



Data Article

Survey data on organizational resources and capabilities, export marketing strategy, export competitiveness, and firm performance in exporting firms in Indonesia



Unggul Heriqbaldi^a, Achmad Jayadi^a, Angga Erlando^a,
Bhimo Rizky Samudro^b, Wahyu Widodo^c, Miguel Angel Esquivias^{a,*}

^a Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

^b Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

^c Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 October 2022

Revised 17 March 2023

Accepted 28 March 2023

Available online 5 April 2023

Dataset link: [Government assistance for exporting firms in Indonesia \(Original data\)](#)

Keywords:

Export promotion programs

Resource-based view

Organizational resources

Firm capabilities

Export marketing strategies

Export competitiveness

Export performance

Small and medium enterprises

Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This article presents a dataset of 204 exporting firms surveyed in Indonesia to assess the internationalization and participation of enterprises in government export promotion programs (EPP). Under a resource-based view (RBV) approach, the dataset includes four dimensions of government export assistance programs, three dimensions capturing organizational resources and organizational capabilities. In addition, the survey collects data on the firms' export marketing strategies, competitiveness, and market performance. Firm-level characteristics are identified to reveal the organizational characteristics, the companies' strategic features, and market orientation. The dataset also includes obstacles the companies face across dimensions and sub-components with critical attributes. In total, the dataset includes 19 constructs of questions with 180 variables. The dataset can be used to test the firms' competitive advantage in export markets, assess the role of government programs in the firms' export performance, examine export barriers as predictors, mediators, and moderators of export performance, etc. The dataset can

Abbreviations: EPP, export promotion programs; RBV, resource-based view; SEM, Structural Equation Model.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: miguel@feb.unair.ac.id (M.A. Esquivias).

Social media: [@jayadinita](#) (A. Jayadi), [@AnggaErlando](#) (A. Erlando), [@esquiviasid](#) (M.A. Esquivias)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2023.109112>

2352-3409/© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

be used under different theoretical approaches, i.e., RBV, internationalization process, or institutional theories.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Specifications Table

Subject	Strategy and Management
Specific subject area	National export promotion programs and export performance: the intervening role of organizational resources and capabilities, marketing strategies, and competitive advantage
Type of data	Anonymized raw data (.csv) and tables
How the data were acquired	A web-based survey using Google Forms, presented in Bahasa Indonesia. The link is as follows: https://bit.ly/SurveyEksportir
Data format	Raw, filtered, and partially analyzed
Description of data collection	The raw data were collected through a web-based survey targeting managers of exporting firms in Indonesia. The survey links and invitations were distributed via email and WhatsApp to 600 firms, randomly selected from a validated dataset of 1.155 exporter firms listed in government and public directories. Two hundred and four responses were completed. Incomplete responses were eliminated. The invitation to complete the voluntary survey was sent to managers of exporting firms on behalf of the Ministry of National Development Planning of the Republic of Indonesia in collaboration with Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia. The survey was distributed between July and September 2022.
Data source location	The online survey covered a sample of exporting firms from 18 provinces in Indonesia: Bali, Banten, Central Java, Central Sulawesi, DI Yogyakarta, DKI Jakarta, East Java, Jambi, Kepulauan Riau, Lampung, Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, North Sumatera, Riau, South Sulawesi, West Java, West Nusa Tenggara, and West Sumatera.
Data accessibility	Repository name: Mendeley Data Heriqbaldi, Unggul; Esquivias, Miguel Angel; Jayadi, Akhmad; Erlando, Angga; Samudro, Bhimo Rizky; Widodo, Wahyu (2022), "Government assistance for exporting firms in Indonesia", Mendeley Data, V1, doi: 10.17632/rxnj476rg5.1 Direct URL to data: https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/rxnj476rg5/1

Value of the Data

- This data collection offers multiple indicators to measure participation in government export promotion programs (EPP) at the corporate level in Indonesia. The core components of the EPP comprise information sharing, education and training, trade mobility, and financial aid.
- This data collection can be applied to examine how government support programs affect Indonesian business competitiveness and export performance. Policymakers can examine the efficacy of each support program and modify it according to company-specific factors available in the dataset.
- The dataset can be utilized by the scientific communities to understand and identify how the internationalization of business activities is affected by a firm's resources, capabilities, international marketing strategies, and competitiveness.
- This dataset can be used by the government through the agency in charge of improving assistance programs. Examples include boosting the relevance of export training and education curriculum, making certain trade mobility options more available, and delivering financial schemes to potential exporters with high efficacy.

- This dataset can be used by professors in econometrics courses in higher education institutions, particularly in relation to the use of Structural Equation models (SEM), logistic regression, and clustering analysis.
- Future studies can use the dataset to empirically examine firm export performance under different Internationalization theories.

1. Objectives

Understanding firm internationalization is an important area of investigation in international marketing research, management, and international economics. When the export is sought, firms' internal resources and capabilities often interact with external factors such as government assistance. The Indonesian economy offers a suitable setting to analyze firm internationalization and government assistance for global market expansion because Indonesia is one of the largest emerging economies globally, with rapid growth in exports. Firms in Indonesia employ internal resources and capabilities to develop export marketing strategies. The government assists these firms by providing external resources and helping them build capabilities. With the right and properly executed export marketing strategies, firms could achieve global competitiveness in cost, product, and services, becoming more profitable with improved global performance. Beside, the questionnaire includes three blocks of questions aimed at capturing the export marketing strategy of firms, the perception of export competitiveness, and the export firm performance related to the market (sales performance) and financial performance.

2. Data Description

We collected data to better understand organizational resources and capabilities related to export activities in Indonesia. Developing countries (such as Indonesia) are new to export promotion programs, so data on their firm internationalization process are scarce. Therefore, the collected data in this study can help illustrate the participation of firms in government assistance programs aimed at improving firms' resources and capabilities. The data also helps to better understand export strategy, competitiveness, and international sales performance. The companies provided information on barriers to exports and obstacles perceived by exporters in Indonesia in terms of access to government support, resources, capabilities, strategy, and competitiveness. To guide the data collection, surveyed firms are defined as:

- A privately-owned firm with transnational sales in the last three years
- A firm that has participated in any sort of export assistance program
- A firm that is at least partially owned by Indonesian investors

The survey instrument was developed following the conceptual framework of Leonidou Palihawadana and Theodosiou [1]. We adopted the scales in the questionnaire following previous studies [1]. Table 1 summarizes the variables in the datasets.

The dataset contains self-reported responses from key informants (managers or individuals holding management positions in export activities). Table 2 provides the respondents' general characteristics. Firms from all merchandise sectors, sizes, ages, and all locations in Indonesia were invited to participate.

Table 3 provides the descriptive statistics of the variables in the dataset and the appropriate validity and reliability tests. The survey instrument was tested for validity and reliability to ensure that it follows the conceptual framework of Leonidou Palihawadana and Theodosiou [1].

Table 1
Variables, variable and question types, value labels, and second-order constructs.

Field(s)	Variable(s)	Variable Type	Type of question	Value labels	Second order Construct
101	Sector of the firm	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: Food & Drinks, 2: Textiles, 3: Furniture, 4: Electric, electronics, and machinery, 5: Automotive, 6: Agricultural commodities, 7: Chemical and pharmaceutical, 8: Handicraft, 9: Others	-
102_City	Location of the firm	Nominal	Single-choice question	City	-
102_ Province	Location of the firm	Nominal	Single-choice question	Province	-
103	Industrial area	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: yes; 2: no	-
104	Special economic zone	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: yes; 2: no	-
105	Total labor (workers)	Ordinal	Classification question	1: 5 – 19; 2: 20 – 99; 3: More than 100	-
106	Share of exports from total output	Ordinal	Classification question	1: Less than 10%; 2: 10% – 40%; 3: 41% - 75%; 4: More than 75%	-
107	Age as firm (years)	Ordinal	Classification question	1: Less than 2; 2: 3 – 5; 3: 6 - 10; 4: 11 – 15; 5: 16 – 20; 6: more than 20	-
108	Age as exporter (years)	Ordinal	Classification question	1: Never; 2: Less than 2 years; 3: 2 - 5; 4: 6 – 10; 5: 11 – 15; 6: 16 -20; 7: more than 20	-
109	Share of non-production workers to total labor	Ordinal	Classification question	1: Less than 25%; 2: 25% – 50%; 3: 51% - 75%; 4: More than 75%	-
110	Export division	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: yes; 2: no	-
111	Law services	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: Government; 2: Internal; 3: External (private); 4: None	-
112	Type of exported goods	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	1: Raw Materials, 2: Intermediate Goods, 3: Final Products	-
113	Status as Exporter	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: Regular (every month); 2: Non-regular but active (at least once a year but not monthly); 3: Non-Regular (no exports last year)	-
114	Destination Markets	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	1: ASEAN (Southeast Asia), 2: East Asia (China, Japan, S Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, etc.), 3: South Asia (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh), 4: Europe & Russia;	-

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Field(s)	Variable(s)	Variable Type	Type of question	Value labels	Second order Construct
115	Film's role in exported goods (activity type)	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	5: North America (USA, Canada, Mexico); 6: Latin America and Caribbean (Central and South America); 7: Africa; 8: Middle East; 9: Australia, New Zealand, Oceania 1: Exporter and producers; 2: Design Product; 3: Trader (no production)	-
116	Brand or trademark	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: yes; 2: no	-
117	Logistic services	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	1: Independent; 2: Through Trader; 3: Forwarding service; 4: Association; 5: Cooperative	-
118	International partnership	Nominal	Single-choice question	1: yes; 2: no	-
2A1...2A5, 2A7	Reported participation in export promotion programs related to information (five programs and one perceived obstacle)	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Promotion Programs: Information
2A6	Source of access to information programs	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	1: Government, 2: Non-Government (external firm), 3: Independent (internal company)	-
2A8	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Promotion Programs: Information
2B1...2B5, 2B7	Reported participation in export promotion programs	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Promotion Programs: Training and Education
2B6	Source of Education and Training Programs	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	1: Government, 2: Non-Government (external firm), 3: Independent (internal company)	-
2B8	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Promotion Programs
2C1...2C4, 2C6	Reported participation in export promotion programs	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Promotion Programs: Trade Mobility

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Field(s)	Variable(s)	Variable Type	Type of question	Value labels	Second order Construct
2C5	Source of Trade Mobility Programs	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	1: Government, 2: Non-Government (external firm), 3: Independent (internal company)	-
2C7	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Promotion Programs Trade Mobility
2D1...2D3, 2D5	Reported participation in export promotion programs	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Promotion Programs Financial Aid
2D4	Source of financial access	Nominal	Multiple-choice question	1: Government, 2: Non-Government (external firm), 3: Independent (internal company)	-
2D6	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Promotion Programs Financial Aid
3A1...3A7	Perceived available organizational resources	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Organizational Resources (Managerial)
3A8	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Organizational Resources (Managerial)
3B1...3B6	Perceived available organizational resources	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Organizational Resources (Production & R&D)
3B7	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Organizational Resources (Production & R&D)
3C1...3C5	Perceived available organizational resources	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Organizational Resources (Intellectual)
3C6	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Organizational Resources (Intellectual)
4A1 ... 4A5	Perceived available organizational capabilities	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Organizational Capabilities (Business Opportunities)
4A6	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Organizational Capabilities (Business Opportunities)
4B1 ... 4A5	Perceived available organizational capabilities	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Organizational Capabilities (Building Relationships)
4B6	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Organizational Capabilities (Building Relationships)

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Field(s)	Variable(s)	Variable Type	Type of question	Value labels	Second order Construct
4C1 ... 4C5	Perceived available organizational capabilities	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Organizational Capabilities (Innovation)
4C6	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Organizational Capabilities (Innovation)
5A1...5A6	Perceived existent Export Marketing Strategy	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Marketing Strategy (Product)
5A7	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Marketing Strategy (Product)
5B1...5B6	Perceived existent Export Marketing Strategy	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Marketing Strategy (Price)
5B7	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Marketing Strategy (Price)
5C1...5C6	Perceived existent Export Marketing Strategy	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Marketing Strategy (Distribution)
5C7	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Marketing Strategy (Distribution)
5D1...5D6	Perceived existent Export Marketing Strategy	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Strongly Disagree – 7: Strongly Agree	Export Marketing Strategy (Promotion)
5D7	Rank of perceived highest obstacles	Ordinal	Ordering	1: Highest Obstacle – 3: Lowest Obstacle	Export Marketing Strategy (Promotion)
6A1...6A4	Perceived competitiveness change in Cost	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Worse – 7: Better	Cost Competitiveness
6B1...6B4	Perceived competitiveness change in Product	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Worse – 7: Better	Product Competitiveness
6C1...6C4	Perceived competitiveness change in Service	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Worse – 7: Better	Service Competitiveness
701...706	Perceived Market performance	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Very Low – 7: Very High	Market Performance
801...806	Perceived Financial performance	Ordinal	7-point Likert scale	1: Very Low – 7: Very High	Financial Performance

Table 2

Characteristics of respondent companies.

Number of workers	Number of Firms	Percentage
5-19 People	126	63%
20-99 People	44	22%
> 100 People	32	16%
Export Proportion to total production		
< 10%	71	36%
10%-40%	62	31%
41%-75%	39	20%
>75%-100%	28	14%
Company age since the establishment		
	Amount	
< 2 Years	31	16%
3-5 Years	61	31%
6-10 Years	46	23%
11-15 Years	20	10%
16-20 Years	7	4%
>20 Years	35	18%
Company age since becoming an exporter		
	Amount	
<2 Years	70	35%
2-5 Years	65	33%
6-10 Years	26	13%
11-15 Years	8	4%
16-20 Years	12	6%
>20 Years	19	10%

Notes. Total Sample 204 export companies.

Table 3

Research instruments validity and reliability test results.

Indicator		Item to total		CR		AVE
		Correlation (r)		Alpha (Status)		
Utilization of Export Promotion Program (EPP)						
Scale (1) strongly disagree and (7) strongly agree						
Export Promotion Program in Information	1. Overseas market opportunity information	0.818	*	0.783	*	0.788
	2. Export technical information and requirements	0.808	*			
	3. Export publications	0.757	*			
	4. Information about specific sectors	0.813	*			
	5. Information about the export destination	0.754	*			
	6. Access to information is an obstacle for the firm	0.397	*			

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

Indicator		Item to total Correlation (r)		CR		AVE
		R (Status)		Alpha (Status)		
Export Promotion Program in Education and Training	1. Basic training on exports	0.824	*	0.808	*	0.678
	2. Training for documentation and management exports	0.842	*			
	3. Export counselling and coaching	0.885	*			
	4. Online exports training	0.871	*			
	5. Export training through e-commerce channels	0.850	*			
	6. Access, frequency and variety of training are an obstacle	0.857	*			
Export Promotion Program for Trade Mobility	1. Trade show	0.790	*	0.803	*	0.641
	2. Participate/follow trade missions	0.830	*			
	3. Take advantage of outside trade office support	0.772	*			
	4. Online digital platforms	0.840	*			
	5. Limited access and frequency of mobility activities	0.866	*			
	6. Trade show	0.875	*			
Export Promotion Program for Financial Aid	Applying for credit for export activities	0.898	*	0.816	*	0.672
	Applying for an export credit guarantee	0.883	*			
	Obtaining financial assistance for exports	0.799	*			
	Limited access to finance is an obstacle	0.600	*			
Source Export Related Organizations (Has)						
Scale (1) strongly disagree to (7) for strongly agree						
Source Managerial capacity	1. Interest/commitment to export	0.656	*	0.772	*	0.620
	2. Managerial ability	0.772	*			
	3. Experience with overseas market	0.770	*			
	4. Very positive behavior in supporting exports	0.780	*			
	1. Allocation of a sufficient number of personnel for export	0.730	*			
	2. Have trained personnel/staff	0.800	*			
	3. Limited managerial resources are an obstacle	0.343	*			

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

Indicator		Item to total Correlation (r)		CR		AVE
		R (Status)		Alpha (Status)		
Source Production and Research & Development capacity	1. Modern production technology and equipment	0.772	*	0.765	*	0.500
	2. Export-only production capacity	0.751	*			
	3. Patent/brand/ royalty etc.	0.682	*			
	4. Technical knowledge for export-only production	0.673	*			
	5. Research and development budget	0.723	*			
	6. Limited production and R&D resources are an obstacle	0.394	*			
Source of intellectual capacity	1. Knowledge of overseas requests	0.855	*	0.806	*	0.677
	2. Knowledge of business practices in the destination country	0.871	*			
	3. Knowledge of export regulations and documentation	0.877	*			
	4. Knowledge of logistics needs	0.890	*			
	5. Limited intellectual resources are an obstacle	0.527	*			
Ability to Identify Business Opportunities Abroad	1. Overseas market	0.866	*	0.802	*	0.654
	2. Business opportunities	0.854	*			
	3. Contacting prospective overseas customers	0.809	*			
	4. Looking for important information in foreign markets	0.862	*			
	5. Limited capability/ability to identify business opportunities	0.532	*			
Capability to Build Relationships	1. Understanding the demands of the customer	0.799	*	0.779	*	0.569
	2. Looking for/getting company representatives	0.683	*			
	3. Making business ties with partners overseas	0.826	*			
	4. Build and maintain relationships with suppliers	0.772	*			
	5. Limited ability to build relationships/relationships abroad is an obstacle	0.489	*			

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

Indicator		Item to total		CR		AVE
		R (Status)	Correlation (r)	Alpha (Status)		
Innovation Capability	1. Able to apply new methods and ideas	0.818	*	0.794	*	0.596
	2. Able to develop new/innovative products	0.842	*			
	3. Able to apply innovative marketing methods	0.810	*			
	4. Able to identify competitor trends/tendencies	0.782	*			
	5. Limited innovation capability is an obstacle	0.553	*			
Export Marketing Strategy (Able to fulfil/ Offer/ Apply):						
Scale (1) strongly disagree to (7) for strongly agree						
Product-Related Marketing Strategy	1. Product standard/quality	0.773	*	0.787	*	0.564
	1. Customer taste	0.825	*			
	2. Customer demands (packaging/labelling)	0.810	*			
	3. Customer demands (branding)	0.789	*			
	4. Customer demands (warranty/ after-sales service)	0.783	*			
	5. Limited product-related marketing strategies are an obstacle	0.523	*			
Price-Related Marketing Strategy	1. The attractive profit margin for importers	0.814	*	0.785	*	0.631
	2. Attractive payment schemes for partners	0.770	*			
	3. Attractive terms of sale	0.842	*			
	4. Price matching/competitive price	0.758	*			
	5. Satisfactory retail price	0.838	*			
	6. Limited marketing strategies related to price are an obstacle	0.444	*			

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

Indicator		Item to total Correlation (r)		CR		AVE
		R (Status)	*	Alpha (Status)	*	
Marketing Strategy Related to Distribution	1. Fast delivery	0.819	*	0.786	*	0.643
	2. Effective inventory replenishment	0.879	*			
	3. Sufficient distribution coverage	0.790	*			
	4. Managing distributors/agents	0.787	*			
	5. Responding timely to orders	0.791	*			
	6. A limited distribution strategy is a constraint	0.393	*			
Promotion-Related Marketing Strategy	1. Improve promotional activities	0.840	*	0.790	*	0.581
	2. Improve community relations	0.837	*			
	3. Increase personal sales	0.825	*			
	4. Increase advertising	0.806	*			
	5. Increase sales instantly	0.825	*			
	6. A limited promotion strategy is an obstacle	0.426	*			
Export Competitive Advantage						
Scale: Worse (1) to Better (7)						
Export Competitive Advantage from Cost Aspect	1. Raw material cost	0.892	*	0.838	*	0.711
	2. Unit cost (average cost)	0.888	*			
	3. Distribution fee	0.875	*			
	4. Cost of sales	0.876	*			
Export Competitive Advantage from Product Aspect	1. Product differentiation	0.853	*	0.833	*	0.680
	2. New product introduction	0.868	*			
	3. Product variety	0.906	*			
	4. Brand awareness/product brand recognition	0.851	*			
Export Competitive Advantage from the Service Aspect	1. Product availability	0.892	*	0.831	*	0.630
	2. Product delivery reliability	0.859	*			
	3. Pre and after-sales service	0.829	*			
	4. Ease of public access to products	0.847	*			

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

Indicator	Item to total Correlation (r)		CR		AVE	
	R (Status)		Alpha (Status)			
Export Market Performance (Able to maintain/Improve)						
Scale: Worse (1) to Better (7)						
Export Market Performance	1. Value (VALUE)	0.833	*	0.806	*	0.730
	2. Customers	0.829	*			
	3. new customer	0.813	*			
	4. Company/product reputation	0.888	*			
	5. Partner satisfaction	0.897	*			
	6. Delivering products according to customer wishes	0.808	*			
Export Financial Performance (Able to improve)						
Scale (1) very low to (7) for very high						
Export Financial Performance	1. Sales volume	0.917	*	0.817	*	0.721
	2. Share/niche	0.892	*			
	3. Export profitability	0.890	*			
	4. Export sales intensity	0.922	*			
	5. Return on Investment (ROI)	0.922	*			
	6. Return on Assets (ROA)	0.942	*			

Note $n = 204$; Cr. Cronbach's Alpha, AVE: Average variance extracted, CR: Composite reliability; R: Item to total Correlation; * Valid and Reliable in line with Bagozzi and Yi [2], suggesting a minima Alpha value of 0.7 and AVE greater than 0.5 for Structural Equation Models).

3. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

3.1. Experimental Design

The survey was designed based on previous theoretical models analyzing the impact of export promotion programs, organizational resources, and organizational capabilities [1]. The instrument consists of 18 constructs from the literature review [1]. The measures in the different questions were adapted from previous research whenever available. The concepts were derived from the widely used theoretical conceptualizations: the resource-based view (RBV) approach. The instrument used different question formats to minimize bias in the responses. We adopted the 7-point Likert scale following the RBV approaches in past research [1,3,4], and in line with management, marketing, and exporting literature [1,5,6]. Although no specific measurements have been established in the field of exports, the leading reference [1] used the 1-7 scale following the recommended procedures to develop a measurement scale [7].

The national export promotion programs were grouped into four categories that cover most government initiatives. The concepts and scales for the EPP were implemented by Leonidou et al. [1] to facilitate the empirical testing and offer a more objective comparison with earlier studies. Respondents identified their level of adoption and use of these programs. The programs were grouped based on a series of focus group discussions (FGDs) with the Ministry of Planning and Development of Indonesia and with the participation of other ministries related to export pro-

motion. We also provided different indicators of firm performance, distinguishing export market and financial performance.

The survey instrument was developed in six parts. The first section focused on firm profile and general export activities, including years of establishment, sector, geographical location, number of workers, the share of output exported, age as an exporter, the share of workers in production activities, type of goods exported, destination markets, partnerships, method of exporting, and so on. The second section assessed the adoption of government export promotion programs—comprising four groups and 17 items—in the last three years of operations. The third section collected data on export-related to organizational resources, i.e., managerial resources (six items), production and research and development (five items), and intellectual resources (four items). The fourth part covers organizational capabilities, i.e., capabilities related to business opportunities (four items), building relationships (four items), and innovation (four items). The fifth section covers export market strategies such as product strategies, price, distribution, and promotion, each containing five items. The sixth section covers export competitiveness related to costs, products, and services, each containing four items. The seventh section focuses on export market performance using six assessment items. The eighth section focuses on financial performance using six assessment items.

Section two (export promotion programs) to section five (export marketing strategies) also include questions assessing the perceived obstacles in each block of questions, and four items to assess the extent to which lack of access to programs, resources, capabilities, or lack of effective strategy hinders the firm. Questions on barriers are targeted to firms with a high degree of perceived limitations on specific blocks of questions.

Before launching the survey, the questionnaire was submitted for review to policymakers and academics and tested with twenty firms. In line with earlier empirical studies in business research [6], we tested the potential nonrespondent bias by comparing the responses from the 20 managers in the instrument testing with the full sample. We performed a t-test procedure for two independent samples to compare group means to test our experiments using three variables (total labor force, proportion of exports to total production, and current ratio of production to non-production workforce). The results indicate no statistical difference between group mean differences exists between the two groups.

A second test was to remove the possibility of common method bias in our data. We tested one of the provinces (East Java) and the rest of the sample (all other provinces) to see the differences in the mean by selecting three different variables: total labor force, the proportion of exports to total production, and the current ratio of production to the non-production workforce. The t-test procedure for two independent samples indicates no statistical difference between the group means based on regional location. After the two experiments, we could conclude that nonrespondent and common method bias are not an issue in our data.

4. Materials

The survey was distributed via email to more than 2,000 export companies in Indonesia. The directories of companies were collected from government agencies and publicly accessible databases. The firms included in the directories are exporting firms, randomly selected. The survey was administered online, targeting owners, export managers, or export-related personnel. Data are presented as anonymized raw data (comma-separated values or CSV). The Word document containing the full text (questionnaire) employed in the survey is also attached.

5. Methods

We initially collected export company directories through various ministries in Indonesia, the national statistics bureau, the export bank with an extensive database, the Ministry of Industry,

and business associations. More than 2,000 companies were collected, and their data were compared with public information on the Internet. Of the total of 2,000 firms validated, 1,155 firms exported at least once a year in the last three years. The 1,155 exporting firms were confirmed through a database provided by the Ministry of Planning and Development of Indonesia (combined datasets from different ministries and directories), and a dataset by Statistics Indonesia. Email addresses and telephone numbers were identified to establish contact. We sent questionnaires to 600 firms assuming that only one-third would respond (common response rate in Indonesia). The 600 firms were randomly selected from the 1,155 validated sampling framework. The randomly selected sample of firms includes companies from different sectors (manufacturing 67% and agriculture 23%), firm size (62.7% small, 22.5% medium, and 14.7% large), and locations (84% are located in the widespread manufacturing corridor in the Java Island), in line with earlier datasets for exporting firms in Indonesia [8]. Considering a 5.5% margin error, given a 90% confidence interval, the survey aimed at achieving at least 188 completed questionnaires from the exporting firms (ideal sample size of 188). We retrieved 204 valid responses, which equals a response rate of 34%. Achieving a representative sample for exporting firms in Indonesia requires a minimum of 188 firms. Our sample of 204 firms is in line with previous studies with a range of respondents between 50 and 285 [1,3–5], and similar to earlier studies in Indonesia targeting 200 respondents to reach the minimum representative sample size for exporting firms in the country [8].

To ensure security and privacy, a letter of introduction issued by the Ministry of Planning and Development was delivered by researchers from Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia, explaining the data collection purposes. The survey was anonymous to protect the participants' privacy (individuals or companies). The data were collected between July and September 2022 from key informants at senior/export management levels.

To reduce the bias, informants were asked screening questions; (1) responsibility for export activities, (2) directly related to the firm's exports, (3) knowledge of export activities, and (4) having the security and authority to answer the instrument questions [9]. An invitation and a link to a web-based survey were sent via email or electronic messaging (WhatsApp) to informants. Initially, the response rate was about 10%. After several follow-ups and recalls (we set a maximum of three follow-ups per respondent to avoid bias in data collection), the study collected 225 fully completed responses. Twenty-one surveys were not completed correctly (duplicates or incomplete), so they were eliminated. In addition, since the questions were directed toward export-related activities, only surveys completed by a person in positions, positions or responsibilities related to export were included in the study sample.

Ethics Statements

Ethics approval for survey studies is not required. Data are properly anonymized, and informed consent was obtained at the time of original data collection.

The Survey instrument includes a consent form to get survey participants' informed written consent that the data collected will be used for research and publication purposes while keeping personal details confidential.

Any personal information that "could reasonably identify respondents was removed or changed before data files were shared with other researchers or results were made public."

CRedit Author Statement

Unggul Heriqbaldi: Contributed to the Design of the Survey (Team Leader) and Writing – the original draft; **Achmad Jayadi:** Contributed as survey manager and Writing – review; **Angga Erlando:** Supported the Data collection by coordinating the teams of surveyors in the East Indonesia region, as well as Data curation; **Bhimo Rizky Samudro:** Supported the Data collection

by coordinating the teams of surveyors in Central Java, Indonesia region, as well as Formal analysis; **Wahyu Widodo**: Supported the Data collection by coordinating the teams of surveyors in West Java, Indonesia region, as well as data Validation; **Miguel Angel Esquivias**: Contributed to the Direct Supervision of the project, Methodology, and Writing editing.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data Availability

[Government assistance for exporting firms in Indonesia \(Original data\)](#) (Mendeley Data).

Acknowledgments

Funding: This work was supported by the Research Grant Riset Kolaborasi Indonesia Tahun 2022 through the ministry of Education in the Republic of Indonesia, RKI/RKIA/2022/315.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:[10.1016/j.dib.2023.109112](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2023.109112).

References

- [1] L.C. Leonidou, D. Palihawadana, M. Theodosiou, National export-promotion programs as drivers of organizational resources and capabilities: effects on strategy, competitive advantage, and performance, *J. Int. Mark.* 19 (2) (2011) 1–29 Jun, doi:[10.1509/jimk.19.2.1](https://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.19.2.1).
- [2] R.P. Bagozzi, Y. Yi, On the evaluation of structural equation models, *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 16 (1) (1988) 74–94.
- [3] A.K. Shamsuddoha, M. Yunus Ali, Mediated effects of export promotion programs on firm export performance, *Asia Pac. J. Mark. Logist.* 18 (2) (2006) 93–110 Apr, doi:[10.1108/13555850610658255](https://doi.org/10.1108/13555850610658255).
- [4] O. Malca, J. Peña-Vinces, F.J. Acedo, Export promotion programmes as export performance catalysts for SMEs: insights from an emerging economy, *Small Bus. Econ.* 55 (3) (2020) 831–851 Oct, doi:[10.1007/s11187-019-00185-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00185-2).
- [5] L.C. Leonidou, C.S. Katsikeas, D.N. Coudounaris, Five decades of business research into exporting: a bibliographic analysis, *J. Int. Manag.* 16 (1) (2010) 78–91 Mar, doi:[10.1016/j.intman.2009.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2009.06.001).
- [6] N.A. Morgan, A. Kaleka, C.S. Katsikeas, Antecedents of export venture performance: a theoretical model and empirical assessment, *J. Mark.* 68 (1) (2004) 90–108, doi:[10.1509/jmkg.68.1.90.24028](https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.90.24028).
- [7] G.A. Churchill Jr., A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs, *J. Mark. Res.* 16 (February) (1979) 64–73.
- [8] M. Revindo, C. Gan, C. Nguyen, Internationalization strategy and process: evidence from Indonesian SMEs, *WJM* 8 (1) (2017) 59–74 Mar, doi:[10.21102/wjm.2017.03.81.05](https://doi.org/10.21102/wjm.2017.03.81.05).
- [9] J.P. Cannon, W.D. Perreault Jr, Buyer–seller relationships in business markets, *J. Mark. Res.* 36 (4) (1999) 439–460.