, it is firm-level variables such as innovative capacity and entrepreneurial orientation that determine the subsequent speed and magnitude of that internationalization (McGaughey, Kumaraswamy & Liesch, 2016). The relative significance of environmental versus firm-specific characteristics is a general issue that research has still to answer.

The status of industry as a contextual factor and its role in SME internationalization presents another challenge for future research. Scholars have urged more attention be given to industry context in research on SME internationalization (e.g., Reuber et al., 2017), and Table 5 lists some studies that have adopted an industry focus. However, its polycontextual nature presents a tall order for future research. An SME's membership in a given industry gives its context a distinctive institutional, social and knowledge/technological profile and flavor (Child et al., 2017). This brings a range of associated theoretical perspectives into play simultaneously. Thus, while the technological basis of an SME's industry determines the critical resources that underpin its international competitiveness, the munificence and institutional maturity of its home-country environment may impact the availability of those resources. In some countries, industry and institutional effects on internationalization are intertwined with government initiative to support 'industry winners.' Moreover, industry and host country institutional environment can interact in impacting SME policies on taking their IP overseas. For example, location in a knowledge-intensive industry makes IP protection in foreign markets a key strategic consideration for SMEs and has been found to affect their willingness to trust and collaborate with foreign partners. Conversely, an SME based in a home country with few knowledge resources may seek foreign markets with weak IP protection so it can appropriate 'knowledge leakage'. Industries are also social systems in which key SME decision-makers have been found to adopt similar business models via a process of mimetic isomorphism (Spender, 1989). How much this mimetic isomorphism reflects imitation or independent responses to similar constraints is a subject deserving further research.

While most SMEs are situated in a defined industry in terms of their root competences and products, some may rely on an array of network connections from a range of other industries or sectors. This particularly applies to knowledge-based SMEs for which their creation of intellectual property often depends on a range of external sources of knowledge and financial support, while in turn their IP can support diversified applications to different markets (Powell, White, Koput & Owen-Smith, 2005). When SMEs engage with a wide set of network connections which may extend to different industries and which perform complementary functions for their internationalization, they can be said to belong to an ecosystem (Jacobides, Cennamo & Gawer, 2018; Moore, 1993). The concept has the potential to reconcile industry and network perspectives of SME context. It draws attention to the specialized and complementary roles of external resource providers in assisting an SME's internationalization. The focus of their assistance is likely to be industry specific, even though the location of the providers need not be. At the same time, the ecosystem concept draws attention to issues highlighted by network analysis including the linkages between players in an SME's context and the role that an SME may play in international business systems, ranging from a being niche supplier to MNEs to a keystone player in a new field of innovation.

As with all analogies derived from other disciplines, that of an ecosystem has limitations. Its point of reference is the totality of actors (or naturally occurring organisms in biology) in a system, rather than the actions of a single member, namely an SME which can choose to enter or quit particular networks. With its systemic focus, it assumes a greater degree of cohesion, interdependence and

continuity than may be typical of SME contexts. In addition, the disparate application of the concept – to business ecosystems, innovation ecosystems, industry ecosystems and entrepreneurial ecosystems among others – calls for theoretical consolidation (Gomes, Facin, Salerno & Ikenami, 2018). Clarification of the insights that the ecosystem concept can offer into the context of SME internationalization therefore presents a further opportunity for future investigation.

Finally, while the impact of national institutions in the host and (especially) home country has been studied, the role of other institutional levels has been relatively neglected. Here we refer to subnational institutions which in certain countries such as China and Canada have considerable trade and investment discretion, regional institutions such as the EU that impose their own regulatory constraints at the same time that they subsidize SME exports, and international institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) that enact trade rules. Just because SMEs are unlikely to have their government launch a protracted trade war on their behalf as the USA and the EU did for Boeing and Airbus, respectively, does not mean that they are not impacted, nor that they are not engaged in cooperative lobbying as fishing organizations on both sides of the channel were in the recent Brexit negotiations.

4.2.3. Interactions of SME decision-makers with the actors and organizations in their contexts

In expounding his thesis that organizational environments are enacted by key players, Weick argued that enactment ‘boils down to a straightforward theme: people are in a complex reciprocal relationship with their environments’ (Weick, 2003: 186). The interaction between the micro-level context of key SME decision-makers and factors in the wider meso and macro contexts needs to be a central focus of future research on how context comes to influence SME internationalization. While not within the scope of our review, a large body of research on IE also points to how the ‘context’ of SME decision-makers, in terms of factors such as their international experience and international connections, can shape the internationalization policies they adopt within conditions created by their wider firm and environmental contexts (Elbanna, Hsieh & Child, 2020). Important insights into the nature of contextual influences should be offered by further research into how SME decision-makers interpret their contexts, and how their relationship with players in those contexts may influence their internationalization. ‘Cognitive mapping’ may be the method of choice to unearth this issue to show what action possibilities are considered and which constraints actually come into play. It has scarcely been employed so far. Furthermore, the small scale of SMEs makes it possible to observe how firms actually make decisions involving their context, which is not visible or easily decipherable in a large organization.

We have outlined the methodological possibilities of focusing future studies on how SME leaders interpret the contexts of their firms when making decisions on internationalization. As participants in such decisions and enablers of their implementation, actors in the firm's context are likely to play a critical role (Coviello, Kano & Liesch, 2017). This also draws attention to the importance of decision-makers’ relationships with actors in their environments. In the process of internationalizing, SMEs build relationships with external actors within both their domestic and foreign contexts. The proactive construction of relational frameworks by firms is a salient theme in the networking perspective on SME internationalization. This holds that connections to external networks can facilitate and support the internationalization of SMEs by providing relevant resources including information, finance, technical knowledge, connections to foreign market networks, and insurance against risk (Jones et al., 2011; Torkkeli, Kuivalainen, Saarenketo & Puumalainen, 2019).

Institutional theorists have also long pointed out that organizations are embedded in a relational framework comprising the social and political relations they have with external actors and agencies

(Scott & Meyer, 1983). Some external actors are officials located in public institutions, who may facilitate SME internationalization through funding, market information and foreign contacts, or constrain it through laws, regulations, or norms. Other external actors outside the public sector can also be relevant as, for example, sources of venture capital, consultancy, or technology for innovation. In some cases, SME decision-makers can enact part of their environment by choosing which external parties to engage with; in the case of other external relationships such as those with foreign market regulators they may have no such choice. As indicated in Table 5, SMEs especially from emerging economies may establish collaborations with MNEs to prepare for and support their internationalization (Prashantham, Kumar & Bhattacharyya, 2019). This includes the practice of 'inward internationalization' through OEM production, licensing and joint ventures (Child & Rodrigues, 2005), as well as 'piggybacking' on MNEs to enter foreign markets through producing for their supply chains.

While the contribution that relational networking can make to SME internationalization is well recognized, many key issues remain under-researched. One concerns the requirements for building and maintaining relationships with foreign partners that can bridge institutional and cultural differences (Couper, 2019). Another question concerns the nature of the assistance SMEs need to further their internationalization aims and who provides specific forms of assistance. For example, do SMEs require help in establishing or cementing connections to influential institutional officials and politicians in foreign markets? To what extent does an SME's area of activity – as denoted by its industry– determine the kind of resources that it needs to secure from external sources?

The management of external relationships may be crucial to SME's internationalization even when operating in a resource rich environment, if access to resources such as capital requires social connections and legitimacy. For example, in the munificent context of Qatar where internationalizing firms can benefit from abundant financial resources, it has become apparent that access to them by a small firm depends on the social capital of the owner (Younis & Karmowska, 2018). The implication is that the link between SME resource dependence and internationalization cannot be analyzed purely by reference to economic theories, but must also draw upon political and social perspectives. That SMEs suffer from a liability of smallness implies that, compared to MNEs, they are disadvantaged by power asymmetry in their relations with the state and with key stakeholders. The processes through which key individuals may be able to counterbalance this by mediating the relations between firms and external organizations constitutes an outstanding issue for further research concerned with how different contextual levels – macro, meso and micro – interact.

4.3. Scope for theory development

The review has demonstrated beyond doubt that context is highly significant for understanding SME internationalization, and that variations in contextual situations establish boundary conditions for theorizing on internationalization. Each aspect of context is liable to present different implications for specific aspects of SME internationalization such as its resourcing, its perceived risk, and its trajectory over time such as sequence of foreign markets entered, entry modes, earliness and speed of internationalization. Moreover, context is a multi-dimensional, multi-faceted, phenomenon. The nature and incidence of its different facets vary across situations. While relatively few studies have addressed the combined effects of different contextual factors, there is growing evidence that they can moderate each other's influence. Moderation among contextual variables can take place across different levels, and SME decisions on internationalization provide an important focal point for this process.

The key findings derived from our review, listed in Table 5, indicate that the principal perspectives applied to the theorization of MNE internationalization are relevant to understanding the context of SME internationalization. Some contribute to the conceptualization of context, among them the institutional, cultural, economic, political and technological perspectives. Others, including the resource, networking, ownership, transaction costs, and technological perspectives, offer explanations for the strategies and behaviors of internationalizing firms within their context.

However, while theoretical perspectives developed for MNEs identify contextual factors that are also relevant for SMEs, whether their assumptions inform how such factors apply to SMEs, and with what consequences, is problematic. They definitely would not capture contextual factors that are specific for SMEs. The basic conclusion we draw from our review is that the treatment in the IB literature of the role of context in SME internationalization is ripe for problematization, namely 'identifying, articulating, and challenging assumptions underlying existing literature and, based on that, constructing research questions that will lead to the development of more interesting and influential theories' (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011, p.252). The key to problematization lies in the challenging of existing assumptions and the generation of new research questions.

The principal, albeit largely implicit, assumption informing IB perspectives on the context of internationalization is that what applies to an MNE will also apply to an SME. In reality these are two quite different kinds of firm. The extent and manner in which mainstream IB perspectives apply to SMEs is qualified by their most obvious difference to their larger counterparts, namely their smaller size. Size is a boundary condition to theories of firm internationalization in its context. Size locates a firm in its context with respect to its market power, leverage over other market and non-market organizations, public and reputational visibility, and networking possibilities. Size also has internal consequences concerning a firm's governance (including its capacity to internalize transactions governance), organization, decision-making and style of leadership. The significance of these size-related characteristics has begun to surface in discussions on the contrasting theoretical foundations of IB and IE research (e.g., Verbeke & Ciravegna, 2018). They are crucial to evaluating the adequacy of existing theories for the subject of this review, and for identifying questions for future research.

The role of context in the internationalization of SMEs is likely to contrast to the case of MNEs for a number of reasons, each of which should inform the future development of theorizing sensitive to SMEs. One reason is informed by a combination of political and resource-based perspectives. It concerns the asymmetric power and dependence that characterizes the relationship of SMEs with contextual agencies and organizations. Overall, compared to large firms, SMEs are less in a position to shape institutional elements of context such as regulation and political risk, or shape the terms of market competition. They are therefore more influenced by those elements and more vulnerable to changes in them. This is because SMEs are less likely to have contingency plans, can least afford resource slack to use as a buffer, and lack the capacity to switch to different sectors and markets as a source of risk-reducing diversification. MNEs tend to have greater leverage vis-à-vis institutions in their home and host country contexts due to their accumulation of assets and competences which enable them to offer inducements such as investment, technology transfer, employment creation, and even bribes. Most SMEs are unable to command the resources to offer such inducements. Their entry into foreign markets is typically achieved on the basis of market appeal based on innovation, the ability to rapidly adapt products and services, or offering specialized inputs to MNE global value chains. While MNEs often apply internalization advantage to foreign market entry by forming foreign subsidiaries and alliances, SMEs usually enter foreign markets via external means such as exporting, licensing, franchising, or supplying a global value chain. Their management of internationalization is

also frequently externalized through the use of foreign agents or through following the requirements imposed by an MNE customer.

A reliance on externalization is also apparent from many of the reviewed studies showing that SMEs in seeking to internationalize try to compensate for resource and informational deficiencies via external networking and social capital development in which personal relations and trust play a major supporting role. The ownership stake SME leaders often possess, and the legitimacy of being founders, can facilitate the development of personal relations with foreign clients and customers which bridge psychic distance and value incongruence (Child & Rodrigues, 2008; Puthusserry et al., 2014; Puthusserry, Child & Khan, 2020). Reliance on informal arrangements may also grant SMEs more flexibility to adjust to changes in, and variations of, context. Nevertheless, while the personal characteristics and social connections of SME entrepreneurs are theoretically relevant to understanding their networking process, an explanation for why internationalizing SMEs need to rely heavily on personal networking should refer to the combination of their resource dependence and political weakness.

SME leaders seeking support for internationalization can find it more feasible to rely on informal networks than on the formal help of public institutions, especially in nations with institutional voids (Narooz & Child, 2017). Schiffer and Weder (2001b) find that SMEs lack the opportunity for collusion with government as well as with other firms, putting them at a disadvantage to large firms. The classic non-market strategies identified in the literature (Mellahi, Frynas, Sun & Siegel, 2016) by which firms try to influence institutional policies through corporate political action such as lobbying and political alliances, are difficult for SMEs to adopt because they normally lack sufficient clout even when acting collectively. They also have limited capacity to secure external influence and legitimacy through reputation-building based on applying their capabilities and resources to environmental and social goals.

Our general conclusion is therefore that theorizing on SME internationalization should assume that they suffer from a size-related power deficit. That power asymmetry is associated with resource deficiencies which lead to dependence on external parties. Nevertheless, there may be exceptions that can also inform theory building. For instance, there is the possibility that purposive action by SME entrepreneurs, especially in coalition with others, may sometimes mitigate institutional constraints on their internationalization, even to the extent of bringing about modifications to institutional rules and practices. The extent to which interaction between SMEs and contextual agencies, driven on the part of SMEs by collective learning and proactive collaboration, gives rise to a coevolutionary process over time between SMEs and external agencies is a potentially rich area for future theoretical exploration. It could draw on, and integrate, insights from institutional, agency, entrepreneurial and political perspectives (McGaughey et al., 2016). Another exception, and one that is probably becoming increasingly salient, arises when an SME possesses a unique innovative capability. A technologically disrupting SME, such as BioNTech, commands a market-transforming innovation that creates a basis for instant internationalization and attracts other resources necessary to support it such as finance and eager MNE partners. These examples suggest that an entrepreneurial action perspective when combined with insights from political and resource dependence theories, offers a fruitful avenue for theoretical development on the dynamics of context and SME internationalization.

Firm size also carries organizational implications relevant to the theorization of SME internationalization in its context compared to that relevant for MNEs. This becomes evident in decision-making on internationalization both with respect to the information utilized and to the process followed. SMEs typically lack the resources, including the requisite knowledge and

specialized staff, to conduct a systematic scanning of the environment. They may instead rely on external providers of information whose services do not always meet an SME's specific requirements. Consequently, they may miss key elements of context and or fail to understand how those elements might impact them. Decisions in SMEs are normally made by a limited number of individuals (chiefly the owner) which may preclude critical evaluation of prospects and may bias learning from experience. By contrast, many studies have shown that larger organizational size is associated with internal organizational formalization and specialization (Donaldson, 2001). As a result, MNEs are likely to employ procedural rationality (and a causation approach) in their decision-making on internationalization, backed by the specialized internal resources to secure detailed information on foreign markets. By contrast, information less-rich SMEs appear to be more likely to rely on decisions informed by entrepreneurial intuition and personal experience (Child & Hsieh, 2014). Indeed, in the absence of reliable information, serendipity can become their mode of making decisions on internationalization (Crick & Spence, 2005). Insofar as SMEs adopt a less complex mode of decision-making on internationalization, they may be more agile but at the same time more limited in their ability to inform their decisions and to implement them through channels possessing appropriate resources and foreign market experience.

The theoretical specification of antecedents to, and influences on, SME internationalization decision-making is complex, involving a likely interaction between macro, meso and micro contextual influences together with attributes of the decision itself (Elbanna et al., 2020). Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the assumptions underpinning existing theories of MNE decision-making and its outcomes are generally not valid for SMEs. An example is the incremental international expansion assumed by the Uppsala model to characterize MNEs, which, it is claimed, does not apply to SMEs (Rialp, Rialp & Knight, 2005), particularly the born global (Knight & Cavusgil, 1996).

There is today considerable environmental disruption in the context of internationalization, due to rapid technological advances, a growing level of political intervention in the rules of international business and the socio-economic consequences of climate change and environmental degradation. There is growing evidence that these changes carry different implications for SMEs and MNEs, which again speaks for distinctions in theorizing. This has become clear with respect to the consequences of the emerging new technological context. Some of the studies reviewed have shown how the internet is opening up opportunities for SMEs to access relevant foreign market information directly and to achieve a global market spread rapidly (e.g., Jean & Kim, 2020). The internet is reducing the previous reliance of SMEs on externalization to support their internationalization through piggybacking on MNEs or employing external consultants. Use of the internet to access foreign markets directly reduces the external dependence of SMEs, including on MNEs. New technology is also providing the means for many knowledge intensive SMEs to develop innovative products and services based on digitalization. The impact of new technology on an SME's internationalization is not deterministic, because it will also depend on factors such as the extent to which its leadership appreciates technological possibilities and is motivated to adopt them, as well as on the firm's ability to recruit suitably qualified technical staff. Nevertheless, technology needs to occupy a central role in theorizing on the context of SME internationalization and as a factor likely to further differentiate SMEs from MNEs.

Similarly, the changing political context of international business is challenging the neo-liberal market assumptions that have informed much of IB theory. The politicization of trade leading to a degree of de-globalization has, since the advent of the coronavirus pandemic, developed into an unprecedented level of political intervention in markets. On the assumption that it represents a new normal, theorists are currently debating the implications of this trend. It is likely to impose greater

constraints on the internationalization of SMEs compared to larger firms because of their limited ability to exercise political and institutional influence which we noted earlier. This reinforces the view that the political context of SME internationalization requires its own distinct theorization.

Our review also identifies other contextual factors that point to a need for new theories on SME internationalization. For example, there is a growing body of work on the internationalization of SMEs from emerging economies which highlights that its success can be fostered by distinctive strategies such as the compositional approach and specific features such as returnee entrepreneurs from developed economies and ethnically-based networking between trading partners. In the light of considerations such as these, the cultural and social characteristics of their home and host economies may create conditions peculiar to the internationalization of SMEs which call for new theoretical development. The relatively low level of attention that has been accorded to industry as an aspect of an SME's context is another area that requires greater theoretical attention, especially in view of evidence that SMEs tend to be more industry-specific than MNEs and that the industry in which SMEs are located is associated with contrasting international business models (Child et al., 2017).

SMEs also may gain a competitive advantage in their internationalization through collaboration with MNEs in new product development, technology alliances, global value chains, or providing inputs for servicing large manufacturing firms (Zahoor et al., 2020). The potentially symbiotic relationships between MNEs and SMEs require new theorizing, especially with respect to the combination of opportunity and dependency trade-offs facing SMEs. Thus, when SMEs expand by way of piggybacking on a large MNE, they are able to overcome their resource handicap but may end up with lesser understanding of a market context which they do not actively choose. This is also the case where SMEs rely on third parties which retain direct contact with customers and their market environment (Vendrell-Herrero et al., 2017). In other words, we do not just require distinct theories of MNE and SME internationalization, but also a theory of MNE/SME relations within the changing context of international business.

5. Conclusion and recommendations

The present review gives rise to recommendations concerning both methodology and issues for further research. The review demonstrates that many operational challenges remain. In Section 4.1, we argued that in operationalizing their methodologies, researchers need to be exact and consistent in their definition of SME for sampling purposes. Because the SME as a category includes a variety of firm sizes and qualitatively different forms such as traditional SME, INV, BG, micro-multinationals and family-owned firm, full information about samples would not only facilitate replication as a means for accumulating knowledge, but also enable more precise comparisons between samples and within them. Contextually informed justifications for sample selection, and specific information on the contexts of studies have often been absent or presented superficially. Precision is also required when identifying the exact form of internationalization adopted, though this has not in general presented such a problem in the studies reviewed. On the other hand, we noted that the treatment of context leaves much to be desired. Future studies need to use research design to include theoretically relevant contextual variables rather than (as frequently happens) relegating them to dummy control variables usually without due consideration of the theoretical assumptions underlying this. In other words, sampling frameworks should promote contextualization based on up-front theorizing about the relevance of context to SME internationalization. Although, as noted earlier, this poses a considerable challenge, it has to be addressed in order for the subject to progress.

We have recognized that theorizing about context and SME internationalization is a challenging task. This is due both to the inherent complexity of the subject and to the multifarious range of perspectives brought to bear on it. The presence of polycontextuality and diversity among SMEs points to the complexity of the subject. The existence of relevant perspectives contributed by different disciplines, and/or deriving from a focus on different contextual levels, generates a considerable range of theories to consider. The theoretical challenge is increased insofar as some perspectives, such as the political, deserve greater attention than they have received to date. Nevertheless, in Section 4.2 we offered ways in which the problem might be addressed. They include assigning (and justifying) theoretical primacy to one aspect of context, pursuing a configurational approach in the hope that key contextual profiles might be identified, which consolidate the empirical treatment of context, and adopting a subjective approach whereby the impact of context on SME internationalization is studied through the lens of SME decision-makers and their interpretations of their situations. The underlying recommendation here is to be more conscious of context when applying theories to SME internationalization. This includes taking due account of aspects of context that have been under-researched, notably industry and polity, and further identifying new contextual features specific to SMEs.

Insights provided by the review inform recommendations for the conduct of future research. 'Context is everywhere' and poses major challenges, but this also means that it cannot be ignored. Even studies that are not designed to be comparative between contexts should be fully aware and explicit about the relevance of the contexts from which their data are drawn. More specifically, research into context and SME internationalization requires a justification for the selection of the study's context beyond mere convenience, inclusion in their analyses of contextual variations such as relevant home and host country institutions, industry and ownership, a careful description of other key variables such as firm size, and the contextualization of the discussion of their findings. Examination of contextual boundary conditions, and hence the extent to which current theories are generally applicable, has to be a priority for future research.

In practice, one finds repeatedly that only limited areas of context have been taken into account. More facets need to be identified and taken into consideration. Initially, a deeper understanding of the role that context plays would benefit from more research of a qualitative nature into, for instance, the precise roles that different external network links play in assisting SME internationalization. Examples of context-related areas which have little or no representation in the reviewed literature are (1) the impact of the sustainability agenda on SME internationalization regarding the choice of international partners or locations; (2) the impact of digital transformation on SME internationalization; (3) internationalization undertaken by not-for-profit SMEs; (4) the forms and consequences of SME collaboration with MNEs as a platform for internationalization; and (5) the impact of SME internationalization on host countries, regarding for instance local entrepreneurship and competitiveness. The research by Farah, Elias, Chakravarty, and Beamish (2021) into the impact of host country corporate income tax rates on MNE subsidiary survival points to another aspect of SME international context that has been under-researched.

There has been a relative dearth of comparative research strategies in the existing literature. It is, for instance, rare for SME samples to permit a comparison between their country and industry locations with respect to potential implications for their internationalization. More studies are needed that compare SMEs from different contexts and that take account both the home and host country contexts of their international business, including how SMEs can accommodate to differences between the two. It was also apparent from Table 3 that some countries such as Finland and Spain account for a relatively large number of studies, possibly reflecting the relatively high

importance of SMEs in those countries and/or the presence there of some key researchers. This does, however, raise the question of what contexts are typical for SMEs, how they differ and how this may impact on their internationalization. Factors such as the size of the domestic market, and the institutional support available to SMEs may play a role, and it is only comparative research that can throw light on these possibilities.

We also endorse the comparison of what Przeworski and Teune (1970) call 'partially similar cases'. Rather than the preference we find in the reviewed articles for comparing contrasting cases that appear to differ on most if not all contextual elements, such as the US and China, it might be better to compare cases that are similar on some elements but differ on one, or a few, in effect controlling for the former and enabling a clearer understanding of the impact of each layer of context, a major challenge noted at the beginning of this article. For instance, to clarify the role of industry, a neglected element of context in the literature, it might be more fruitful to compare, say, the operation of US manufacturing versus service SMEs in the same market, e.g., China. Or, one could compare the operations of SMEs in Singapore and China, nations that show cultural similarity (Ronen & Shenkar, 2017) yet differ in their institutional environment.

We have already noted the limitation of the theoretical landscape where institutional theory is by far the most popular lens with which to study the impact of context on SME internationalization. In a way this makes sense given that the theory is context-focused, but this comes at the cost of neglecting other theoretical lenses that, together, could provide a more comprehensive view of the phenomenon of interest but are not often deployed. For instance, resource dependence theory is highly relevant not only to the dependence of SMEs on external resources such as state subsidies, but also to SME dependence on large multinationals that may lead them to pursue modes and locations that do not represent their first choice but are dictated by the preference of a multinational. Thus an SME may prefer an alliance due to resource shortage, but ends up in a wholly owned affiliate because its multinational client is concerned about knowledge leakage to a competitor. Also relevant are transaction cost economics (TCE), which is the theory of choice in research on multinationals, option theory, signal theory, and more. A research design that juxtaposes hypotheses derived from different theories will go a long way towards not only enhancing knowledge of SME internationalization as a product of context, but will also make a theoretical contribution in its own right.

Although many recent studies of internationalization have involved SMEs located in the emerging economies of China and India, much current theorizing still derives from research on MNEs based in developed economies like the USA. Research on SME internationalization does not yet have strong roots in other contexts such as sub-Saharan Africa. It may well be necessary to target locations for future research not only on the basis of economic relevance, not to mention convenience, but in terms of their theoretical significance or knowledge void. For example, comparing SMEs in an economy where they are dominant to one in which they are not, or one where a dedicated government agency such as the US Small Business Administration is there to compensate for some of their limited resources to one where they are by and large left to struggle on their own.

A theme underlying this review paper has been the extent to which context-oriented theories developed to account for MNE internationalization also apply to SMEs. However, studies directly comparing MNE and SMEs have been rare. The paucity of direct comparisons between SMEs and large MNEs not only limits empirical observation, it also constrains theory development. Given the light they should throw on the question of theoretical equivalence, there is clearly a need for more direct comparisons between the two categories of firm. Since most organizational and IB theories were developed with large companies in mind, the suitability of those theories for small firms,

already questioned by Max Weber, is of the essence. Addressing this question is a tall task but one that might yield fruit not only for the specific population of SMEs but also for the very theoretical base underlying IB as well as its related fields of management and strategy.

At times, SMEs are simply more visible to a researcher. For example, Vahlne and Johanson (2013) strived to incorporate behavioral elements into the internationalization paradigm, elements that were mostly implicit in the original Uppsala model and are best researched in an SME where actors and behavioral processes are more transparent. At other times, SMEs can help establish boundary conditions to a theory. For instance, certain strategies to control interdependencies in resource dependence theory, such as building slack by way of developing reputation, may not be feasible in an SME, which may need to develop substitutes, for example via a long-term relationship with a large MNE. In turn, such relationships may place constraints on whether and where the SME will internationalize. At the same time, the dynamics of the business relationships between MNEs and SMEs are changing in the context of digitalization and innovation. The internet appears to be reducing the dependence of SMEs on MNEs to provide channels to international markets. Among other developments, partnerships between smaller and larger firms to marry the exploratory capabilities of the former with the exploitative capabilities of the latter, and to speed up the innovation cycle, are becoming increasingly common. Their implications for the degree and mode of SME internationalization are under-researched.

Appendix 1. Methodological procedures for article search, selection and inclusion.

1. Scope of the study.
 - 1.1. To review how context is considered in articles concerning SME internationalization.
2. Journal selection.
 - 2.1. All journals listed in the British Association of Business Schools 2018 (ABS) journal ranking at 3, 4, and 4* levels in the categories most relevant to the subject of the review, namely: 'Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management', 'International Business and Area Studies', as well as 'Strategy'.
 - 2.2. The Journal of International Marketing, although falling outside the above mentioned thematic areas, has been also reviewed because among marketing journals it specifically focuses on international business.
3. Criteria for article inclusion/exclusion.
 - 3.1. Peer-reviewed journal articles only.
 - 3.2. Empirical and conceptual.
 - 3.3. Studies focused on SMEs and their internationalization.
 - 3.4. A broad approach to the identification of SMEs was adopted for the purpose of the review. That is: (1) authors define the focus of their article as SMEs (even though data on firm size may not be provided); (2) articles sample born global firms, INVs, start-ups, nascent internationals, or micro-multinationals, and the firms sampled employ less than 500 people; (3) on reading the article it was clear that it concerned smaller firms.
 - 3.5. Concerned with any mode of internationalization.
4. Search method and scope.
 - 4.1. Full manual search in each issue of the journals included in the review (22 journals) from January 2010 to November 2020 (inclusive).

- 4.2. Initial focus on: (i) title, (ii) abstract and (iii) introduction, (iv) methodology section, (v) key words, if available. In borderline cases, full papers were read and discussed between all the authors of the present paper.
5. Verification check stage
 - 5.1. Manual checking of all papers included in the database in order to finalise the decision on their inclusion or exclusion. This is to ensure consistency with the criteria for article selection.
6. Identification of the basic contextual characteristics of the included papers, such as: (i) how SME is defined in the paper, if at all, (ii) size of the sample, (iii) quantitative or qualitative or mixed or conceptual methods, (iv) home and host countries considered, (v) theoretical lenses adopted, (vi) reference to context, (v) main argument/ contribution of the paper. These characteristics were tabulated to aid analysis.
7. Manual checking of patterns, discussion between all three authors of the present article and final verification of the articles list, n=333.

References

- Acs and Terjesen, 2013. Z.J. Acs, S. Terjesen. Born local: Toward a theory of new venture's choice of internationalization. *Small Business Economics*, 41 (2013), pp. 521-535.
- Adomako et al., 2019. S. Adomako, J. Amankwah-Amoah, G.O. Dankwah, A. Danso, F. Donbesuur. Institutional voids, international learning effort and internationalization of emerging market new ventures. *Journal of International Management*, 25 (4) (2019), Article 100666.
- Adomako et al., 2020. S. Adomako, K. Frimpong, A. Danso, J. Amankwah-Amoah, M. Uddin, K. Kesse. Home country institutional impediments and international expansion of developing country SMEs. *International Business Review*, 29 (5) (2020), Article 101716.
- Alayo et al., 2019. M. Alayo, A. Maseda, T. Iturralde, U. Arzubiaga. Internationalization and entrepreneurial orientation of family SMEs: The influence of the family character. *International Business Review*, 28 (1) (2019), pp. 48-59.
- Albarran et al., 2013. P. Albarran, R. Carrasco, A. Holl. Domestic transport infrastructure and firms' export market participation. *Small Business Economics*, 40 (4) (2013), pp. 879-898.
- Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011. M. Alvesson, J. Sandberg. Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36 (2) (2011), pp. 247-271.
- Amoako and Lyon, 2014. I.O. Amoako, F. Lyon. We don't deal with courts': Cooperation and alternative institutions shaping exporting relationships of SMEs in Ghana. *International Small Business Journal*, 32 (2) (2014), pp. 117-139.
- Arregle et al., 2017. J.L. Arregle, P. Duran, M.A. Hitt, M. van Essen. Why is family firms' internationalization unique? A meta-analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41 (5) (2017), pp. 801-831.
- Assadinia et al., 2019. S. Assadinia, V. Kadile, I. Gölgeci, N. Boso. The effects of learning orientation and marketing programme planning on export performance: Paradoxical moderating role of psychic distance. *International Small Business Journal*, 37 (5) (2019), pp. 423-449.

- Autio et al., 2011. E. Autio, G. George, O. Alexy. International entrepreneurship and capability development—Qualitative evidence and future research directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35 (1) (2011), pp. 11-37.
- Bai et al., 2017. W. Bai, M. Johanson, O.M. Martín. Knowledge and internationalization of returnee entrepreneurial firms. *International Business Review*, 26 (4) (2017), pp. 652-665.
- Baker and Welter, 2020. T. Baker, F. Welter. *Contextualizing entrepreneurship theory*. Routledge, New York (2020).
- Berger et al., 2017. R. Berger, R. Herstein, A. Silbiger, B.R. Barnes. Developing international business relationships in a Russian context. *Management International Review*, 57 (3) (2017), pp. 441-471.
- Björnberg et al., 2014. A. Björnberg, H.P. Elstrodt, V. Pandit. The family-business factor in emerging markets. *McKinsey Quarterly* (2014). December 1-6.
- Boehe, 2013. D. Boehe. Collaborate at home to win abroad: How does access to local network resources influence export behavior? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51 (2) (2013), pp. 167-182.
- Bonini and Alkan, 2012. S. Bonini, S. Alkan. The political and legal determinants of venture capital investments around the world. *Small Business Economics*, 39 (4) (2012), pp. 997-1016.
- Boter and Holmquist, 1996. H. Boter, C. Holmquist. Industry characteristics and internationalization processes in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11 (6) (1996), pp. 471-487.
- Buckley, 1989. P.J. Buckley. Foreign direct investment by small-and medium-sized enterprises: The theoretical background. Buckley, P.J. (ed.). *The multinational enterprise*, Palgrave Macmillan (1989). (24-45) London
- Cardoza and Fornes, 2011. G. Cardoza, G. Fornes. The internationalisation of SMEs from China: The case of Ningxia Hui autonomous region. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28 (4) (2011), pp. 737-759.
- Catanzaro et al., 2019. A. Catanzaro, K. Messeghem, S. Sammut. Effectiveness of export support programs: Impact on the relational capital and international performance of early internationalizing small businesses. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57 (2) (2019), pp. 436-461.
- Chandra and Wilkinson, 2017. Y. Chandra, I.F. Wilkinson. Firm internationalization from a network-centric complex-systems perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 52 (6) (2017), pp. 691-701.
- Chen et al., 2014. H.I. Chen, W. Hsu, C. Chang. Family ownership, institutional ownership, and internationalization of SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52 (4) (2014), pp. 771-789.
- Cheng, 1994. J.L.C. Cheng. On the concept of universal knowledge in organizational science: Implications for cross-national research. *Management Science*, 40 (1) (1994), pp. 162-168.
- Child, 2009. J. Child. Context, comparison and methodology in Chinese management research. *Management and Organization Review*, 5 (1) (2009), pp. 57-73.
- Child and Hsieh, 2014. J. Child, L. Hsieh. Decision mode, information and network attachment in the internationalization of SMEs: A configurational and contingency analysis. *Journal of World Business*, 49 (4) (2014), pp. 598-610.

Child et al., 2017. J. Child, L. Hsieh, S. Elbanna, J. Karmowska, S. Marinova, P. Puthusserry, et al. SME international business models: The role of context and experience. *Journal of World Business*, 52 (5) (2017), pp. 664-679.

Child and Marinova, 2014. J. Child, S.T. Marinova. The role of contextual combinations in the globalization of Chinese firms. *Management and Organization Review*, 10 (3) (2014), pp. 347-371

Child and Rodrigues, 2005. J. Child, S.B. Rodrigues. The internationalization of Chinese firms: A case for theoretical extension? *Management and Organization Review*, 1 (3) (2005), pp. 381-410.

Child and Rodrigues, 2008. J. Child, S.B. Rodrigues. The process of SME internationalization: British firms entering Brazil. *Economia e Gestão*, 17 (3) (2008), pp. 31-55.

Child and Rodrigues, 2011. J. Child, S.B. Rodrigues. How organizations engage with external complexity: A political action perspective. *Organization Studies*, 32 (6) (2011), pp. 803-824.

Classen et al., 2014. N. Classen, M. Carree, A. Van Gils, B. Peters. Innovation in family and non-family SMEs: An exploratory analysis. *Small Business Economics*, 42 (3) (2014), pp. 595-609.

Couper, 2019. C. Couper. Institutional bridging for SME high-distance internationalisation to China: A contextualized explanation. *Management and Organization Review*, 15 (2) (2019), pp. 307-340.

Coviello et al., 2017. N. Coviello, L. Kano, P.W. Liesch. Adapting the Uppsala model to a modern world: Macro-context and microfoundations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48 (9) (2017), pp. 1151-1164.

Crick and Spence, 2005. D. Crick, M. Spence. The internationalisation of 'high performing' UK high-tech SMEs: A study of planned and unplanned strategies. *International Business Review*, 14 (2) (2005), pp. 167-185.

Cui et al., 2014. A.P. Cui, M.F. Walsh, S. Zou. The importance of strategic fit between host-home country similarity and exploration exploitation strategies on small and medium-sized enterprises' performance: A contingency perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 22 (4) (2014), pp. 67-85.

De Maeseneire and Claeys, 2012. W. De Maeseneire, T. Claeys. SMEs, foreign direct investment and financial constraints: The case of Belgium. *International Business Review*, 21 (3) (2012), pp. 408-424.

De Villa et al., 2015. M.A. De Villa, T. Rajwani, T. Lawton. Market entry modes in a multipolar world: Untangling the moderating effect of the political environment. *International Business Review*, 24 (3) (2015), pp. 419-429.

Del Bosco and Bettinelli, 2020. B. Del Bosco, C. Bettinelli. How do family SMEs control their investments abroad? The role of distance and family control. *Management International Review*, 60 (1) (2020), pp. 1-35.

Delerue and Lejeune, 2011. H. Delerue, A. Lejeune. Managerial secrecy and intellectual asset protection in SMEs: The role of institutional environment. *Journal of International Management*, 17 (2) (2011), pp. 130-142.

Denk et al., 2012. N. Denk, L. Kaufmann, J.F. Roesch. Liabilities of foreignness revisited: A review of contemporary studies and recommendations for future research. *Journal of International Management*, 18 (4) (2012), pp. 322-334.

Dimitratos et al., 2003. P. Dimitratos, J. Johnson, J. Slow, S. Young. Micromultinationals: New types of firms for the global competitive landscape. *European Management Journal*, 21 (2) (2003), pp. 164-174.

Dimitratos et al., 2011. P. Dimitratos, A. Petrou, E. Plakoyiannaki, J.E. Johnson. Strategic decision-making processes in internationalization: Does national culture of the focal firm matter? *Journal of World Business*, 46 (2) (2011), pp. 194-204.

Donaldson, 2001. L. Donaldson. *The contingency theory of organizations*. Sage, Thousand Oaks (2001).

Eberhard and Craig, 2013. M. Eberhard, J. Craig. The evolving role of organisational and personal networks in international market venturing. *Journal of World Business*, 38 (3) (2013), pp. 385-397.

Eisend et al., 2016. M. Eisend, H. Evanschitzky, R.J. Calantone. The relative advantage of marketing over technological capabilities in influencing new product performance: The moderating role of country institutions. *Journal of International Marketing*, 24 (1) (2016), pp. 41-56.

Elbanna et al., 2020. S. Elbanna, L. Hsieh, J. Child. Contextualizing internationalization decision-making research in SMEs: Towards an integration of existing studies. *European Management Review*, 17 (2) (2020), pp. 573-591.

European Commission, 2015. European Commission (2015). User guide to the SME Definition. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/conferences/state-aid/sme/smedefinitionguide_en.pdf (Accessed 11 January 2021).

Fainshmidt et al., 2018. S. Fainshmidt, W.Q. Judge, R.V. Aguilera, A. Smith. Varieties of institutional systems: A contextual taxonomy of understudied countries. *Journal of World Business*, 53 (3) (2018), pp. 307-322.

Felzensztein et al., 2015. C. Felzensztein, L. Ciravegna, P. Robson, J.E. Amorós. Networks, entrepreneurial orientation, and internationalization scope: Evidence from Chilean small and medium enterprises. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53 (1) (2015), pp. 145-160.

Felzensztein et al., 2019. C. Felzensztein, K.R. Deans, L.P. Dana. Small firms in regional clusters: Local networks and internationalization in the Southern Hemisphere. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57 (2) (2019), pp. 496-516.

Francioni et al., 2017. B. Francioni, T. Vissak, F. Musso. Small Italian wine producers' internationalization: The role of network relationships in the emergence of late starters. *International Business Review*, 26 (1) (2017), pp. 12-22.

Freeman et al., 2012. S. Freeman, K. Hutchings, S. Chetty. Born-globals and culturally proximate markets. *Management International Review*, 52 (3) (2012), pp. 425-460.

Freeman et al., 2010. S. Freeman, K. Hutchings, M. Lazaris, S. Zyngier. A model of rapid knowledge development: The smaller born-global firm. *International Business Review*, 19 (1) (2010), pp. 70-84.

Gabrielsson and Gabrielsson, 2011. M. Gabrielsson, P. Gabrielsson. Internet-based sales channel strategies of born global firms. *International Business Review*, 20 (1) (2011), pp. 88-99.

Galkina and Chetty, 2015. T. Galkina, S. Chetty. Effectuation and networking of internationalizing SMEs. *Management International Review*, 55 (5) (2015), pp. 647-676.

- Gelfand, 2011. M.J. Gelfand, et al. Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332 (2011), pp. 1100-1105. (New York, N.Y.).
- George, 2015. G. George. Expanding context to redefine theories: Africa in management research. *Management and Organization Review*, 11 (1) (2015), pp. 5-10.
- Goerzen, 2018. A. Goerzen. Small firm boundary-spanning via bridging ties: Achieving international connectivity via cross-border inter-cluster alliances. *Journal of International Management*, 24 (2) (2018), pp. 153-164.
- Golovko and Valentini, 2014. E. Golovko, G. Valentini. Selective learning-by-exporting: Firm size and product versus process innovation. *Global Strategy Journal*, 4 (3) (2014), pp. 161-180.
- Gomes et al., 2018. L.A. Gomes, A.L.F. Facin, M.S. Salerno, R.K. Ikenami. Unpacking the innovation ecosystem construct: Evolution, gaps and trends. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 136 (2018), pp. 30-48.
- Granovetter, 1985. M. Granovetter. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91 (3) (1985), pp. 481-510.
- Guiso et al., 2009. L. Guiso, P. Sapienza, L. Zingales. Cultural biases in economic exchange? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124 (3) (2009), pp. 1095-1131.
- Guiso et al., 2015. L. Guiso, P. Sapienza, L. Zingales. Corporate culture, societal culture, and institutions. *American Economic Review*, 105 (5) (2015), pp. 336-339.
- Hall and Soskice, 2001. P.A. Hall, D. Soskice. *Varieties of capitalism*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2001).
- Hennart et al., 2019. J.F. Hennart, A. Majocchi, E. Forlani. The myth of the stay-at-home family firm: How family-managed SMEs can overcome their internationalization limitations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 50 (5) (2019), pp. 758-782.
- Hitt et al., 2007. M.A. Hitt, P.W. Beamish, S.E. Jackson, J.E. Mathieu. Building theoretical and empirical bridges across levels: Multilevel research in management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (6) (2007), pp. 1385-1399.
- HSBC 2016. HSBC (2016). *Exporting for Growth: The SME Perspective*. London.
<https://www.business.hsbc.uk/-/media/library/business-uk/pdfs/hsbc-exporting-for-growth-the-sme-perspective.pdf?la=en-GB>.
- Idris and Saridakis, 2018. B. Idris, G. Saridakis. Local formal interpersonal networks and SMEs internationalisation: Empirical evidence from the UK. *International Business Review*, 27 (3) (2018), pp. 610-624.
- Jacobides et al., 2018. M.G. Jacobides, C. Cennamo, A. Gawer. Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39 (8) (2018), pp. 2255-2276.
- Jean et al., 2020. R.J. Jean, K. Daekwan, E. Cavusgil. Antecedents and outcomes of digital platform risk for international new ventures' internationalization. *Journal of World Business*, 55 (1) (2020), Article 101021.
- Jean and Kim, 2020. R.J. Jean, D. Kim. Internet and SMEs' internationalization: The role of platform and website. *Journal of International Management*, 26 (1) (2020), Article 100690.

- Jiang et al., 2016. G. Jiang, M. Kotabe, R.D. Hamilton III, S.W. Smith. Early internationalization and the role of immigration in new venture survival. *International Business Review*, 25 (6) (2016), pp. 1285-1296.
- Johns, 2006. G. Johns. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31 (2) (2006), pp. 386-408.
- Johns, 2018. G. Johns. Advances in the treatment of context in organizational research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5 (1) (2018), pp. 21-46.
- Jones et al., 2011. M.V. Jones, N. Coviello, Y.K. Tang. International entrepreneurship research (1989–2009): A domain ontology and thematic analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26 (6) (2011), pp. 632-659.
- Jones, 1999. M.V. Jones. The internationalization of small high-technology firms. *Journal of International Marketing*, 7 (4) (1999), pp. 15-41.
- Jones and Casulli, 2014. M.V. Jones, L. Casulli. International entrepreneurship: Exploring the logic and utility of individual experience through comparative reasoning approaches. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 38 (1) (2014), pp. 45-69.
- Jonsson and Lindbergh, 2010. S. Jonsson, J. Lindbergh. The impact of institutional impediments and information and knowledge exchange on SMEs' investments in international business relationships. *International Business Review*, 19 (6) (2010), pp. 548-561.
- Kahiya and Dean, 2016. E.T. Kahiya, D.L. Dean. Export stages and export barriers: Revisiting traditional export development. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 58 (1) (2016), pp. 75-89.
- Kalantaridis and Vassilev, 2011. C. Kalantaridis, I. Vassilev. Firm size and the nature of international relationships: The case of globally integrated small firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49 (4) (2011), pp. 639-658.
- Keupp et al., 2012. M.M. Keupp, M. Palmié, O. Gassmann. The strategic management of innovation: A systematic review and paths for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14 (4) (2012), pp. 367-390.
- Knight, 2001. G.A. Knight. Entrepreneurship and strategy in the international SME. *Journal of International Management*, 7 (3) (2001), pp. 155-171.
- Knight and Cavusgil, 1996. G.A. Knight, S.T. Cavusgil. The born global firm: A challenge to traditional internationalization theory. *Advances of International Marketing*, 8 (1996), pp. 11-26.
- Koch et al., 2016. P. Koch, B. Koch, T. Menon, O. Shenkar. Cultural friction in leadership beliefs and foreign invested enterprise survival. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47 (4) (2016), pp. 453-470.
- Kontinen and Ojala, 2010. T. Kontinen, A. Ojala. The internationalization of family businesses: A review of extant research. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1 (2) (2010), pp. 97-107.
- Kurt et al., 2020. Y. Kurt, N. Sinkovics, R.R. Sinkovics, M. Yamin. The role of spirituality in Islamic business networks: The case of internationalizing Turkish SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 55 (1) (2020), Article 101034.

- Laufs and Schwens, 2014. K. Laufs, C. Schwens. Foreign market entry mode choice of small and medium-sized enterprises: A systematic review and future research agenda. *International Business Review*, 23 (6) (2014), pp. 1109-1126.
- Lee et al., 2020. J.Y. Lee, A. Jiménez, T.M. Devinney. Learning in SME internationalization: A new perspective on learning from success versus failure. *Management International Review*, 60 (4) (2020), pp. 485-513.
- Li et al., 2019. J. Li, B. Liu, G. Qian. The belt and road initiative, cultural friction and ethnicity: Their effects on the export performance of SMEs in China. *Journal of World Business*, 54 (4) (2019), pp. 350-359.
- Liang et al., 2014. X. Liang, L. Wang, Z. Cui. Chinese private firms and internationalization: Effects of family involvement in management and family ownership. *Family Business Review*, 27 (2) (2014), pp. 126-141.
- Lindstrand et al., 2011. A. Lindstrand, S. Melén, E.R. Nordman. Turning social capital into business: A study of the internationalization of biotech SMEs. *International Business Review*, 20 (2) (2011), pp. 194-212.
- LiPuma et al., 2013. J.A. LiPuma, S.L. Newbert, J.P. Doh. The effect of institutional quality on firm export performance in emerging economies: A contingency model of firm age and size. *Small Business Economics*, 40 (2013), pp. 817-841.
- Lo et al., 2016. F.Y. Lo, Y.C. Chiao, C.M.J. Yu. Network and institutional effects on SMEs' entry strategies. *Management International Review*, 56 (4) (2016), pp. 531-563.
- Lu and Beamish, 2001. J.W. Lu, P.W. Beamish. The internationalization and performance of SMEs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22 (6-7) (2001), pp. 565-586.
- Luo and Child, 2015. Y. Luo, J. Child. A composition-based view of firm growth. *Management and Organization Review*, 11 (3) (2015), pp. 379-411.
- Mainela et al., 2018. T. Mainela, V. Puhakka, S. Sipola. International entrepreneurship beyond individuals and firms: On the systemic nature of international opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33 (4) (2018), pp. 534-550.
- Manolopoulos et al., 2018. D. Manolopoulos, E. Chatzopoulou, C. Kottaridi. Resources, home institutional context and SMEs' exporting: Direct relationships and contingency effects. *International Business Review*, 27 (5) (2018), pp. 993-1006.
- Masango and Marinova, 2014. S. Masango, S. Marinova. Knowledge-based network ties in early rapidly internationalising small firms: A missing link? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 10 (2014), pp. 471-486.
- McGaughey et al., 2016. S.L. McGaughey, A. Kumaraswamy, P.W. Liesch. Institutions, entrepreneurship and co-evolution in international business. *Journal of World Business*, 51 (6) (2016), pp. 871-881.
- Mellahi et al., 2016. K. Mellahi, J.G. Frynas, P. Sun, D. Siegel. A review of the nonmarket strategy literature: Toward a multi-theoretical integration. *Journal of Management*, 42 (1) (2016), pp. 143-173.

- Mesquita and Lazzarini, 2008. F. Mesquita, S.G. Lazzarini. Horizontal and vertical relationships in developing economies: Implications for SMEs' access to global markets. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51 (2) (2008), pp. 359-380.
- Meyer, 2014. K.E. Meyer. What the fox says, how the fox works: Deep contextualization as a source of new research agendas and theoretical insights. *Management and Organization Review*, 10 (3) (2014), pp. 373-380.
- Meyer and Peng, 2005. K.E. Meyer, M.W. Peng. Probing theoretically into Central and Eastern Europe: Transactions, resources, and institutions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36 (6) (2005), pp. 600-621.
- Michailova, 2011. S. Michailova. Contextualizing in international business research: Why do we need more of it and how can we be better at it? *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27 (1) (2011), pp. 129-139.
- Moore, 1993. J.F. Moore. Predators and prey: A new ecology of competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 71 (3) (1993), pp. 75-83.
- Musteen et al., 2014. M. Musteen, D.K. Datta, M.M. Butts. Do international networks and foreign market knowledge facilitate SME internationalization? Evidence from the Czech Republic. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38 (4) (2014), pp. 749-774.
- Musteen et al., 2010. M. Musteen, J. Francis, D.K. Datta. The influence of international networks on internationalization speed and performance: A study of Czech SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 45 (3) (2010), pp. 197-205.
- Nakos et al., 2014. G. Nakos, K.D. Brouthers, P. Dimitratos. International alliances with competitors and non-competitors: The disparate impact on SME international performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 8 (2) (2014), pp. 167-182.
- Narooz and Child, 2017. R. Narooz, J. Child. Networking responses to different levels of institutional void: A comparison of internationalizing SMEs in Egypt and the UK. *International Business Review*, 26 (4) (2017), pp. 683-696.
- Nasra and Dacin, 2010. R. Nasra, M.T. Dacin. Institutional arrangements and international entrepreneurship: The state as institutional entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34 (3) (2010), pp. 583-609.
- Nielsen and Raswant, 2018. B.B. Nielsen, A. Raswant. The selection, use, and reporting of control variables in international business research: A review and recommendations. *Journal of World Business*, 53 (6) (2018), pp. 958-968.
- North, 1989. D. North. Institutions and economic growth: An historical introduction. *World Development*, 17 (9) (1989), pp. 1319-1332.
- Obadia et al., 2017. C. Obadia, I. Vida, J. Pla-Barber. Differential effects of bilateral norms on SMEs' export relationships: A dynamic perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 25 (3) (2017), pp. 21-41.
- Odlin, 2019. D. Odlin. Domestic competitor influence on internationalizing SMEs as an industry evolves. *Journal of World Business*, 54 (2) (2019), pp. 119-136.

OECD 2018. OECD. Fostering greater SME participation in a globally integrated economy. Discussion Paper. Proceedings of the SME ministerial conference, OECD, Paris (2018).
<https://www.oecd.org/cfe/smes/ministerial/documents/2018-SME-Ministerial-Conference-Plenary-Session-3.pdf>

Onuklu et al., 2021. A. Onuklu, T.L. Hilla, I.S. Darendelib, O.F. Genc. Poison or antidote: How subnational informal institutions exacerbate and ameliorate institutional voids. *Journal of International Management*, 27 (1) (2021), Article 100806.

Oparaocha, 2015. G.O. Oparaocha. SMEs and international entrepreneurship: An institutional network perspective. *International Business Review*, 24 (5) (2015), pp. 861-873.

Ottaviano and Martincus, 2011. G. Ottaviano, C.V. Martincus. SMEs in Argentina: Who are the exporters? *Small Business Economics*, 37 (3) (2011), pp. 341-361.

Oviatt and McDougall, 1994. B.M. Oviatt, P.P. McDougall. Toward a theory of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25 (1) (1994), pp. 45-64.

Paul et al., 2017. J. Paul, S. Parthasarathy, P. Gupta. Exporting challenges of SMEs: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of World Business*, 52 (3) (2017), pp. 327-342.

Pergelova et al., 2019. A. Pergelova, T. Manolova, R. Simeonova-Ganeva, D. Yordanova. Democratizing entrepreneurship? Digital technologies and the internationalization of female-led SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57 (1) (2019), pp. 14-39.

Pfeffer, 1987. J. Pfeffer. Bringing the environment back in: The social context of business strategy. D.J. Teece (Ed.), *The competitive challenge. Strategies for industrial innovation and renewal*, Ballinger, Cambridge, MA (1987), pp. 119-136.

Pisani et al., 2017. N. Pisani, A. Kourula, A. Kolk, R. Meijer. How global is international CSR research? Insights and recommendations from a systematic review. *Journal of World Business*, 52 (5) (2017), pp. 591-614.

Podsakoff et al., 2005. P. Podsakoff, S. MacKenzie, D. Bachrach, N. Podsakoff. The influence of management journals in the 1980s and 1990s. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26 (5) (2005), pp. 473-488.

Pongelli et al., 2016. C. Pongelli, M.G. Caroli, M. Cucculelli. Family business going abroad: The effect of family ownership on foreign market entry mode decisions. *Small Business Economics*, 47 (3) (2016), pp. 787-801.

Post et al., 2020. C. Post, R. Sarala, C. Gatrell, J.E. Prescott. Advancing theory with review articles. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57 (2) (2020), pp. 351-376.

Poulis et al., 2013. K. Poulis, E. Poulis, E. Plakoyiannaki. The role of context in case study selection: An international business perspective. *International Business Review*, 22 (1) (2013), pp. 304-314.

Powell et al., 2005. W.W. Powell, D.R. White, K.W. Koput, J. Owen-Smith. Network dynamics and field evolution: The growth of interorganizational collaboration in the life sciences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110 (4) (2005), pp. 1132-1205.

Prashantham and Dhanaraj, 2015. S. Prashantham, C. Dhanaraj. MNE ties and new venture internationalization: Exploratory insights from India. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 32 (4) (2015), pp. 901-924.

- Prashantham et al., 2019. S. Prashantham, K. Kumar, S. Bhattacharyya. International new ventures from emerging economies: Network connectivity and legitimacy building. *Management and Organization Review*, 15 (3) (2019), pp. 615-641.
- Przeworski and Teune, 1970. A. Przeworski, H. Teune. *The logic of comparative social inquiry*. Wiley, New York (1970).
- Pugh et al., 1969. D.S. Pugh, D.J. Hickson, C.R. Hinings. An empirical taxonomy of structures of work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14 (1) (1969), pp. 115-126.
- Puig et al., 2018. F. Puig, M. Gonzalez-Loureiro, P.N. Ghauri. Running faster and jumping higher? Survival and growth in international manufacturing new ventures. *International Small Business Journal*, 36 (7) (2018), pp. 829-850.
- Puthusserry et al., 2014. P.N. Puthusserry, J. Child, S.B. Rodrigues. Psychic distance, its business impact and modes of coping: A study of British and Indian partner SMEs. *Management International Review*, 54 (1) (2014), pp. 1-29.
- Puthusserry et al., 2020. P. Puthusserry, J. Child, Z. Khan. Social capital development through the stages of internationalization: Relations between British and Indian SMEs. *Global Strategy Journal*, 10 (2) (2020), pp. 282-308.
- Qian et al., 2018. G. Qian, L. Li, Z. Qian. Interactions among factors driving and inhibiting the early internationalization of small, young technology enterprises. *Management International Review*, 58 (2) (2018), pp. 251-280.
- Rashid and Waqar, 2017. A. Rashid, S.M. Waqar. Exchange rate fluctuations, firm size, and export behavior: An empirical investigation. *Small Business Economics*, 49 (3) (2017), pp. 609-625.
- Reuber et al., 2017. A.R. Reuber, P. Dimitratos, O. Kuivalainen. Beyond categorization: New directions for theory development about entrepreneurial internationalization. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48 (4) (2017), pp. 411-422.
- Reuber et al., 2018. A.R. Reuber, G.A. Knight, P.W. Liesch, L. Zhou. International entrepreneurship: The pursuit of entrepreneurial opportunities across national borders. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49 (4) (2018), pp. 395-406.
- Rialp et al., 2005. A. Rialp, J. Rialp, G.A. Knight. The phenomenon of early internationalizing firms: What do we know after a decade (1993–2003) of scientific inquiry? *International Business Review*, 14 (2) (2005), pp. 147-166.
- Ribau et al., 2018. C.P. Ribau, A.C. Moreira, M. Raposo. SME internationalization research: Mapping the state of the art. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 35 (2) (2018), pp. 280-303.
- Richardson, 2014. C. Richardson. Firm internationalisation within the Muslim world. *Journal of World Business*, 49 (3) (2014), pp. 386-395.
- Roffia et al., 2021. P. Roffia, S. Moracchiato, E. Liguori, S. Kraus. Operationally defining family SMEs: A critical review. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*. (2021), 10.1108/JSBED-11-2020-0399.
- Ronen and Shenkar, 2017. S. Ronen, O. Shenkar. *Navigating global business: A cultural compass*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2017).

- Safari and Chetty, 2019. A. Safari, S. Chetty. Multilevel psychic distance and its impact on SME internationalization. *International Business Review*, 28 (4) (2019), pp. 754-765.
- Schiffer and Weder, 2001a. M. Schiffer, B. Weder. Firm size and the business environment: Worldwide survey results. World Bank, Washington, DC (2001).
- Schiffer and Weder, 2001b. M. Schiffer, B. Weder. Firm size and the business environment: Worldwide service results. The World Bank, Washington DC: (2001) International Finance Corporation, Discussion Paper IFD43.
- Sciascia et al., 2012. S. Sciascia, P. Mazzola, J.H. Astrachan, T.M. Pieper. The role of family ownership in international entrepreneurship: Exploring nonlinear effects. *Small Business Economics*, 38 (1) (2012), pp. 15-31.
- Scott and Meyer, 1983. W.R. Scott, J. Meyer. The organization of societal sectors. Scott, W.R. and Meyer, J. (Eds). *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality*, Sage, Beverley Hills, CA (1983), pp. 129-153.
- Seifert et al., 2012. R.E. Seifert, J. Child, S.B. Rodrigues. The role of interpretation in the internationalization of smaller Brazilian firms. *Brazilian Administrative Review*, 9 (4) (2012), pp. 475-497.
- Shapiro et al., 2007. D.L. Shapiro, M.A. Von Glinow, Z. Xiao. Toward polycontextual sensitive research methods. *Management and Organization Review*, 3 (1) (2007), pp. 129-152.
- Sharma and Chua, 2013. P. Sharma, J.H. Chua. Asian family enterprises and family business research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 30 (3) (2013), pp. 641-656.
- Shenkar, 2001. O. Shenkar. Cultural distance revisited: Towards a more rigorous conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32 (3) (2001), pp. 519-535.
- Shenkar et al., 2008. O. Shenkar, Y. Luo, O. Yeheskel. From 'distance' to 'friction': Substituting metaphors and redirecting intercultural research. *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (4) (2008), pp. 905-923.
- Shepherd and Rudd, 2014. N.G. Shepherd, J.M. Rudd. The influence of context on the strategic decision-making process: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16 (3) (2014), pp. 340-364.
- Snyder, 2019. H. Snyder. Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104 (2019), pp. 333-339.
- Sorenson and Stewart, 2008. O. Sorenson, T.E. Stewart. Bringing the context back in: Settings and the search for syndicate partners in venture capital investment networks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53 (2008), pp. 266-294.
- Spender, 1989. J.C. Spender. *Industry recipes*. Blackwell, Oxford (1989).
- Stoian et al., 2017. M.C. Stoian, J. Rialp, P. Dimitratos. SME networks and international performance: Unveiling the significance of foreign market entry mode. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55 (1) (2017), pp. 128-148.

- Stoian et al., 2018. M.C. Stoian, P. Dimitratos, E. Plakoyiannaki. SME internationalization beyond exporting: A knowledge-based perspective across managers and advisers. *Journal of World Business*, 53 (5) (2018), pp. 768-779.
- St-Pierre et al., 2018. J. St-Pierre, O. Sakka, M. Bahri. External financing, export intensity and inter-organizational collaborations: Evidence from Canadian SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 56 (1) (2018), pp. 68-87.
- Szyliowicz and Galvin, 2010. D. Szyliowicz, T. Galvin. Applying broader strokes: Extending institutional perspectives and agendas for international entrepreneurship research. *International Business Review*, 19 (4) (2010), pp. 317-332.
- Tajeddin and Carney, 2019. M. Tajeddin, M. Carney. African business groups: How does group affiliation improve SMEs' export intensity? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 43 (6) (2019), pp. 1194-1222.
- Tan et al., 2018. A. Tan, P. Brewer, P. Liesch. Rigidity in SME export commencement decisions. *International Business Review*, 27 (1) (2018), pp. 46-55.
- Tasavori et al., 2018. M. Tasavori, R. Zaefarian, T.Y. Eng. Internal social capital and international firm performance in emerging market family firms: The mediating role of participative governance. *International Small Business Journal*, 36 (8) (2018), pp. 887-910.
- Teagarden et al., 2018. M.B. Teagarden, M.A. Von Glinow, K. Mellahi. Contextualizing international business research: Enhancing rigor and relevance. *Journal of World Business*, 53 (3) (2018), pp. 303-306.
- Terjesen et al., 2016. S. Terjesen, J. Hessels, D. Li. Comparative international entrepreneurship: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 42 (1) (2016), pp. 299-344.
- Thanos et al., 2017. I.C. Thanos, P. Dimitratos, P. Sapouna. The implications of international entrepreneurial orientation, politicization, and hostility upon SME international performance. *International Small Business Journal*, 35 (4) (2017), pp. 495-514.
- Tolstoy, 2010. D. Tolstoy. Network development and knowledge creation within the foreign market: A study of international entrepreneurial firms. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22 (5) (2010), pp. 379-402.
- Torkkeli et al., 2019. L. Torkkeli, O. Kuivalainen, S. Saarenketo, K. Puumalainen. Institutional environment and network competence in successful SME internationalisation. *International Marketing Review*, 36 (1) (2019), pp. 31-55.
- Tranfield et al., 2003. D. Tranfield, D. Denyer, P. Smart. Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14 (3) (2003), pp. 207-222.
- Tsui, 2004. A. Tsui. Contributing to global management knowledge: A case for high quality indigenous research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21 (4) (2004), pp. 491-513.
- Uner et al., 2013. M.M. Uner, A. Kocak, E. Cavusgil, S.T. Cavusgil. Do barriers to export vary for born globals and across stages of internationalization? An empirical inquiry in the emerging market of Turkey. *International Business Review*, 22 (5) (2013), pp. 800-813.

Urbano et al., 2011. D. Urbano, N. Toledano, D. Ribeiro-Soriano. Socio-cultural factors and transnational entrepreneurship: A multiple case study in Spain. *International Small Business Journal*, 29 (2) (2011), pp. 119-134.

Vahlne and Johanson, 2013. J.E. Vahlne, J. Johanson. The Uppsala model on evolution of the multinational business enterprise – From internalization to coordination of networks. *International Marketing Review*, 30 (3) (2013), pp. 189-210.

Vendrell-Herrero et al., 2017. F. Vendrell-Herrero, E. Gomes, K. Mellahi, J. Child. Building international business bridges in geographically isolated areas: The role of foreign market focus and outward looking competences in Latin American SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 52 (4) (2017), pp. 489-502.

Verbeke and Ciravegna, 2018. A. Verbeke, L. Ciravegna. International entrepreneurship research versus international business research: A false dichotomy? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49 (4) (2018), pp. 387-394.

Weber et al., 1996. Y. Weber, O. Shenkar, Raveh. A National versus corporate cultural fit in mergers and acquisitions: An exploratory study. *Management Science*, 42 (8) (1996), pp. 1215-1227.

Weick, 2003. K.E. Weick. *Enacting an environment: The infrastructure of organizing*. Westwood R., Clegg S. (Eds.), *Debating organization: Point-counterpoint in organization studies*, Blackwell, Oxford (2003), pp. 184-194.

Welch and Luostarinen, 1988. L. Welch, R. Luostarinen. Internationalization: Evolution of a concept. *Journal of General Management*, 14 (2) (1988), pp. 34-55.

Welter et al., 2019. F. Welter, T. Baker, K. Wirsching. Three waves and counting: The rising tide of contextualization in entrepreneurship research. *Small Business Economics*, 52 (2) (2019), pp. 319-330.

Williams and Spielmann, 2019. C. Williams, N. Spielmann. Institutional pressures and international market orientation in SMEs: Insights from the French wine industry. *International Business Review*, 28 (5) (2019), Article 101582.

World Bank 2020. World Bank. (2020). *Doing Business 2020. Comparing Business Regulation in 190 Economies*.
<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/32436/9781464814402.pdf>.

Xu and Hitt, 2020. K. Xu, M.A. Hitt. The international expansion of family firms: The moderating role of internal financial slack and external capital availability. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 37 (1) (2020), pp. 127-153.

Yan et al., 2020. H. Yan, X. Hu, Y. Liu. The international market selection of Chinese SMEs: How institutional influence overrides psychic distance. *International Business Review* (2020), Article 101703.

Younis and Karmowska, 2018. Younis, H., & Karmowska, J. (2018). Environmental munificence in the context of SME internationalization decision: Institutional and social capital perspective. Paper presented to the AIB UK&I Conference Birmingham University, April.

Zaefarian et al., 2016. R. Zaefarian, T.Y. Eng, M. Tasavori. An exploratory study of international opportunity identification among family firms. *International Business Review*, 25 (1) (2016), pp. 333-345.

Zahoor et al., 2020. N. Zahoor, O. Al-Tabbaa, Z. Khan, G. Wood. Collaboration and internationalization of SMEs: Insights and recommendations from a systematic review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22 (4) (2020), pp. 427-456.

Zahra et al., 2014. S.A. Zahra, M. Wright, S.G. Abdelgawad. Contextualization and the advancement of entrepreneurship research. *International Small Business Journal*, 32 (5) (2014), pp. 479-500.

¹ Illustrative sources are cited in Table 5, full details of which can be found in the list of references at the end of this article.

² These two sources reported studies of family firms in the US and China, respectively; most were SMEs.

Online Appendix 1. Reviews and meta-analysis articles on topics relevant to context in SME internationalization, published in the sampled journals.

Article	Relevance to the role of context in SME internationalization
Alon, I., Anderson, J., Munim, Z. H., & Ho, A. (2018). A review of the internationalization of Chinese enterprises. <i>Asia Pacific Journal of Management</i> , 35(3), 573-605.	A review paper on the internationalization of Chinese enterprises (ICE)
Arregle, J. L., Duran, P., Hitt, M. A., & Van Essen, M. (2017). Why is family firms' internationalization unique? A meta-analysis. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 41(5), 801-831.	Cross-country differences in the relationship between family firm and internationalization are explained by the roles of family control, internationalization types, and home countries' institutional contexts.
Caprar, D.V., Devinney, T.M., & Caligiuri, P. (2015). <u>Conceptualizing and measuring culture in international business and management: From challenges to potential solutions</u> , <i>Journal of International Business</i> , 46(9), 1011-1027.	Critiques "one-size-fits-all" approach to measuring culture; introduces new measurement approaches.
Chabowski, B., Kekec, P., Morgan, N. A., Hult, G. T. M., Walkowiak, T., & Runnalls, B. (2018). An assessment of the exporting literature: Using theory and data to identify future research directions. <i>Journal of International Marketing</i> , 26(1), 118-143.	The article provides a qualitative review of the core theoretical exporting areas and evaluates the exporting domain quantitatively over six decades (1958–2016).
Cuervo-Cazurra, A., Mudambi, R., & Pedersen, T. (2019). Clarifying the relationships between institutions and global strategy. <i>Global Strategy Journal</i> , 9(2), 151-175.	A review of the relationship between institutions and global strategy.

Denk, N., Kaufmann, L., & Roesch, J-F. (2012). Liabilities of Foreignness Revisited: A Review of Contemporary Studies and Recommendations for Future Research, <i>Journal of International Management</i> ,18 (4): 322-334.	Analysis of drivers and outcomes of liabilities of foreignness. The paper also examines how theoretical streams have been applied to the concept, including theories of international expansion, social network theory, institutional theory, and the resource-based view.
De Villa, M. A., Rajwani, T., & Lawton, T. (2015). Market entry modes in a multipolar world: Untangling the moderating effect of the political environment. <i>International Business Review</i> , 24(3), 419-429.	A review of the extant literature on market entry modes to explain the multi-levels of the political environment.
Eduardsen, J., & Marinova, S. (2020). Internationalisation and risk: Literature review, integrative framework and research agenda. <i>International Business Review</i> , 101688.	A review paper on internationalisation and risk.
Eisend, M., Evanschitzky, H., & Calantone, R. J. (2016). The relative advantage of marketing over technological capabilities in influencing new product performance: the moderating role of country institutions. <i>Journal of International Marketing</i> , 24(1), 41-56.	The study shows that the relative advantage of marketing over technological capabilities for new product performance depends on the institutional context in a country.
Gomes, E., Barnes, B. R., & Mahmood, T. (2016). A 22-year review of strategic alliance research in the leading management journals. <i>International Business Review</i> , 25(1), 15-27.	This study contributes to the strategic alliance literature by providing a comprehensive review of over 800 articles that have appeared in 22 leading management journals over a 22 year period.
Jiang, G., Kotabe, M., Zhang, F., Hao, A. W., Paul, J., & Wang, C. L. (2020). The determinants and performance of early internationalizing firms: A literature review and research agenda. <i>International Business Review</i> , 101662.	A review on the determinants and performance of early internationalizing firms.
Karami, M., Wooliscroft, B., & McNeill, L. (2019). Effectuation and internationalisation: a review and agenda for future research. <i>Small Business Economics</i> , 1-35.	The study systematically reviews the SME internationalisation literature to clarify the ways effectuation theory supports international entrepreneurship (IE) scholarship.
Kirca, A. H., Roth, K., Hult, G. T. M., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2012). The role of context in the multinationality-performance relationship: A meta-analytic review. <i>Global Strategy Journal</i> , 2(2), 108-121.	A systematic investigation of the moderating effects of firm-, industry-, and country-level factors on the multinationality-performance relationship.

<p>Kotler, P., Manrai, L. A., Lascu, D. N., & Manrai, A. K. (2019). Influence of country and company characteristics on international business decisions: A review, conceptual model, and propositions. <i>International Business Review</i>, 28(3), 482-498.</p>	<p>This research advances a conceptual model of country and company characteristics influencing key international business decisions</p>
<p>Kurt, Y., & Kurt, M. (2020). Social network analysis in international business research: An assessment of the current state of play and future research directions. <i>International Business Review</i>, 29(2), 101633.</p>	<p>The study contributes to IB research by incorporating social network analysis (SNA) as an innovative and promising research tool.</p>
<p>Liesh, P. Welch, L.S., & Buckley, P.J. (2011). Risk and uncertainty in internationalisation and international entrepreneurship studies. <i>Management International Review</i>, 51(6): 851-873.</p>	<p>The article reviews how risk and uncertainty in the international expansion of the firm are treated in the internationalisation and international entrepreneurship literatures.</p>
<p>Metsola, J., Leppäaho, T., Paavilainen-Mäntymäki, E., & Plakoyiannaki, E. (2020). Process in family business internationalisation: The state of the art and ways forward. <i>International Business Review</i>, 29(2), 101665.</p>	<p>A review of a process in family business internationalisation.</p>
<p>Nielsen, B.B., & Raswant, A. (2018). The selection, use, and reporting of control variables in international business research: A review and recommendations, <i>Journal of World Business</i>, 53 (6), 958-968.</p>	<p>The study explores the selection, use, and reporting of control variables in studies published in the leading international business (IB) research journals.</p>
<p>Pukall, T. J., & Calabro, A. (2014). The internationalization of family firms: A critical review and integrative model. <i>Family Business Review</i>, 27(2), 103-125.</p>	<p>The paper offers an integrative theoretical model integrating the concept of socioemotional wealth with the revised Uppsala model. The framework resulting from the analysis helps understand behaviors of internationalizing family firms by focusing on when and how they internationalize, especially related to risk attitudes, the role of knowledge and networks.</p>
<p>Rialp, A., Merigó, J. M., Cancino, C. A., & Urbano, D. (2019). Twenty-five years (1992–2016) of the International Business Review: A bibliometric overview. <i>International Business Review</i>, 28(6), 101587.</p>	<p>A bibliometric overview of the leading trends regarding IBR publications and citations since its creation in 1992 until 2016.</p>
<p>Srivastava, S., Singh, S., & Dhir, S. (2020). Culture and International business research: A</p>	<p>The study explores the role of culture and international business in internationalization outcomes through a systematic review and</p>

review and research agenda. <i>International Business Review</i> , 101709.	analysis of articles published between 2009 and 2019.
Stahl, G. K., & Tung, R.L., (2015). Towards a more balanced treatment of culture in international business studies: The need for positive cross-cultural scholarship , <i>Journal of International Business Studies</i> , 46 (4), 391-414.	The work offers an 'integrative framework' for understanding positive as well as negative effects of cultural differences.
Tung, R.L. & Stahl, G.K., (2018). The tortuous evolution of the role of culture in IB research: What we know, what we don't know, and where we are headed , <i>Journal of International Business Studies</i> , 49 (9), 1167-1189.	A review of the literature on culture in IB.
Tuomisalo, T., & Leppäaho, T. (2019). Learning in international new ventures: A systematic review. <i>International Business Review</i> , 28(3), 463-481.	The paper reports the findings of a systematic review on learning among International New Ventures (INVs).

Online Appendix 2. Reviewed articles.

Acedo, F. J., & Galán, J. L. (2011). Export stimuli revisited: The influence of the characteristics of managerial decision makers on international behaviour. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(6), 648-670.

Acs, Z. J., & Terjesen, S. (2013). Born local: toward a theory of new venture's choice of internationalization. *Small Business Economics*, 41(3), 521-535.

Adomako, S., Amankwah-Amoah, J., Dankwah, G.O., Danso, A., & Donbesuur, F. (2019). Institutional voids, international learning effort and internationalization of emerging market new ventures. *Journal of International Management*, 25 (4), 100666.

Adomako, S., Frimpong, K., Danso, A., Amankwah-Amoah, J., Uddin, M., & Kesse, K. (2020). Home country institutional impediments and international expansion of developing country SMEs. *International Business Review*, 29(5), 101716.

Ahi, A., Baronchelli, G., Kuivalainen, O., & Piantoni, M. (2017). International market entry: how do small and medium-sized enterprises make decisions?. *Journal of International Marketing*, 25(1), 1-21.

Alayo, M., Maseda, A., Iturralde, T., & Arzubiaga, U. (2019). Internationalization and entrepreneurial orientation of family SMEs: The influence of the family character. *International Business Review*, 28(1), 48-59.

Albarran, P., Carrasco, R., & Holl, A. (2013). Domestic transport infrastructure and firms' export market participation. *Small Business Economics*, 40(4), 879-898.

Amoako, I. O., & Lyon, F. (2014). 'We don't deal with courts': Cooperation and alternative institutions shaping exporting relationships of small and medium-sized enterprises in Ghana. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(2), 117-139.

- Andersson, S., Evers, N. & Griot, C. (2013). Local and international networks in small firm internationalization: Cases from the Rhône-Alpes medical technology regional cluster. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(9-10), 867-888.
- Añón Higón, D., & Driffield, N. (2011). Exporting and innovation performance: Analysis of the annual Small Business Survey in the UK. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(1), 4-24.
- Assadinia, S., Kadile, V., Gölgeci, I., & Boso, N. (2019). The effects of learning orientation and marketing programme planning on export performance: Paradoxical moderating role of psychic distance. *International Small Business Journal*, 37(5), 423-449.
- Autio, E. (2017). Strategic entrepreneurial internationalization: A normative framework. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 11(3), 211-227.
- Autio, E., George, G., & Alexy, O. (2011). International entrepreneurship and capability development—qualitative evidence and future research directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 11-37.
- Bai, W., Johanson, M., & Martín Martín, O. (2019). Dual business relationships, opportunity knowledge, and new product development: A study on returnee young ventures. *Journal of International Marketing*, 27(3), 26-42.
- Bai, W., Johanson, M., & Martín, O. M. (2017). Knowledge and internationalization of returnee entrepreneurial firms. *International Business Review*, 26(4), 652-665.
- Baronchelli, G., Bettinelli, C., Del Bosco, B., & Loane, S. (2016). The impact of family involvement on the investments of Italian small-medium enterprises in psychically distant countries. *International Business Review*, 25(4), 960-970.
- Baum, M., Schwens, C., & Kabst, R. (2013). International as opposed to domestic new venturing: The moderating role of perceived barriers to internationalization. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(5), 536-562.
- Baum, M., Schwens, Ch., & Kabst, R. (2011). A typology of international new ventures: Empirical evidence from high-technology industries. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(3), 305-330.
- Bauweraerts, J., Sciascia, S., Naldi, L., & Mazzola, P. (2019). Family CEO and board service: Turning the tide for export scope in family SMEs. *International Business Review*, 28(5), 101583.
- Beleska-Spasova, E., & Glaister, K. W. (2010). Geographic orientation and performance. *Management International Review*, 50(5), 533-557.
- Belhoste, N., Bocquet, R., Favre-Bonté, V., & Bally, F. (2019). How do SMEs use support services during their internationalisation process: A comparative study of French traditional SMEs and INVs in Asia. *International Small Business Journal*, 37(8), 804-830.
- Benito-Osorio, D., Colino, A., Guerras-Martín, L. Á., & Zúñiga-Vicente, J. Á. (2016). The international diversification-performance link in Spain: Does firm size really matter? *International Business Review*, 25(2), 548-558.
- Berger, R., Herstein, R., Silbiger, A., & Barnes, B. R. (2017). Developing international business relationships in a Russian context. *Management International Review*, 57(3), 441-471.

- Berrill, J., O'Hagan-Luff, M., & van Stel, A. (2020). The moderating role of education in the relationship between FDI and entrepreneurial activity. *Small Business Economics*, 54(4), 1041-1059.
- Bertoni, F., Colombo, M. G., & Quas, A. (2015). The patterns of venture capital investment in Europe. *Small Business Economics*, 45(3), 543-560.
- Blackburne, G. D., & Buckley, P. J. (2019). The international business incubator as a foreign market entry mode. *Long Range Planning*, 52(1), 32-50.
- Boehe, D. (2013). Collaborate at home to win abroad: How does access to local network resources influence export behavior? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(2), 167-182.
- Bolzani, D., & Der Foo, M. (2018). The 'why' of international entrepreneurship: uncovering entrepreneurs' personal values. *Small Business Economics*, 51(3), 639-666.
- Booltink, L. W., & Saka-Helmhout, A. (2018). The effects of R&D intensity and internationalization on the performance of non-high-tech SMEs. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(1), 81-103.
- Boso, N., Cadogan, J. W., & Story, V. M. (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation and market orientation as drivers of product innovation success: A study of exporters from a developing economy. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(1), 57-81.
- Braunerhjelm, P., & Halldin, T. (2019). Born globals—presence, performance and prospects. *International Business Review*, 28(1), 60-73.
- Brouthers, K. D., Nakos, G., & Dimitratos, P. (2015). SME entrepreneurial orientation, international performance, and the moderating role of strategic alliances. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(5), 1161-1187.
- Bruneel, J., Clarysse, B., & Autio, E. (2018). The role of prior domestic experience and prior shared experience in young firm internationalization. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(3), 265-284.
- Bruneel, J., Yli-Renko, H., & Clarysse, B. (2010). Learning from experience and learning from others: how congenital and interorganizational learning substitute for experiential learning in young firm internationalization. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 4(2), 164-182.
- Brzozowski, J., Cucculelli, M., & Surdej, A. (2014). Transnational ties and performance of immigrant entrepreneurs: the role of home-country conditions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26(7-8), 546-573.
- Buccieri, D., Javalgi, R. G., & Cavusgil, E. (2020). International new venture performance: Role of international entrepreneurial culture, ambidextrous innovation, and dynamic marketing capabilities. *International Business Review*, 29(2), 101639.
- Bunz, T., Casulli, L., Jones, M. V., & Bausch, A. (2017). The dynamics of experiential learning: Microprocesses and adaptation in a professional service INV. *International Business Review*, 26(2), 225-238.
- Camisón, C., & Villar-López, A. (2010). Effect of SMEs' international experience on foreign intensity and economic performance: The mediating role of internationally exploitable assets and competitive strategy. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 48(2), 116-151.

- Cardoza, G., & Fornes, G. (2011). The internationalisation of SMEs from China: The case of Ningxia Hui autonomous region. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28(4), 737-759.
- Casillas, J. C., Barbero, J. L., & Sapienza, H. J. (2015). Knowledge acquisition, learning, and the initial pace of internationalization. *International Business Review*, 24(1), 102-114.
- Catanzaro, A., Messeghem, K., & Sammut, S. (2019). Effectiveness of export support programs: Impact on the relational capital and international performance of early internationalizing small businesses. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(sup2), 436-461.
- Cerrato, D., & Fernhaber, S. A. (2018). Depth versus breadth: Exploring variation and performance differences among internationalising new ventures. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(7), 758-779.
- Cerrato, D., & Piva, M. (2015). The effect of global orientation on the performance of international new ventures: evidence from Italy. *Management International Review*, 55(6), 857-883.
- Cerrato, D., Crosato, L., & Depperu, D. (2016). Archetypes of SME internationalization: A configurational approach. *International Business Review*, 25(1), 286-295.
- Chan, R. Y., & Ma, K. H. (2016). Environmental orientation of exporting SMEs from an emerging economy: Its antecedents and consequences. *Management International Review*, 56(5), 597-632.
- Chandra, Y., Styles, C., & Wilkinson, I. F. (2012). An opportunity-based view of rapid internationalization. *Journal of International Marketing*, 20(1), 74-102.
- Chandra, Y., Styles, C., & Wilkinson, I. F. (2015). Opportunity portfolio: Moving beyond single opportunity explanations in international entrepreneurship research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 32(1), 199-228.
- Chang, F.Y.M., & Webster, C.M. (2019). Influence of innovativeness, environmental competitiveness and government, industry and professional networks on SME export likelihood. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(4), 1304-1327.
- Charoensukmongkol, P. (2016). Cultural intelligence and export performance of small and medium enterprises in Thailand: Mediating roles of organizational capabilities. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(1), 105-122.
- Chen, H.-I., Hsu, W.T., & Chang, Ch.-Y. (2014). Family ownership, institutional ownership, and internationalization of SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52(4), 771-789.
- Cheng, H. L., & Yu, C. M. (2012). Adoption of practices by subsidiaries and institutional interaction within internationalised small-and medium-sized enterprises. *Management International Review*, 52(1), 81-105.
- Chetty, S., Johanson, M., & Martin, O.M. (2014). Speed of internationalization: Conceptualization, measurement and validation. *Journal of World Business*, 49 (4), 633-650.
- Chetty, S., Karami, M., & Martín, O. M. (2018). Opportunity discovery and creation as a duality: Evidence from small firms' foreign market entries. *Journal of International Marketing*, 26(3), 70-93.

- Chiarvesio, M., Marchi, V. D., & Maria, E. D. (2015). Environmental innovations and internationalization: Theory and practices. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 24(8), 790-801.
- Child, J., & Hsieh, L. (2014). Decision mode, information and network attachment in the internationalization of SMEs: A configurational and contingency analysis. *Journal of World Business*, 49(4), 598-610.
- Child, J., Hsieh, L., Elbanna, S., Karmowska, J., Marinova, S., Puthusserry, P., Tsai, T., Narooz, R., & Zhang, Y. (2017). SME international business models: The role of context and experience. *Journal of World Business*, 52(5), 664-679.
- Ciravegna, L., Kuivalainen, O., Kundu, S. K., & Lopez, L. E. (2018). The antecedents of early internationalization: A configurational perspective. *International Business Review*, 27(6), 1200-1212.
- Coeurderoy, R., Cowling, M., Licht, G., & Murray, G. (2012). Young firm internationalization and survival: Empirical tests on a panel of 'adolescent' new technology-based firms in Germany and the UK. *International Small Business Journal*, 30(5), 472-492.
- Colclough, S. N., Moen, Ø., Hovd, N. S., & Chan, A. (2019). SME innovation orientation: Evidence from Norwegian exporting SMEs. *International Small Business Journal*, 37(8), 780-803.
- Couper, C. (2019). Institutional bridging for SME high-distance internationalisation to China: A contextualized explanation. *Management and Organization Review*, 15(2), 307-340.
- Coviello, N. E., McDougall, P. P., & Oviatt, B. M. (2011). The emergence, advance and future of international entrepreneurship research—An introduction to the special forum. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(6), 625-631.
- Cui, A. P., Walsh, M. F., & Zou, S. (2014). The importance of strategic fit between host-home country similarity and exploration exploitation strategies on small and medium-sized enterprises' performance: A contingency perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 22(4), 67-85.
- Cumming, D., Fischer, E., & Peridis, T. (2015). Publicly funded business advisory services and entrepreneurial internationalization. *International Small Business Journal*, 33(8), 824-839.
- D'Angelo, A., & Presutti, M. (2019). SMEs international growth: The moderating role of experience on entrepreneurial and learning orientations. *International Business Review*, 28(3), 613-624.
- D'Angelo, A., Majocchi, A., & Buck, T. (2016). External managers, family ownership and the scope of SME internationalization. *Journal of World Business*, 51(4), 534-547.
- Dabić, M., Maley, J., Dana, L. P., Novak, I., Pellegrini, M. M., & Caputo, A. (2020). Pathways of SME internationalization: A bibliometric and systematic review. *Small Business Economics*, 55(3), 705-725.
- Dai, L., Maksimov, V., Gilbert, B. A., & Fernhaber, S. A. (2014). Entrepreneurial orientation and international scope: The differential roles of innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(4), 511-524.

- Dasí, À., Iborra, M., & Safón, V. (2015). Beyond path dependence: Explorative orientation, slack resources, and managerial intentionality to internationalize in SMEs. *International Business Review*, 24(1), 77-88.
- De Clercq, D., & Zhou, L. (2014). Entrepreneurial strategic posture and performance in foreign markets: the critical role of international learning effort. *Journal of International Marketing*, 22(2), 47-67.
- De Clercq, D., Sapienza, H. J., Yavuz, R. I., & Zhou, L. (2012). Learning and knowledge in early internationalization research: Past accomplishments and future directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(1), 143-165.
- De Maeseneire, W., & Claeys, T. (2012). SMEs, foreign direct investment and financial constraints: The case of Belgium. *International Business Review*, 21(3), 408-424.
- de Vasconcellos, S. L., Garrido, I. L., & Parente, R. C. (2019). Organizational creativity as a crucial resource for building international business competence. *International Business Review*, 28(3), 438-449.
- Del Bosco, B., & Bettinelli, C. (2020). How do family SMEs control their investments abroad? The role of distance and family control. *Management International Review*, 60(1), 1-35.
- Delerue, H., & Lejeune, A. (2011). Managerial secrecy and intellectual asset protection in SMEs: The role of institutional environment. *Journal of International Management*, 17 (2), 130-142.
- Delerue, H., & Lejeune, A. (2012). Internationalization of biotechnology start-ups: Geographic location and mimetic behaviour. *International Small Business Journal*, 30(4), 388-405.
- Deng, Z., Jean, R.-J., & Sinkovics, R.R. (2018). Rapid expansion of international new ventures across institutional distance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49(8): 1010-1032.
- Deng, Z., Jean, R. J. B., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2017). Polarizing effects of early exporting on exit. *Management International Review*, 57(2), 243-275.
- Dikova, D., Jaklič, A., Burger, A., & Kunčič, A. (2016). What is beneficial for first-time SME-exporters from a transition economy: A diversified or a focused export-strategy? *Journal of World Business*, 51(2), 185-199.
- Dimitratos, P., Johnson, J. E., Plakoyiannaki, E., & Young, S. (2016). SME internationalization: How does the opportunity-based international entrepreneurial culture matter? *International Business Review*, 25(6), 1211-1222.
- Dimitratos, P., Petrou, A., Plakoyiannaki, E., & Johnson, J.E. (2011). Strategic decision-making processes in internationalization: Does national culture of the focal firm matter? *Journal of World Business*, 46(2), 194-204.
- Dimitratos, P., Plakoyiannaki, E., Pitsoulaki, A., & Tüselmann, H. J. (2010). The global smaller firm in international entrepreneurship. *International Business Review*, 19(6), 589-606.
- Dimitratos, P., Voudouris, I., Plakoyiannaki, E., & Nakos, G. (2012). International entrepreneurial culture—Toward a comprehensive opportunity-based operationalization of international entrepreneurship. *International Business Review*, 21(4), 708-721.

- Dominguez, N., & Mayrhofer, U. (2017). Internationalization stages of traditional SMEs: Increasing, decreasing and re-increasing commitment to foreign markets. *International Business Review*, 26(6), 1051-1063.
- Dunford, R., Palmer, I., & Benveniste, J. (2010). Business model replication for early and rapid internationalisation: The ING direct experience. *Long Range Planning*, 43(5-6), 655-674.
- Eddleston, K.A., Sarathy, R., & Banalieva, E.R. (2019). When a high-quality niche strategy is not enough to spur family-firm internationalization: The role of external and internal contexts. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 50 (5), 783 – 808.
- Efrat, K., & Shoham, A. (2012). Born global firms: The differences between their short- and long-term performance drivers. *Journal of World Business*, 47 (4), 675-685.
- Eliasson, K., Hansson, P., & Lindvert, M. (2012). Do firms learn by exporting or learn to export? Evidence from small and medium-sized enterprises. *Small Business Economics*, 39(2), 453-472.
- Eriksson, T., Nummela, N., & Saarenketo, S. (2014). Dynamic capability in a small global factory. *International Business Review*, 23(1), 169-180.
- Esteve-Pérez, S., & Rodríguez, D. (2013). The dynamics of exports and R&D in SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, 41(1), 219-240.
- Estrin, S., Gozman, D., & Khavul, S. (2018). The evolution and adoption of equity crowdfunding: entrepreneur and investor entry into a new market. *Small Business Economics*, 51(2), 425-439.
- Evers, N., & O’Gorman, C. (2011). Improvised internationalization in new ventures: The role of prior knowledge and networks. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(7-8), 549-574.
- Evers, N., Andersson, S., & Hannibal, M. (2012). Stakeholders and marketing capabilities in international new ventures: Evidence from Ireland, Sweden, and Denmark. *Journal of International Marketing*, 20(4), 46-71.
- Exposito, A., & Sanchis-Llopis, J. A. (2019). The effects of innovation on the decisions of exporting and/or importing in SMEs: Empirical evidence in the case of Spain. *Small Business Economics*, 55(3), 813-829.
- Fariborzi, H., & Keyhani, M. (2018). Internationalize to live: A study of the post-internationalization survival of new ventures. *Small Business Economics*, 50(3), 607-624.
- Felzensztein, Ch., Ciravegna, L., Robson, P., & Amorós, J.E. (2015). Networks, entrepreneurial orientation, and internationalization scope: Evidence from Chilean small and medium enterprises. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(supl), 145-160.
- Felzensztein, Ch., Deans, K.R., & Dana, L.-P. (2019). Small firms in regional clusters: Local networks and internationalization in the southern hemisphere. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(2), 496-516.
- Fernández-Mesa, A., & Alegre, J. (2015). Entrepreneurial orientation and export intensity: Examining the interplay of organizational learning and innovation. *International Business Review*, 24(1), 148-156.
- Fernhaber, S. A., & Li, D. (2010). The impact of interorganizational imitation on new venture international entry and performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(1), 1-30.

- Fernhaber, S. A., & Li, D. (2013). International exposure through network relationships: Implications for new venture internationalization. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28*(2), 316-334.
- Ferreras-Méndez, J. L., Fernández-Mesa, A., & Alegre, J. (2019). Export performance in SMEs: The importance of external knowledge search strategies and absorptive capacity. *Management International Review, 59*(3), 413-437.
- Fink, M., & Harms, R. (2012). Contextualizing the relationship between self-commitment and performance: Environmental and behavioural uncertainty in (cross- border) alliances of SMEs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 24*(3-4), 161-179.
- Fletcher, M., & Harris, S. (2012). Knowledge acquisition for the internationalization of the smaller firm: Content and sources. *International Business Review, 21*(4), 631-647.
- Francioni, B., Vissak, T., & Musso, F. (2017). Small Italian wine producers' internationalization: The role of network relationships in the emergence of late starters. *International Business Review, 26*(1), 12-22.
- Freeman, S., Hutchings, K., & Chetty, S. (2012). Born-globals and culturally proximate markets. *Management International Review, 52*(3), 425-460.
- 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.
- Freixanet, J., Renart, G., & Rialp-Criado, A. (2018). The impact of managers' global orientation on SME export and economic performance. *Management International Review, 58*(4), 571-604.
- Freixanet, J., Rialp, A., & Churakova, I. (2020). How do innovation, internationalization, and organizational learning interact and co-evolve in small firms? A complex systems approach. *Journal of Small Business Management, 58*(5), 1030-1063.
- Gabrielsson, M., Gabrielsson, P., & Dimitratos, P. (2014). International entrepreneurial culture and growth of international new ventures. *Management International Review, 54*(4), 445-471.
- Galkina, T., & Chetty, S. (2015). Effectuation and networking of internationalizing SMEs. *Management International Review, 55*(5), 647-676.
- Garcia-Lillo, F., Claver-Cortés, E., Marco-Lajara, B., & Úbeda-García, M. (2017). Mapping the intellectual structure of research on 'born global' firms and INVs: A citation/co-citation analysis. *Management International Review, 57*(4), 631-652.
- Gashi, P., Hashi, I., & Pugh, G. (2014). Export behaviour of SMEs in transition countries. *Small Business Economics, 42*(2), 407-435.
- Gerschewski, S., & Xiao, S. S. (2015). Beyond financial indicators: An assessment of the measurement of performance for international new ventures. *International Business Review, 24*(4), 615-629.
- Gerschewski, S., Lew, Y. K., Khan, Z., & Park, B. I. (2018). Post-entry performance of international new ventures: The mediating role of learning orientation. *International Small Business Journal, 36*(7), 807-828.

- Gerschewski, S., Rose, E.L., & Lindsay, V.J. (2015). Understanding the drivers of international performance for born global firms: An integrated perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 50 (3), 558-575.
- Giovannetti, G., Marvasi, E., & Sanfilippo, M. (2015). Supply chains and the internationalization of small firms. *Small Business Economics*, 44(4), 845-865.
- Glavas, C., & Mathews, S. (2014). How international entrepreneurship characteristics influence Internet capabilities for the international business processes of the firm. *International Business Review*, 23(1), 228-245.
- Goerzen, A. (2018). Small Firm Boundary-spanning via Bridging Ties: Achieving International Connectivity via Cross-border Inter-cluster Alliances, *Journal of International Management*, 24(2), 153-164.
- Golovko, E., & Valentini, G. (2014). Selective learning-by-exporting: Firm size and product versus process innovation. *Global Strategy Journal*, 4(3), 161-180.
- Graves, C., & Shan, Y. G. (2014). An empirical analysis of the effect of internationalization on the performance of unlisted family and nonfamily firms in Australia. *Family Business Review*, 27(2), 142-160.
- Guo, Y.H. (2012). Small and medium enterprises as pioneers in the expansion of global production networks: A case study of the Japanese electronics industry in Guangdong, China. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(3-4), 143-159.
- Haapanen, L., Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, P., Nikkilä, S., & Paakkolanvaara, P. (2019). The function-specific microfoundations of dynamic capabilities in cross-border mergers and acquisitions. *International Business Review*, 28(4), 766-784.
- Hagen, B., Zucchella, A., Cerchiello, P., & De Giovanni, N. (2012). International strategy and performance—Clustering strategic types of SMEs. *International Business Review*, 21(3), 369-382.
- Hagsten, E., & Kotnik, P. (2017). ICT as facilitator of internationalisation in small-and medium-sized firms. *Small Business Economics*, 48(2), 431-446.
- Hånell, S.M., Nordman, E.R., & Tolstoy, D. (2017). New product development in foreign customer relationships: a study of international SMEs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 29(7-8), 715-734.
- Hashai, N. (2011). Sequencing the expansion of geographic scope and foreign operations by 'born global' firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(8): 995–1015.
- Henley, A., & Song, M. (2020). Innovation, internationalisation and the performance of microbusinesses. *International Small Business Journal*, 38(4), 337-364.
- Hennart, J. F. (2014). The accidental internationalists: a theory of born globals. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(1), 117-135.
- Hennart, JF. (2020). More than intent: A bundling model of MNE–SME interactions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(7): 1176–1194.

- Hennart, J.F., Majocchi, A., & Forlani, E. (2019). The myth of the stay-at-home family firm: How family-managed SMEs can overcome their internationalization limitations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 50(5): 758–782.
- Hernández, V., & Nieto, M. J. (2016). Inward–outward connections and their impact on firm growth. *International Business Review*, 25(1), 296-306.
- Hessels, J., & Parker, S.C. (2013). Constraints, internationalization and growth: A cross-country analysis of European SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 48(1), 137-148.
- Hessels, J., & Terjesen, S. (2010). Resource dependency and institutional theory perspectives on direct and indirect export choices. *Small Business Economics*, 34(2), 203-220.
- Hessels, J., & van Stel, A. (2011). Entrepreneurship, export orientation, and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 37(2), 255-268.
- Hilmersson, M. (2014). Experiential knowledge types and profiles of internationalising small and medium-sized enterprises. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(7), 802-817.
- Hilmersson, M. (2014). Small and medium-sized enterprise internationalisation strategy and performance in times of market turbulence. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(4), 386-400.
- Hilmersson, M., & Jansson, H. (2012). International network extension processes to institutionally different markets: Entry nodes and processes of exporting SMEs. *International Business Review*, 21(4), 682-693.
- Hilmersson, M., & Johanson, M. (2016). Speed of SME internationalization and performance. *Management International Review*, 56(1), 67-94.
- Hilmersson, M., & Johanson, M. (2020). Knowledge acquisition strategy, speed of capability development and speed of SME internationalisation. *International Small Business Journal*, 0266242620909029.
- Hilmersson, M., Johanson, M., Lundberg, H., & Papaioannou, S. (2017). Time, temporality, and internationalization: The relationship among point in time of, time to, and speed of international expansion. *Journal of International Marketing*, 25(1), 22-45.
- Hohenthal, J., Johanson, J., & Johanson, M. (2014). Network knowledge and business-relationship value in the foreign market. *International Business Review*, 23, 4-19.
- Hollender, L., Zapkau, F. B., & Schwens, C. (2017). SME foreign market entry mode choice and foreign venture performance: The moderating effect of international experience and product adaptation. *International Business Review*, 26(2), 250-263.
- Hsieh, L., Child, J., Narooz, R., Elbanna, S., Karmowska, J., Marinova, S., Puthusserry, P., Tsai, T., & Zhang, Y. (2019). A multidimensional perspective of SME internationalization speed: The influence of entrepreneurial characteristics. *International Business Review*, 28(2), 268-283.
- Hsu, W-T., Chen, H.L., & Cheng, C-Y. (2012). Internationalization and firm performance of SMEs: The moderating effects of CEO attributes. *Journal of World Business*, 48(1), 1-12.
- Huett, P., Baum, M., Schwens, C., & Kabst, R. (2014). Foreign direct investment location choice of small-and medium-sized enterprises: The risk of value erosion of firm-specific resources. *International Business Review*, 23(5), 952-965.

- Ibeh, K., Jones, M. V., & Kuivalainen, O. (2018). Consolidating and advancing knowledge on the post-entry performance of international new ventures. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(7), 741-757.
- Idris, B., & Saridakis, G. (2018). Local formal interpersonal networks and SMEs internationalisation: Empirical evidence from the UK. *International Business Review*, 27(3), 610-624.
- Ilhan-Nas, T., Sahin, K., & Cilingir, Z. (2011). International ethnic entrepreneurship: Antecedents, outcomes and environmental context. *International Business Review*, 20(6), 614-626.
- Inouye, T. M., Joshi, A. M., Hemmatian, I., & Robinson, J. A. (2020). Counteracting globalization's skeptics: How diasporas influence the internationalization preferences of minority entrepreneurs' firms. *Global Strategy Journal*, 10(1), 123-173.
- Islankina, E., & Thurner, T.W. (2018). Internationalization of cluster initiatives in Russia: Empirical evidence. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(7-8), 776-799.
- Jean, R-J., & Kim, D. (2020). Internet and SMEs' internationalization: The role of platform and website. *Journal of International Management*, 26 (1), 100690.
- Jean, R-J., Daekwan, K., & Cavusgil, E. (2020). Antecedents and outcomes of digital platform risk for international new ventures' internationalization. *Journal of World Business*, 55(1).
- Jiang, G., Kotabe, M., Hamilton III, R. D., & Smith, S. W. (2016). Early internationalization and the role of immigration in new venture survival. *International Business Review*, 25(6), 1285-1296.
- Johanson, M., & Martín, O. M. (2015). The incremental expansion of Born Internationals: A comparison of new and old Born Internationals. *International Business Review*, 24(3), 476-496.
- Johnson, J.H., Arya, B., & Mirchandani, D.A. (2013). Global integration strategies of small and medium multinationals: Evidence from Taiwan. *Journal of World Business*, 48(1), 47-57.
- Jones, M. V., Coviello, N., & Tang, Y. K. (2011). International entrepreneurship research (1989–2009): a domain ontology and thematic analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(6), 632-659.
- Jonsson, S., & Lindbergh, J. (2010). The impact of institutional impediments and information and knowledge exchange on SMEs' investments in international business relationships. *International Business Review*, 19(6), 548-561.
- Kalantaridis, Ch., & Vassilev, I. (2011). Firm size and the nature of international relationships: The case of globally integrated small firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(4), 639-658.
- Kalinic, I., & Forza, C. (2012). Rapid internationalization of traditional SMEs: Between gradualist models and born globals. *International Business Review*, 21(4), 694-707.
- Kalinic, I., Sarasvathy, S. D., & Forza, C. (2014). 'Expect the unexpected': Implications of effectual logic on the internationalization process. *International Business Review*, 23(3), 635-647.
- Karafyllia, M., & Zucchella, A. (2017). Synergies and tensions between and within domestic and international market activities of firms. *International Business Review*, 26(5), 942-958.

- Karami, M., & Tang, J. (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation and SME international performance: The mediating role of networking capability and experiential learning. *International Small Business Journal*, 37(2), 105-124.
- Khavul, S., Pérez-Nordtvedt, L., & Wood, E. (2010). Organizational entrainment and international new ventures from emerging markets. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 104-119.
- Khavul, S., Peterson, M., Mullens, D., & Rasheed, A. A. (2010). Going global with innovations from emerging economies: investment in customer support capabilities pays off. *Journal of International Marketing*, 18(4), 22-42.
- Kim, J. J., & Hemmert, M. (2016). What drives the export performance of small and medium-sized subcontracting firms? A study of Korean manufacturers. *International Business Review*, 25(2), 511-521.
- Kiss, A. N., Danis, W. M., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2012). International entrepreneurship research in emerging economies: A critical review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(2), 266-290.
- Kiss, A. N., Danis, W. M., Nair, S., & Suddaby, R. (2020). Accidental tourists? A cognitive exploration of serendipitous internationalisation. *International Small Business Journal*, 38(2), 65-89.
- Kiss, A. N., Fernhaber, S., & McDougall-Covin, P. P. (2018). Slack, innovation, and export intensity: Implications for small-and medium-sized enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 42(5), 671-697.
- Kiss, A. N., Williams, D. W., & Houghton, S. M. (2013). Risk bias and the link between motivation and new venture post-entry international growth. *International Business Review*, 22(6), 1068-1078.
- Knight, G.A., & Liesch, P.W. (2016). Internationalization: From incremental to born global. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1), 93-102.
- Kontinen, T., & Ojala, A. (2011). International opportunity recognition among small and medium-sized family firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(3), 490-514.
- Kontinen, T., & Ojala, A. (2011). Network ties in the international opportunity recognition of family SMEs. *International Business Review*, 20(4), 440-453.
- Kurt, Y., Sinkovics, N., Sinkovics, R.R., & Yamin, M. (2020). The role of spirituality in Islamic business networks: The case of internationalizing Turkish SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 55(1).
- Kwon, Y. C. (2011). Relationship-specific investments, social capital, and performance: The case of Korean exporter/foreign buyer relations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28(4), 761-773.
- Lahiri, S., Mukherjee, D., & Peng, M. W. (2020). Behind the internationalization of family SMEs: A strategy tripod synthesis. *Global Strategy Journal*.
- Lamb, P., Sandberg, J., & Liesch, P.W. (2011). Small firm internationalisation unveiled through phenomenography. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(5), 672-693.

- Landau, C., Karna, A., Richter, A., & Uhlenbruck, K. (2016). Institutional leverage capability: Creating and using institutional advantages for internationalization. *Global Strategy Journal, 6*(1), 50-68.
- Laufs, K., & Schwens, C. (2014). Foreign market entry mode choice of small and medium-sized enterprises: A systematic review and future research agenda. *International Business Review, 23*(6), 1109-1126.
- Lee, H., Kelley, D., Lee, J., & Lee, S. (2012). SME survival: The impact of internationalization, technology resources, and alliances. *Journal of Small Business Management, 50*(1), 1-19.
- Lee, J. Y., Jiménez, A., & Devinney, T. M. (2020). Learning in SME internationalization: A new perspective on learning from success versus failure. *Management International Review, 60*(4), 485-513.
- Lenaerts, K., & Merlevede, B. (2015). Firm size and spillover effects from foreign direct investment: The case of Romania. *Small Business Economics, 45*(3), 595-611.
- Leppäaho, T., Chetty, S., & Dimitratos, P. (2018). Network embeddedness in the internationalization of biotechnology entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 30*(5-6), 562-584.
- Li, J., Liu, B., & Qian, G. (2019). The belt and road initiative, cultural friction and ethnicity: Their effects on the export performance of SMEs in China. *Journal of World Business, 54* (4), 350-359.
- Li, L., Qian, G., & Qian, Z. (2012). The performance of small and medium-sized technology-based enterprises: Do product diversity and international diversity matter? *International Business Review, 21*(5), 941-956.
- Li, L., Qian, G., & Qian, Z. (2015). Should small, young technology-based firms internalize transactions in their internationalization? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 39*(4), 839-862.
- Liesh, P., Welch, L.S., & Buckley, P.J. (2011). Risk and uncertainty in internationalisation and international entrepreneurship studies. *Management International Review, 51*(6), 851-873.
- Lin, Z., Cao, X., & Cottam, E. (2020). International networking and knowledge acquisition of Chinese SMEs: The role of global mind-set and international entrepreneurial orientation. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 32*(5-6), 449-465.
- Liñán, F., Paul, J., & Fayolle, A. (2019). SMEs and entrepreneurship in the era of globalization: Advances and theoretical approaches. *Small Business Economics, 55*(3), 695-703.
- Lindstrand, A., Melén, S., & Nordman, E. R. (2011). Turning social capital into business: A study of the internationalization of biotech SMEs. *International Business Review, 20*(2), 194-212.
- LiPuma, J. A., Newbert, S. L., & Doh, J. P. (2013). The effect of institutional quality on firm export performance in emerging economies: a contingency model of firm age and size. *Small Business Economics, 40*(4), 817-841.
- Lo, F. Y., Chiao, Y. C., & Yu, C. M. J. (2016). Network and institutional effects on SMEs' entry strategies. *Management International Review, 56*(4), 531-563.

- Loane, S., Bell, J., & Cunningham, I. (2014). Entrepreneurial founding team exits in rapidly internationalising SMEs: A double edged sword. *International Business Review*, 23(2), 468-477.
- López-Navarro, M.A., Callarisa-Fiol, L., & Moliner-Tena, M.A. (2013). Long-term orientation and commitment in export joint ventures among small and medium-sized firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(1), 100-113.
- Loufrani-Fedida, S., Hauch, V., & Elidrissi, D. (2019). The dynamics of relational competencies in the development of born global firms: A multilevel approach. *International Business Review*, 28(2), 222-237.
- Love, J. H., & Ganotakis, P. (2013). Learning by exporting: Lessons from high-technology SMEs. *International Business Review*, 22(1), 1-17.
- Love, J. H., & Roper, S. (2015). SME innovation, exporting and growth: A review of existing evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 33(1), 28-48.
- Love, J. H., Roper, S., & Zhou, Y. (2016). Experience, age and exporting performance in UK SMEs. *International Business Review*, 25(4), 806-819.
- Madsen, T. K., Moen, Ø., & Hammervold, R. (2012). The role of independent intermediaries: The case of small and medium-sized exporters. *International Business Review*, 21(4), 535-546.
- Maekelburger, B., Schwens, C., & Kabst, R. 2012. Asset specificity and foreign market entry mode choice of small and medium-sized enterprises: The moderating influence of knowledge safeguards and institutional safeguards. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43(5): 458–476.
- Mainela, T., Puhakka, V., & Sipola, S. (2018). International entrepreneurship beyond individuals and firms: On the systemic nature of international opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(4), 534-550.
- Majocchi A., D'Angelo, A., Forlani, E., & Buck, T. (2018). Bifurcation bias and exporting: Can foreign work experience be an answer? Insight from European family SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 53 (2), 237-247.
- Makhmadshoev, D., Ibeh, K., & Crone, M. (2015). Institutional influences on SME exporters under divergent transition paths: Comparative insights from Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. *International Business Review*, 24(6), 1025-1038.
- Makri, K., Theodosiou, M., & Katsikea, E. (2017). An empirical investigation of the antecedents and performance outcomes of export innovativeness. *International Business Review*, 26(4), 628-639.
- Malca, O., Peña-Vinces, J., & Acedo, F. J. (2019). Export promotion programmes as export performance catalysts for SMEs: Insights from an emerging economy. *Small Business Economics*, 55(3), 831-851.
- Manolopoulos, D., Chatzopoulou, E., & Kottaridi, C. (2018). Resources, home institutional context and SMEs' exporting: direct relationships and contingency effects. *International Business Review*, 27(5), 993-1006.

- Manolova, T. S., Manev, I. M., & Gyoshev, B. S. (2014). Friends with money? Owner's financial network and new venture internationalization in a transition economy. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(8), 944-966.
- Manolova, T.S., Manev, I.M., & Gyoshev, B.S. (2010). In good company: The role of personal and inter-firm networks for new-venture internationalization in a transition economy. *Journal of World Business*, 45(3), 257-265.
- Mansion, S. E., & Bausch, A. (2020). Intangible assets and SMEs' export behavior: a meta-analytical perspective. *Small Business Economics*, 55(3), 727-760.
- Martineau, C., & Pastoriza, D. (2016). International involvement of established SMEs: A systematic review of antecedents, outcomes and moderators. *International Business Review*, 25(2), 458-470.
- Masiello, B., & Izzo, F. (2019). Interpersonal social networks and internationalization of traditional SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(sup2), 658-691.
- McCormick, M., & Fernhaber, S. A. (2018). Are growth expectations being met? Implications for the internationalization of micro-sized ventures. *Small Business Economics*, 50(3), 591-605.
- McDougall-Covin, P., Jones, M. V., & Serapio, M. G. (2014). High-potential concepts, phenomena, and theories for the advancement of international entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(1), 1-10.
- Merino, F., Monreal-Pérez, J., & Sánchez-Marín, G. (2015). Family SMEs' internationalization: Disentangling the influence of familiness on Spanish firms' export activity. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(4), 1164-1184.
- Miocevic, D., & Crnjak-Karanovic, B. (2011). Cognitive and information-based capabilities in the internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises: The case of Croatian exporters. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(4), 537-557.
- Montoro-Sanchez, A., Diez-Vial, I., & Belso-Martinez, J.A. (2018). The evolution of the domestic network configuration as a driver of international relationships in SMEs. *International Business Review*, 27(4), 727-736.
- Muralidharan, E., & Pathak, S. (2017). Informal institutions and international entrepreneurship. *International Business Review*, 26(2), 288-302.
- Musteen M., Francis, J., & Datta, D.K. (2010). The influence of international networks on internationalization speed and performance: A study of Czech SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 45(3), 197-205.
- Musteen, M., Ahsan, M., & Park, T. (2017). SME s, Intellectual Capital, and Offshoring of Service Activities: An Empirical Investigation. *Management International Review*, 57(4), 603-630.
- Musteen, M., Datta, D. K., & Butts, M. M. (2014). Do international networks and foreign market knowledge facilitate SME internationalization? Evidence from the Czech Republic. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(4), 749-774.

- Muzychenko, O., & Liesch, P.W. (2015). International opportunity identification in the internationalisation of the firm. *Journal of World Business*, 50(4), 704-717.
- Nakos, G., Brouthers, K. D., & Dimitratos, P. (2014). International alliances with competitors and non-competitors: The disparate impact on SME international performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 8(2), 167-182.
- Nakos, G., Dimitratos, P., & Elbanna, S. (2019). The mediating role of alliances in the international market orientation-performance relationship of SMEs. *International Business Review*, 28(3), 603-612.
- Naldi, L., Achtenhagen, L., & Davidsson, P. (2015). International corporate entrepreneurship among SMEs: A test of Stevenson's notion of entrepreneurial management. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(3), 780-800.
- Narooz, R., & Child, J. (2017). Networking responses to different levels of institutional void: A comparison of internationalizing SMEs in Egypt and the UK. *International Business Review*, 26(4), 683-696.
- Nasra, R., & Dacin, M. T. (2010). Institutional arrangements and international entrepreneurship: the state as institutional entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(3), 583-609.
- Navarro-García, A. (2016). Drivers of export entrepreneurship. *International Business Review*, 25(1), 244-254.
- Nordman, E. R., & Tolstoy, D. (2014). Does relationship psychic distance matter for the learning processes of internationalizing SMEs? *International Business Review*, 23(1), 30-37.
- 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(1), 51-69.
- Nummela, N., Saarenketo, S., Jokela, P., & Loane, S. (2014). Strategic decision-making of a born global: a comparative study from three small open economies. *Management International Review*, 54(4), 527-550.
- Obadia, C., Vida, I., & Pla-Barber, J. (2017). Differential effects of bilateral norms on SMEs' export relationships: a dynamic perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 25(3), 21-41.
- Odlin, D. (2019). Domestic competitor influence on internationalizing SMEs as an industry evolves. *Journal of World Business*, 54 (2), 119-136.
- Odlin, D., & Benson-Rea, M. (2017). Competing on the edge: Implications of network position for internationalizing small-and medium-sized enterprises. *International Business Review*, 26(4), 736-748.
- Ojala, A. (2015). Geographic, cultural, and psychic distance to foreign markets in the context of small and new ventures. *International Business Review*, 24(5), 825-835.
- Onkelinx, J., Manolova, T. S., & Edelman, L. F. (2016). Human capital and SME internationalization: Empirical evidence from Belgium. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(6), 818-837.

Onuklua, A., Hilla, T.L., Darendelib, I.S., & Genc, O.F. (2021). Poison or antidote: How subnational informal institutions exacerbate and ameliorate institutional voids. *Journal of International Management*, 27 (1): 100806.

Oparaocha, G. O. (2015). SMEs and international entrepreneurship: An institutional network perspective. *International Business Review*, 24(5), 861-873.

Ottaviano, G., & Martincus, C. V. (2011). SMEs in Argentina: Who are the exporters? *Small Business Economics*, 37(3), 341-361.

Oura, M. M., Zilber, S. N., & Lopes, E. L. (2016). Innovation capacity, international experience and export performance of SMEs in Brazil. *International Business Review*, 25(4), 921-932.

Palmié, M., Zeschky, M., Winterhalter, S., Sauter, P. W., Haefner, N., & Gassmann, O. (2016). Coordination mechanisms for international innovation in SMEs: Effects on time-to-market and R&D task complexity as a moderator. *Small Business Economics*, 46(2), 273-294.

Park, S., & LiPuma, J. A. (2020). New venture internationalization: The role of venture capital types and reputation. *Journal of World Business*, 55(1), 101025.

Park, S., LiPuma, J. A., & Prange, C. (2015). Venture capitalist and entrepreneur knowledge of new venture internationalization: A review of knowledge components. *International Small Business Journal*, 33(8), 901-928.

Paul, J., Parthasarathy, S., & Gupta, P. (2017). Exporting challenges of SMEs: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of World Business*, 52(3), 327-342.

Pellegrino, J. M., & McNaughton, R. B. (2015). The co-evolution of learning and internationalization strategy in international new ventures. *Management International Review*, 55(4), 457-483.

Pellegrino, J. M., & McNaughton, R. B. (2017). Beyond learning by experience: The use of alternative learning processes by incrementally and rapidly internationalizing SMEs. *International Business Review*, 26(4), 614-627.

Pergelova, A., Angulo-Ruiz, F., & Yordanova, D. I. (2018). Gender and international entry mode. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(6), 662-685.

Pergelova, A., Manolova, T., Simeonova-Ganeva, R., & Yordanova, D. (2019). Democratizing entrepreneurship? Digital technologies and the internationalization of female-led SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(1), 14-39.

Petrou, A. P., Hadjielias, E., Thanos, I. C., & Dimitratos, P. (2020). Strategic decision-making processes, international environmental munificence and the accelerated internationalization of SMEs. *International Business Review*, 29(5), 101735.

Pezderka, N., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2011). A conceptualization of e-risk perceptions and implications for small firm active online internationalization. *International Business Review*, 20(4), 409-422.

Pongelli, C., Caroli, M. G., & Cucculelli, M. (2016). Family business going abroad: The effect of family ownership on foreign market entry mode decisions. *Small Business Economics*, 47(3), 787-801.

Prange, C., & Pinho, J. C. (2017). How personal and organizational drivers impact on SME international performance: The mediating role of organizational innovation. *International Business Review*, 26(6), 1114-1123.

Prashantham, S., & Dhanaraj, C. (2015). MNE ties and new venture internationalization: Exploratory insights from India. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 32(4), 901-924.

Prashantham, S., & Floyd, S. W. (2019). Navigating liminality in new venture internationalization. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(3), 513-527.

Prashantham, S., & Birkinshaw, J. (2020). MNE-SME cooperation: An integrative framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(7): 1161-1175.

Prashantham, S., Dhanaraj, C., & Kumar, K. (2015). Ties that bind: Ethnic ties and new venture internationalization. *Long Range Planning*, 48(5), 317-333.

Prashantham, S., Eranova, M., & Couper, C. (2018). Globalization, entrepreneurship and paradox thinking. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 35(1), 1-9.

Prashantham, S., Kumar, K., & Bhattacharyya, S. (2019). International New Ventures from Emerging Economies: Network Connectivity and Legitimacy Building. *Management and Organization Review*, 15 (3), 615-641.

Puig, F., Gonzalez-Loureiro, M., & Ghauri, P. N. (2018). Running faster and jumping higher? Survival and growth in international manufacturing new ventures. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(7), 829-850.

Puthusserry, P. N., Child, J., & Rodrigues, S. B. (2014). Psychic distance, its business impact and modes of coping: A study of British and Indian partner SMEs. *Management International Review*, 54(1), 1-29.

Puthusserry, P., Child, J., & Khan, Z. (2020). Social capital development through the stages of internationalization: Relations between British and Indian SMEs. *Global Strategy Journal*, 10(2), 282-308.

Qian, G., Li, L., & Qian, Z. (2018). Interactions among factors driving and inhibiting the early internationalization of small, young technology enterprises. *Management International Review*, 58(2), 251-280.

Rashid, A., & Waqar, S. M. (2017). Exchange rate fluctuations, firm size, and export behavior: An empirical investigation. *Small Business Economics*, 49(3), 609-625.

Raymond, L., & St-Pierre, J. (2013). Strategic capability configurations for the internationalization of SMEs: A study in equifinality. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(1), 82-102.

Raymond, L., Bergeron, F., Croteau, A.-M. & St-Pierre, J. (2015). Developing absorptive capacity through e-Business: The case of international SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(sup1), 75-94.

Ren, S., Eisingerich, A. B., & Tsai, H. T. (2015). How do marketing, research and development capabilities, and degree of internationalization synergistically affect the innovation performance of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)? A panel data study of Chinese SMEs. *International Business Review*, 24(4), 642-651.

Reuber, A R., Dimitratos, P., & Kuivalainen, O. (2017). Beyond categorization: New directions for theory development about entrepreneurial internationalization, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(4): 411-422.

Reuber, A. R., & Fischer, E. (2011). International entrepreneurship in internet-enabled markets. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(6), 660-679.

Richardson, C. (2014). Firm internationalisation within the Muslim world. *Journal of World Business*, 49 (3), 386-395.

Richardson, C., & Ariffin, S. K. (2019). A leap of faith? Managerial religiosity and market entry decisions. *Management International Review*, 59(2), 277-305.

Riding, A., Orser, B. J., Spence, M., & Belanger, B. (2012). Financing new venture exporters. *Small Business Economics*, 38(2), 147-163.

Ripollés, M., & Blesa, A. (2020). And yet, non-equity cooperative entries do improve international performance: uncovering the role of networks' social capital. *Small Business Economics*, 55(3), 761-776.

Ripollés, M., Blesa, A., & Monferrer, D. (2012). Factors enhancing the choice of higher resource commitment entry modes in international new ventures. *International Business Review*, 21(4), 648-666.

Robson, P. J., Akuetteh, C. K., Westhead, P., & Wright, M. (2012). Exporting intensity, human capital and business ownership experience. *International Small Business Journal*, 30(4), 367-387.

Rodríguez-Serrano, M.A., & Martín-Armario, E. (2019). Born-global SMEs, performance, and dynamic absorptive capacity: Evidence from Spanish firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(2), 298-326.

Roza, M., Van den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2011). Offshoring strategy: Motives, functions, locations, and governance modes of small, medium-sized and large firms. *International Business Review*, 20(3), 314-323.

Sadeghi, A., Rose, E. L., & Chetty, S. (2018). Disentangling the effects of post-entry speed of internationalisation on export performance of INVs. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(7), 780-806.

Sadeghi, V. J., Nkongolo-Bakenda, J. M., Anderson, R. B., & Dana, L. P. (2019). An institution-based view of international entrepreneurship: A comparison of context-based and universal determinants in developing and economically advanced countries. *International Business Review*, 28(6), 101588.

Safari, A., & Chetty, S. (2019). Multilevel psychic distance and its impact on SME internationalization. *International Business Review*, 28(4), 754-765.

- Sandberg, S. (2014). Experiential knowledge antecedents of the SME network node configuration in emerging market business networks. *International Business Review*, 23(1), 20-29.
- Sandulli, F. D., Fernández-Menéndez, J., Rodríguez-Duarte, A., & López-Sánchez, J. I. (2012). The productivity payoff of information technology in multimarket SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, 39(1), 99-117.
- Schwens, C., Zapkau, F. B., Bierwerth, M., Isidor, R., Knight, G., & Kabst, R. (2018). International entrepreneurship: a meta-analysis on the internationalization and performance relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 42(5), 734-768.
- Scuotto V., Del Giudice, M., Tarba, S., Messeni, P. A., & Chang, V. (2020). International social SMEs in emerging countries: Do governments support their international growth? *Journal of World Business*, 55(5), 100995.
- Sedzinauskienė, R., Sekliuckienė, J., & Zucchella, A. (2019). Networks' impact on the entrepreneurial internationalization: A literature review and research agenda. *Management International Review*, 59(5), 779-823.
- Segaro, E. L., Larimo, J., & Jones, M. V. (2014). Internationalisation of family small and medium sized enterprises: The role of stewardship orientation, family commitment culture and top management team. *International Business Review*, 23(2), 381-395.
- Shi, H. X., Graves, C., & Barbera, F. (2019). Intergenerational succession and internationalisation strategy of family SMEs: Evidence from China. *Long Range Planning*, 52(4), 101838.
- Shih, T. Y., & Wickramasekera, R. (2011). Export decisions within Taiwanese electrical and electronic SMEs: The role of management characteristics and attitudes. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28(2), 353-377.
- Sinkovics, R. R., Kurt, Y., & Sinkovics, N. (2018). The effect of matching on perceived export barriers and performance in an era of globalization discontents: Empirical evidence from UK SMEs. *International Business Review*, 27(5), 1065-1079.
- Sleuwaegen, L., & Onkelinx, J. (2014). International commitment, post-entry growth and survival of international new ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 106-120.
- Sousa, C. M., & Bradley, F. (2009). Effects of export assistance and distributor support on the performance of SMEs: The case of Portuguese export ventures. *International Small Business Journal*, 27(6), 681-701.
- Sousa, C. M., & Novello, S. (2014). The influence of distributor support and price adaptation on the export performance of small and medium-sized enterprises. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(4), 359-385.
- Spence, M., Orser, B., & Riding, A. (2011). A comparative study of international and domestic new ventures. *Management International Review*, 51(1), 3-21.
- St-Pierre, J., Sakka, O., & Bahri, M. (2018). External financing, export intensity and inter-organizational collaborations: Evidence from Canadian SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 56(sup1), 68-87.

- Stoian, M.-C., Dimitratos, P., & Plakoyiannaki, E. (2018). SME internationalization beyond exporting: A knowledge-based perspective across managers and advisers. *Journal of World Business*, 53(5), 768-779.
- Stoian, M.-C., Rialp, J., & Dimitratos, P. (2017). SME networks and international performance: Unveiling the significance of foreign market entry mode. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55(1), 128-148.
- Su, J., Zhai, Q., & Landström, H. (2015). Entrepreneurship research in China: Internationalization or contextualization? *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 27(1-2), 50-79.
- Suh, Y., & Kim, M. S. (2014). Internationally leading SMEs vs. internationalized SMEs: Evidence of success factors from South Korea. *International Business Review*, 23(1), 115-129.
- Swoboda, B., Meierer, M., Foscht, T., & Morschett, D. (2011). International SME alliances: the impact of alliance building and configurational fit on success. *Long Range Planning*, 44(4), 271-288.
- Symeonidou, N., Bruneel, J., & Autio, E. (2017). Commercialization strategy and internationalization outcomes in technology-based new ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(3), 302-317.
- Zyliowicz, D., & Galvin, T. (2010). Applying broader strokes: Extending institutional perspectives and agendas for international entrepreneurship research. *International Business Review*, 19(4), 317-332.
- Tajeddin, M., & Carney, M. (2019). African Business Groups: How Does Group Affiliation Improve SMEs' Export Intensity? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 43(6), 1194-1222.
- Tan, A., Brewer, P., & Liesch, P. (2018). Rigidity in SME export commencement decisions. *International Business Review*, 27(1), 46-55.
- Tang, Y. K. (2011). The Influence of networking on the internationalization of SMEs: Evidence from internationalized Chinese firms. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(4), 374-398.
- Tasavori, M., Zaefarian, R., & Eng, T. Y. (2018). Internal social capital and international firm performance in emerging market family firms: The mediating role of participative governance. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(8), 887-910.
- Taylor, M., & Jack, R. (2013). Understanding the pace, scale and pattern of firm internationalization: An extension of the 'born global' concept. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(6), 701-721.
- Thanos, I. C., Dimitratos, P., & Sapouna, P. (2017). The implications of international entrepreneurial orientation, politicization, and hostility upon SME international performance. *International Small Business Journal*, 35(4), 495-514.
- Tolstoy, D. (2010). Network development and knowledge creation within the foreign market: A study of international entrepreneurial firms. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22(5), 379-402.
- Tolstoy, D. (2014). Differentiation in foreign business relationships: A study on small and medium-sized enterprises after their initial foreign market entry. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(1), 17-35.

- Trudgen, R., & Freeman, S. (2014). Measuring the performance of born-global firms throughout their development process: The roles of initial market selection and internationalisation speed. *Management International Review*, 54(4), 551-579.
- Uner, M. M., Kocak, A., Cavusgil, E., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2013). Do barriers to export vary for born globals and across stages of internationalization? An empirical inquiry in the emerging market of Turkey. *International Business Review*, 22(5), 800-813.
- Usui, T., Kotabe, M., & Murray, J. Y. (2017). A dynamic process of building global supply chain competence by new ventures: The case of Uniqlo. *Journal of International Marketing*, 25(3), 1-20.
- Vaillant, Y., Lafuente, E., & Bayon, M. C. (2019). Early internationalization patterns and export market persistence: a pseudo-panel data analysis. *Small Business Economics*, 53(3), 669-686.
- Valdaliso, J., Elola, A., Aranguren, M., & Lopez, S. (2011). Social capital, internationalization and absorptive capacity: The electronics and ICT cluster of the Basque Country. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(9-10), 707-733.
- Vanninen, H., Kuivalainen, O., & Ciravegna, L. (2017). Rapid multinationalization: Propositions for studying born micromultinationals. *International Business Review*, 26(2), 365-379.
- Vasilchenko, E., & Morrish, S. (2011). The role of entrepreneurial networks in the exploration and exploitation of internationalization opportunities by information and communication technology firms. *Journal of International Marketing*, 19(4), 88-105
- Vendrell-Herrero, F., Gomes, E., Mellahi, K., & Child, J. (2017). Building international business bridges in geographically isolated areas: The role of foreign market focus and outward looking competences in Latin American SMEs. *Journal of World Business*, 52 (4), 489-502.
- Villar, C., Alegre, J., & Pla-Barber, J. (2014). Exploring the role of knowledge management practices on exports: A dynamic capabilities view. *International Business Review*, 23(1), 38-44.
- Villena Manzanares, F. (2019). Export performance of SMEs: An empirical analysis of the mediating role of corporate image. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(2), 386-399.
- Vissak, T., & Masso, J. (2015). Export patterns: Typology development and application to Estonian data. *International Business Review*, 24(4), 652-664.
- Voudouris, I., Dimitratos, P., & Salavou, H. (2011). Entrepreneurial learning in the international new high-technology venture. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(3), 238-258.
- Walther, O. (2012). Traders, agricultural entrepreneurs and the development of cross-border regions in West Africa. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(3-4), 123-141.
- Wang, Q., & Liu, C. Y. (2015). Transnational activities of immigrant-owned firms and their performances in the USA. *Small Business Economics*, 44(2), 345-359.
- Williams, C., & Spielmann, N. (2019). Institutional pressures and international market orientation in SMEs: Insights from the French wine industry. *International Business Review*, 28(5), 101582.

Williams, C., Du, J., & Zhang, H. (2020). International orientation of Chinese internet SMEs: Direct and indirect effects of foreign and indigenous social networking site use. *Journal of World Business*, 55 (3), 101051.

Wood, E., Khavul, S., Perez-Nordtvedt, L., Prakhya, S., Velarde Dabrowski, R., & Zheng, C. (2011). Strategic commitment and timing of internationalization from emerging markets: Evidence from China, India, Mexico, and South Africa. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(2), 252-282.

Xiao, J. (2015). The effects of acquisition on the growth of new technology-based firms: Do different types of acquirers matter? *Small Business Economics*, 45(3), 487-504.

Yan, H., Hu, X., & Liu, Y. (2020). The international market selection of Chinese SMEs: How institutional influence overrides psychic distance. *International Business Review*, 101703.

Yang, M., & Gabrielsson, P. (2018). The interface of international marketing and entrepreneurship research: Review, synthesis, and future directions. *Journal of International Marketing*, 26(4), 18-37.

Yang, M.M., Li, T., & Wang, Y. (2020). What explains the degree of internationalization of early-stage entrepreneurial firms? A multilevel study on the joint effects of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, opportunity-motivated entrepreneurship, and home-country institutions. *Journal of World Business*, 55(6), 101114.

Yang, X., Li, J., Stanley, L. J., Kellermanns, F. W., & Li, X. (2020). How family firm characteristics affect internationalization of Chinese family SMEs. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 37(2), 417-448.

Yu, J., Gilbert, B. A., & Oviatt, B. M. (2011). Effects of alliances, time, and network cohesion on the initiation of foreign sales by new ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(4), 424-446.

Zaefarian, R., Eng, T. Y., & Tasavori, M. (2016). An exploratory study of international opportunity identification among family firms. *International Business Review*, 25(1), 333-345.

Zhang, M., & Merchant, H. (2020). A causal analysis of the role of institutions and organizational proficiencies on the innovation capability of Chinese SMEs. *International Business Review*, 29(2), 101638.

Zhang, X., Ma, X., Wang, Y., & Wang, Y. (2014). How can emerging market small and medium-sized enterprises maximise internationalisation benefits? The moderating effect of organisational flexibility. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(6), 667-692.

Zhang, X., Ma, X., Wang, Y., Li, X., & Huo, D. (2016). What drives the internationalization of Chinese SMEs? The joint effects of international entrepreneurship characteristics, network ties, and firm ownership. *International Business Review*, 25(2), 522-534.

Zhu, Q., Qu, Y., Geng, Y., & Fujita, T. (2017). A comparison of regulatory awareness and green supply chain management practices among Chinese and Japanese manufacturers. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26(1), 18-30.