

**DETERMINANTS OF BUYER RELATIONSHIP INTENTION
FROM A SIGNALING PERSPECTIVE:
THE CASE OF VIETNAMESE IMPORTERS**

THI TUYET MAI NGUYEN

BA (NEU), MSc (SOAS, UL), MBus (UTS)

**A Thesis
Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

**University of Technology, Sydney
August 2007**

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of the requirements for a degree, except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

NGUYEN, Thi Tuyet Mai

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research could not have been completed without the guidance, suggestions, encouragement and assistance of a number of persons and organisations. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my principal supervisor, Associate Professor Nigel Barrett, whose invaluable advice, support and, most importantly encouragement, have made this thesis possible. My most sincere thanks are also extended to my co-supervisor, Dr Tho Nguyen, for his support, enthusiasm, his valuable advice on multivariate data analysis, and his endless patience in answering my questions. His insightful comments and guidance were gratefully received at critical stages of this process. His professionalism and conceptual guidance were paramount to the development of my ideas and to my success throughout the program.

I would like to give special thanks to Professor Jordan Louviere for his valuable comments and suggestions in my doctoral assessment report. I am truly indebted to Professor Louise Young for her interest in my work, her guidance and encouragement throughout my doctoral program. My appreciation is also expressed to Dr Ian Lings for his kind help and comments on the rehearsal of my doctoral assessment presentation. I would also like to thank the UTS academic and administrative staff for their support. In addition, I have very much appreciated the financial assistance from the University Graduate School, UTS (thesis completion grant); and from the School of Marketing for the proofreading service.

I wish to thank Huong Lam and her group for their tremendous assistance in the data-collection phase of my thesis. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the in-depth interviewees and managers of organisations who agreed to participate in my research. This thesis would not have been possible without their help.

My appreciation also extends to Cy Robinson and Pat Skinner, who generously took the time and effort to proofread the manuscript by correcting the presentation of the text and references to conform with standard usage and conventions (such as spelling, word usage, punctuation, use of prepositions and articles).

I owe a special debt to my parents and sisters for their unconditional love, support and encouragement in everything I do. I absolutely could not have survived this process without the patience, unlimited support and encouragement from my husband.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my son, my light in the darkness. You will never know how your love and emotional sensitivity have been helping me survive through these days.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
ABSTRACT	xvii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.2. RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION.....	1
1.3. RESEARCH PROBLEM, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVE	4
1.4. RESEARCH CONTEXT	10
1.5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	12
1.6. THESIS STRUCTURE.....	13
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
2.1. INTRODUCTION	15
2.2. RELATIONSHIP INTENTION	15
2.2.1. Relationship Intention Defined.....	16
2.2.1. Relationship Intention Studies	21
2.3. SIGNALING THEORY AND SIGNALING APPLICATIONS IN BUSINESS-TO-BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS	26

2.3.1. Information Economics and Signaling Theory	26
2.3.2. Signal Definitions	27
2.3.2.1. Signal Definitions in Different Contexts	27
2.3.2.2. Signal Definition in the Buyer–Seller Relationship Context	29
2.3.2.3. Signaling Cost and Signaling Effectiveness	31
2.3.3. Research Streams in Signaling Theory	32
2.3.3.1. Signaling Studies on Non-Marketing Fields	32
2.3.3.2. Signaling Studies on Marketing	32
2.3.4. Signaling in Buyer–Seller Relationships	36
2.3.5. Roles of Signal Quality in Influencing Buyer Relationship Intention	38
2.4. SUPPLIER SELECTION LITERATURE AND OFFER QUALITY	41
2.5. SIGNALS IN IMPORTER–EXPORTER RELATIONSHIPS	46
2.6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	49
CHAPTER 3: CONCEPTUAL MODEL – DETERMINANTS OF IMPORTER RELATIONSHIP INTENTION	50
3.1. INTRODUCTION	50
3.2. EXPORTER CREDIBILITY	50
3.2.1. Credibility in Buyer–Seller Relationships	50
3.2.2. Exporter Credibility	51
3.2.3. Exporter Credibility and Importer Relationship Intention	52
3.3. PERCEIVED PRODUCT QUALITY	54
3.3.1. Product Quality in Buyer–Seller Relationships	54
3.3.2. Perceived Product Quality	54
3.3.3. Perceived Product Quality and Exporter Credibility	56
3.4. PERCEIVED PRICE COMPETITIVENESS	57
3.4.1. Perceived Price Competitiveness in Buyer–Seller Relationships	57
3.4.2. Perceived Price Competitiveness and Exporter Credibility	58
3.5. PERCEIVED DELIVERY PERFORMANCE	59

3.5.1. Perceived Delivery Performance in Buyer–Seller Relationships	59
3.5.2. Perceived Delivery Performance	60
3.5.3. Perceived Delivery Performance and Exporter Credibility	60
3.6. SIGNAL CONSISTENCY AND SIGNAL CLARITY	62
3.6.1. Definitions.....	62
3.6.1.1. Signal Consistency.....	62
3.6.1.2. Signal Clarity	63
3.6.2. Signal Consistency, Signal Clarity and Perceived Product Quality	63
3.6.3. Signal Consistency, Signal Clarity and Perceived Price Competitiveness	65
3.6.4. Signal Consistency, Signal Clarity and Perceived Delivery Performance	66
3.6.5. Relationship between Signal Consistency and Signal Clarity	70
3.7. MODERATING FACTORS.....	70
3.7.1. Ownership Type: Privately Owned Firms vs State-Owned Firms.....	71
3.7.1.1. Overview of Ownership Type in Vietnam.....	71
3.7.1.2. Ownership Type and the Moderating Effect.....	73
3.7.2. Relationship Duration	75
3.8. COMPETING MODELS	76
3.8.1. A More Restrictive Competing Model	77
3.8.2. A Less Restrictive Competing Model.....	80
3.9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	80
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	82
4.1. INTRODUCTION	82
4.2. RESEARCH DESIGN AND JUSTIFICATION	82
4.3. MEASURE DEVELOPMENT.....	86
4.3.1. Relationship Intention.....	87
4.3.2. Exporter Credibility	89
4.3.3. Perceived Product Quality	90

4.3.4. Perceived Price Competitiveness	91
4.3.5. Perceived Delivery Performance	92
4.3.6. Signal Consistency	94
4.3.7. Signal Clarity	96
4.3.8. Moderating Variables.....	97
4.3.8.1. Ownership Type.....	97
4.3.8.2. Relationship Duration	97
4.4. PILOT STUDY	98
4.4.1. Reliability Assessment Method	99
4.4.2. Preliminary Assessment of Reliability.....	100
4.5. MAIN SURVEY	104
4.5.1. Sample Design	104
4.5.1.1. Sampling	104
4.5.1.2. Sample Size.....	104
4.5.2. Survey Method.....	105
4.5.3. Key Informant Method	107
4.5.4. Response Rate and Response Bias.....	109
4.6. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	110
4.7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	111
CHAPTER 5: CONSTRUCT VALIDATION.....	112
5.1. INTRODUCTION	112
5.2. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS	112
5.2.1. Ownership	112
5.2.2. Firm Age	113
5.2.3. Types of Business	114
5.2.4. Geographic Location of Exporting Partners	114
5.2.5. Experience in Doing Business with Foreign Partners.....	115
5.2.6. Relationship Duration	115

5.3. CONSTRUCT VALIDITY AND THE USE OF CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS	116
5.3.1. Construct Validity	116
5.3.1.1. Unidimensionality.....	117
5.3.1.2. Reliability.....	118
5.3.1.3. Convergent Validity.....	120
5.3.1.4. Discriminant Validity.....	120
5.3.1.5. Nomological Validity.....	122
5.3.2. Estimation Method.....	124
5.3.3. Overall Model Fit Measures	125
5.4. CONSTRUCT VALIDATION RESULTS.....	128
5.4.1. Item Deletion	128
5.4.2. Results of Reliability Analysis.....	133
5.4.3. Pair-wise CFA Results.....	134
5.5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	164
CHAPTER 6: DATA ANALYSIS – THEORETICAL MODEL TESTING	166
6.1. INTRODUCTION	166
6.2. TWO-STEP APPROACH IN STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING	166
6.3. TESTING THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL USING THE TWO-STEP APPROACH	167
6.3.1. Test Results from the Measurement Model.....	167
6.3.2. Test Results from the Structural/Theoretical Model.....	172
6.4. COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE THEORETICAL MODEL AND ITS COMPETING MODELS.....	176
6.4.1. Comparisons of Model Fit	179
6.4.1.1 Comparison between the Theoretical Model and the Less Restrictive Competing Model.....	179
6.4.1.2. Comparison between the Theoretical Model and the More Restrictive Competing Model	181
6.4.2. Comparisons of Structural Paths.....	182

6.4.2.1. Comparison between the Theoretical Model and the Less Restrictive Competing Model	182
6.4.2.2. Comparison between the Theoretical Model and the More Restrictive Competing Model	185
6.5. HYPOTHESIS TESTING RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	185
6.6. MODERATING EFFECTS	193
6.6.1. Multi-group Analysis in Structural Equation Modeling	194
6.6.2. SEM Results of Structural Path Invariance across Ownership Type.....	199
6.6.3. SEM Results of Structural Path Invariance across Relationship Duration.	205
6.7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	211
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	212
7.1. INTRODUCTION	212
7.2. SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	213
7.3. RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS	215
7.3.1. Theoretical Contributions	215
7.3.2. Methodological Contributions	217
7.3.3. Contextual Contributions	218
7.4. RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS	219
7.4.1. Managerial Implications	219
7.4.2. Implications for Government.....	222
7.5. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS	223
7.6. PROPOSED DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	225
BIBLIOGRAPHY	231

APPENDICES	266
Appendix A1: Questionnaire in English	267
Appendix A2: Questionnaire in Vietnamese	272
Appendix B: Normality of Variables	277
Appendix C1: Covariance Matrix	278
Appendix C2: Correlation Matrix	280
Appendix D: Pair-wise CFA Results: Factor Loadings	282
Appendix E1: Fit Indices of the Measurement Model	285
Appendix E2: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Measurement Model	286
Appendix F1: Unstandardised Regression Weights of the Theoretical Model	288
Appendix F2: Unstandardised Regression Weights of the Less Restrictive Competing Model	289
Appendix F3: Unstandardised Regression Weights of the More Restrictive Competing Model	290
Appendix G1: Standardised Residuals of the Theoretical Model	291
Appendix G2: Standardised Residuals of the Less Restrictive Competing Model	293
Appendix G3: Standardised Residuals of the More Restrictive Competing Model	295
Appendix H1: Variances of Exogenous Constructs, Errors and Disturbances of the Theoretical Model	297
Appendix H2: Variances of Exogenous Constructs, Errors and Disturbances of the Less Restrictive Competing Model	298
Appendix H3: Variances of Exogenous Constructs, Errors and Disturbances of the More Restrictive Competing Model	299
Appendix I1: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Unconstrained Model – State-Owned Sector	300
Appendix I2: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Unconstrained Model – Privately Owned Sector	302
Appendix I3: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Constrained Model – State-Owned Sector	304

Appendix I4: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Constrained Model – Privately Owned Sector	306
Appendix J1: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Unconstrained Model – up to Five Years Group	308
Appendix J2: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Unconstrained Model – more than Five Years Group	310
Appendix J3: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Constrained Model – up to Five Years Group	312
Appendix J4: Standardised Residual Covariance of the Constrained Model – more than Five Years Group	314

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1:	Relationship Intention Literature: A Summary	23
Table 2.2:	Supplier Selection Criteria in International Contexts	44
Table 3.1.	Economic Sectors in Vietnam and their Contributions to GDP (%)	71
Table 3.3.	Summary of Research Hypotheses	81
Table 4.1.	Indicators of the Importer Relationship Intention (REIN) Scale	89
Table 4.2.	Indicators of the Exporter Credibility (CRED) Scale	90
Table 4.3:	Indicators of the Perceived Product Quality (PRO) Scale	91
Table 4.4:	Indicators of the Perceived Price Competitiveness (PRI) Scale	92
Table 4.5:	Indicators of the Perceived Delivery Performance (DELI) Scale	94
Table 4.6:	Indicators of the Signal Consistency (CONS) Scale	96
Table 4.7:	Indicators of the Signal Clarity (CLAR) Scale	97
Table 4.8:	Summary of Pilot Study Data Analysis: Reliability Analysis	102
Table 5.1:	Firm Ownership	113
Table 5.2:	Firm Age	113
Table 5.3:	Types of Responding Firms	114
Table 5.4:	Geographic Location of Exporting Partners	114
Table 5.5:	Number of Years in Doing Business with Foreign Partners	115
Table 5.6:	Relationship Duration	115
Table 5.7:	Reliability Analysis Results of CRED and CLAR	129
Table 5.8.	Modification Index and Expected Parameter Change of CRED Scale	130
Table 5.9:	Results of Construct Reliability Analysis – Cronbach’s Alpha	133
Table 5.10:	Pair-wise CFA Results to Assess Construct Validity	136
Table 5.11:	Summary of Psychometric Properties of Measures	165
Table 6.1:	Correlations among Constructs in the Measurement Model	170

Table 6.2: Assessment of Across-Construct Discriminant Validity 171

Table 6.3: Standardised Regression Coefficients of the Theoretical Model..... 174

Table 6.4: Comparison of Fit Measures between the Measurement and the Structural Models 174

Table 6.5: Comparison of Factor Loadings between the Measurement and the Structural Models 175

Table 6.6: Measures of Fit of the Theoretical, Less Restrictive and More Restrictive Competing Models..... 180

Table 6.7: Comparisons of Standardised Regression Coefficients of the Theoretical, the Less Restrictive and the More Restrictive Competing Models 183

Table 6.8: Comparisons of Factor Loadings on Latent Constructs of the Theoretical, Less Restrictive and More Restrictive Competing Models..... 184

Table 6.9: Differences in Fit Measures between Unconstrained and Constrained Models across the State-owned Sector and the Privately Owned Sector..... 199

Table 6.10: Estimated Results of Unconstrained and Constrained Models across State-owned Sector and Privately Owned Sector 203

Table 6.11: Differences in Fit Measures between Unconstrained and Constrained Models across Relationship Duration 206

Table 6.12: Estimated Results of Unconstrained and Constrained Models across Relationship Duration 209

Table 6.13: Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results..... 211

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1:	Background Theories and the Research Gap	5
Figure 1.2:	Signal Quality and Perceived Offer Quality	8
Figure 1.3:	Relationship between Signal Quality, Perceived Offer Quality and Exporter Credibility	8
Figure 1.4:	Foundation Theories and an Overview of the Conceptual Framework.....	9
Figure 2.1:	Signaling Process	39
Figure 3.1:	Exporter Credibility and Importer Relationship Intention	53
Figure 3.2:	Perceived Product Quality and Exporter Credibility.....	57
Figure 3.3:	Perceived Price Competitiveness and Exporter Credibility	59
Figure 3.4:	Perceived Delivery Performance and Exporter Credibility.....	61
Figure 3.5:	Signal Consistency, Signal Clarity and Perceived Product Quality	65
Figure 3.6:	Signal Consistency, Signal Clarity and Perceived Price Competitiveness.....	66
Figure 3.7:	Signal Consistency, Signal Clarity and Perceived Delivery Performance	68
Figure 3.8:	Theoretical Model – Determinants of Importer Relationship Intention from a Signaling Perspective.....	69
Figure 3.9:	Newly Registered Privately Owned Enterprises in Vietnam	72
Figure 3.10:	A More Restrictive Competing Model.....	78
Figure 3.11:	A Less Restrictive Competing Model	79
Figure 4.1:	Research Process	83
Figure 5.1:	Construct Validation Process	123
Figure 5.2a:	CFA Results of CRED Scale (7 items).....	129
Figure 5.2b:	CFA Results of CRED Scale (6 items)	131
Figure 5.3a:	CFA Results of CLAR Scale (5 items).....	131
Figure 5.3b:	CFA Results of CLAR Scale (4 items)	132

Figure 5.4: Pair-wise CFA Results of REIN–CRED	135
Figure 5.5: Pair-wise CFA Results of REIN–PROD	137
Figure 5.6: Pair-wise CFA Results of REIN–PRI	139
Figure 5.7: Pair-wise CFA Results of REIN–DELI.....	140
Figure 5.8: Pair-wise CFA Results of REIN–CONS	141
Figure 5.9: Pair-wise CFA Results of REIN–CLAR	143
Figure 5.10: Pair-wise CFA Results of CRED–PROD.....	144
Figure 5.11: Pair-wise CFA Results of CRED–PRI	146
Figure 5.12: Pair-wise CFA Results of CRED–DELI	147
Figure 5.13: Pair-wise CFA Results of CRED–CONS.....	148
Figure 5.14: Pair-wise CFA Results of CRED–CLAR.....	150
Figure 5.15: Pair-wise CFA Results of PROD–PRI	151
Figure 5.16: Pair-wise CFA Results of PROD–DELI	152
Figure 5.17: Pair-wise CFA Results of PROD–CONS.....	154
Figure 5.18: Pair-wise CFA Results of PROD–CLAR.....	155
Figure 5.19: Pair-wise CFA Results of PRI–DELI.....	156
Figure 5.20: Pair-wise CFA Results of PRI–CONS	158
Figure 5.21: Pair-wise CFA Results of PRI–CLAR	159
Figure 5.22: Pair-wise CFA Results of DELI–CONS	160
Figure 5.23: Pair-wise CFA Results of DELI–CLAR	162
Figure 5.24: Pair-wise CFA Results of CONS–CLAR.....	163
Figure 6.1: CFA Results of the Final Measurement Model.....	169
Figure 6.2: SEM Results of the Theoretical Model (Standardised Estimates)	173
Figure 6.3: SEM Results of the Less Restrictive Competing Model (Standardised Estimates).....	177
Figure 6.4: SEM Results of the More Restrictive Competing Model (Standardised Estimates).....	178

Figure 6.5a: Unconstrained Model: Structural Paths were Freely Estimated by SEM for Group A.....	196
Figure 6.5b: Unconstrained Model: Structural Paths were Freely Estimated by SEM for Group B.....	197
Figure 6.6: Constrained Model: Structural Paths were Constrained Equally across Two Groups (Standardised Estimates).....	198
Figure 6.7a: SEM Results of Multi-group Analysis across Ownership Type: State-owned Sector (Standardised Estimates).....	201
Figure 6.7b: SEM Results of Multi-group Analysis across Ownership Type: Privately Owned Sector (Standardised Estimates).	202
Figure 6.8a: SEM Results of Multi-group Analysis across Relationship Duration: up to Five Years in Relationships (Standardised Estimates).....	207
Figure 6.8b: SEM Results of Multi-group Analysis across Relationship Duration: More than Five Years in Relationships (Standardised Estimates).....	208

ABSTRACT

Marketing scholars and practitioners have recognised the importance of developing and nurturing relationships to achieve sustainable competitive advantages. However, while selling firms prefer to establish relationships with buyers, it is strongly argued that not all buyers have the motive or desire to do so. Therefore, understanding determinants of buyers' relationship intentions is crucial for sellers to develop appropriate relationship marketing strategies.

A review of the literature on business-to-business relationships reveals that limited research has investigated the existence of imperfect and asymmetric information in buyer-seller relationships. The degree of imperfection and asymmetry is more marked in the importer-exporter relationship context because of differences in cultural, social and business environments. Signaling theory suggests that sending signals can solve problems caused by asymmetric and imperfect information. Signaling theory has become a standard framework for studying a wide variety of phenomena. However, the question of how signals can help to encourage buyers to engage in long-term relationships with sellers has been largely ignored. This study attempts to enhance our knowledge by investigating the determinants of buyers' relationship intention from a signaling perspective.

Based on a review of literature on relationship intention, signaling theory and supplier selection, this study develops a theoretical model to explain: (1) how signal consistency and signal clarity determine importers' relationship intention; and, (2) how signal consistency and signal clarity influence importers' perceptions of the three critical supplier selection criteria (product quality, price competitiveness and delivery performance). Two competing models are also proposed in association with the theoretical model.

A transition economy (Vietnam) was selected in which to test these models. A survey questionnaire was developed based on the literature review and nine in-depth interviews, then tested via a pilot study. Survey data utilising a sample of 418

Vietnamese importers, was used to validate constructs via Confirmatory Factor Analysis, and then to test the theoretical model and its two competing models via two-step approach in Structural Equation Modeling. All constructs achieve reliability and validity, and the theoretical model is selected over its two competing models. All eleven hypotheses derived from the theoretical model are supported by the data.

The results show that signal consistency and signal clarity positively influence perceived product quality, perceived price competitiveness and perceived delivery performance. These perceptions then have positive effects on exporter credibility. Exporter credibility, in turn, positively influences importer relationship intention. The findings also support the moderating roles of ownership and relationship duration.

The study concludes with a discussion of theoretical, methodological and contextual contributions. Managerial implications for exporters, importers and government, as well as directions for future research, are also addressed.