

Non-Tariff Barriers, Environmental Scanning and Export Performance: the Case of Uganda's Dairy Exports to Kenya

Aaron Ecel*, Mariah Nakintu, Ziana Nakabuye and Grace Sojourner

Department of Marketing & International Business, Makerere University Business School, Kampala-Uganda

*Email: eaaron@mubs.ac.ug

Abstract

This research was prompted by the significantly low levels of intra-East African Community (EAC) trade, despite the presence of preferential trade agreements in the region. By focusing on Uganda's dairy sector, the study sought to establish the structure of the sector's exports, establish the competitiveness of the sector's exports into the Kenyan market, to determine the extent to which specific Non-Tariff Barriers are hindering dairy exports from Uganda into the Kenyan dairy market and to establish the mediating role of environmental scanning in the relationship between NTBs and export performance of Uganda's dairy exporters into the Kenyan dairy market. A cross-sectional survey of all Ugandan milk and cream (concentrated or sweetened) dairy exporters was undertaken. The findings revealed that Uganda's dairy exports are concentrated and dependent on mainly two product categories accounting for 92 % of the dairy exports and that the exports are concentrated in only one export market; Kenya (80%). The most detrimental NTBs were: Procedural Problems, Charges on Imports and Customs & Administration Entry Procedures. They study also established that environmental scanning was not significantly related to NTBs and therefore could not mediate the relationship between NTBs and Export performance.

Keywords: Non-tariff barriers, Environmental scanning, export performance, dairy exports, International business, Uganda

1. Introduction

Freund and Ornelas (2010) noted, "The formation of Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) has been, by far, the most popular form of reciprocal trade liberalization in the past 15 years". The essence of reciprocal trade arrangements is for increased access into member states markets (Mugenyi and Zeija, 2006), consequently improving the performance of respective country firms in their export markets. A huge potential of trade exists among the EAC (East African Community) countries. For instance, only 2.1 percent of the total products that Kenya imported from the world in 2010 were from the EAC, 11 percent of the total products imported by Uganda were from the world in 2012 were from the EAC, 28 percent of those imported by Rwanda in 2012 were from the EAC, 17 percent of those imported by Burundi in 2012 were from the EAC and only 3 percent of those imported by the United Republic of Tanzania in 2011 were from the EAC (International Trade Center, 2013) (see Annex A1).

Studies have established the detrimental effect of Non Tariff Barriers (NTBs) to export development and export performance (Tumuhimbise and Ihiga, 2007) while studying the current status of the NTBs in the EAC, established that "a number of NTBs affect the ability of Ugandan businesses to export and import". Through environmental scanning, firms are able to take notice of events and trends in the firm's environment and consequently work out ways in which the firm can adopt to its environment (Holmes, McElwee and Thomas, 1995). Despite the efforts to eliminate current NTBs in the EAC (World Bank, 2008; Okumu and Nyankori, 2010), the complete elimination of NTBs is not likely in the near future. This is partly attributed to the very definition of NTBs. Deardorff and Stern (1997) assert that "NTBs are defined by what they are not". They further note that "NTBs include a potentially unlimited plethora of policies, perhaps as yet un-invented", implying that there is a possibility of new NTBs always cropping up. Within the East African region, Uganda has both comparative and competitive advantages in the dairy sector, and in Uganda, it employs over 2.5 million households who are directly engaged in milk production. To the economy, the dairy sector contributes up to 45%-50% of the national agricultural GDP and between 7%-9% of the national Gross Domestic Product (Wozemba and Rashid, 2008; Uganda National Export Strategy 2008-2012).

2. Problem Statement

Despite the existence of a preferential trade agreement between EAC member states, individual member countries are trading more with non-EAC countries, thus the share of intra-trade is significantly low (see Annex AI). Current research into NTBs have established the detrimental impact of NTBs to trade, however, such studies have been done at an aggregate level, thus focusing on the impact of NTBs on a nations entire economy

(Tumuhimbise and Ihiga, 2007; Okumu and Nyankori, 2010; ITC, 2012). And in those cases, all NTBs have been bundled together, thus failing to identify the most detrimental NTBs. Limited empirical research has established the predictive potential of the specific NTBs on export performance at the firm level, while accounting for a firm's initiative to scan its business environment. In this study, we seek to sieve out the most detrimental NTBs affecting these firms' export performance, while accounting for the firms' initiative to scan its business environment. This will be done with specific focus to Uganda's dairy exports to Kenya. Kenya was chosen among other EAC markets because it imports 70% of all milk and cream in the EAC. The dairy sector was chosen because of its enormous and ever growing export market potential in the EAC region (see Annex A2). The study was guided by the following research objectives; *To establish the structure of Uganda's dairy exports and consequently establish the competitiveness of Uganda's dairy exports into the Kenyan market, To determine the extent to which specific NTBs are hindering dairy exports from Uganda into the Kenyan dairy market, and To establish the mediating role of environmental scanning in the relationship between NTBs and export performance of Uganda's dairy exporters into the Kenyan dairy market.* The study focused on constructs; Trade protectionism using non-tariff barriers, environmental scanning and their linear link to export performance. It particularly focused on Uganda's dairy products, specifically milk and cream (concentrated and sweetened) to the Kenya market.

3. A Review of Literature

Non-Tariff Barriers

Beghin (2006) defines non-tariff barriers (NTBs) as "a wide range of policy interventions other than border tariffs that affect trade of goods, services and factors of production". The ITC (2012) defines them as "policy measures, other than customs tariffs that can potentially have an economic effect on International trade in goods, changing quantities trade or price or both". It further notes that a non-tariff barrier implies a negative impact on trade (protectionist or discriminatory intent). NTBs have become more prominent relative to tariffs, in that, in the fight to lower tariffs, new NTBs have come up to aid protectionist intentions of nations (Beghin, 2006). The ITC (2012) further notes that, despite the increase in economic liberalization, non-tariff based trade barriers have gained gain prominence. It asserts that, non-tariff measures are beginning to exceed tariffs in their trading hindering impacts.

Tumuhimbise and Ihiga (2007), sought to update the inventory of NTBs that hinder intra EAC trade, thus they sought to identify the scope and nature of NTBs that affect intra EAC trade. They found out that actually a number of NTBs do impede Ugandan businesses to export. Such is further worsened by the lack of support services and insufficient access to information on these non-tariff measures. These consequentially affect the competitiveness of the exporters, thus hindering their efforts in access markets and lucrative business opportunities in the region (ITC, 2012). The WTO has established an inventory of NTBs, this categorization was adopted by Tumuhimbise and Ihiga (2007), when studying the NTBs affecting Uganda's intra-trade effects. They include;

Customs documentation and Administrative procedures; These are customs formalities that impede trade, For instance the limited customs open hours for verifying export documents and clearing cargo. *Government participation in trade and restrictive practices tolerated by governments;* These include time consuming cross-border registration of new business mainly attributed to the lack of harmonized business registration procedures. Tumuhimbise and Ihiga (2007) explain that "one has to physically travel to the capital of the country of proposed new business to apply for business registration and pay the applicable registration fees". *Technical barriers to trade:* these include testing, certification and other conformity assessment based restrictions. In some cases, the importing countries expect to carry out their own scientific analysis to certify the standards of the products. Consequently, a lot of time is spent on carrying out quality inspection for products that already have certification marks. UNCTAD (2012) define technical barriers to trade as technical regulations and procedures for assessment of conformity with technical regulations and standards excluding measures covered by the SPS agreement. *Category other: vehicle registration and licensing* for all trucks carrying goods to and transit to be registered in the country of transit. *Immigration procedures;* these include requirements to have valid work permits. In most cases the process of obtaining work permits is quit cumbersome. Enforcement of trade related legislation; these include delays at road blocks.

Environmental Scanning

Slaughter (1999) cautions that, firms that are not alert to the changes in its environment are unlikely to succeed compared to those that effectively scan their environments. Firms that scan their environments are like to be privy to crucial information about "markets, products, customers, competitors and the like". He further asserts that, environmental scanning "stands at the juncture of foresight and strategy". However, he recognizes that limited resources often hinder the average business from seeing the big picture.

Holmes, McElwee and Thomas (1995) define environmental scanning as “the process through which the implications of a range of external factors which are deemed to influence the coherent functioning of an organization are monitored and assessed. Aguiler (1967) defines environmental scanning as the “scanning for information about events and relationships in a company’s outside environment, the knowledge of which would assist top management in its task of charting the company’s future of action. Hambrick (1981) defines environmental scanning as “the managerial activity of learning about events and trends in the organizations environment, conceiving it as the first step in ongoing chain of perceptions and actions leading to an organization’s adoption of its environment.

Holmes et al (1995) note that ,it’s imperative for firms in international business to carry out superior environmental scanning given the level of uncertainty, complexity and the ever changing international business environment. The possible benefits of environmental scanning include; enhancement of the firms capability to capitalize early on opportunities, early warning system / signal for business threat or challenges, and the preparation of the firm to act accordingly with regard to the changing needs and wishes of its customers (Jain, 1993). A firm has to scan the environment for changes in following aspects: economic, technological, government, social, competitor and customer. It’s believed that these aspects constitute the highest level of uncertainty for a firm in the international business environment. (Holmes et al, 1995)

4. Research Methodology

The study was guided by a quantitative and cross-sectional design. The respondents were firms in Uganda that exported Milk and Cream, concentrated or sweetened (HS Code-4/ product cluster at 4-digit). This category was specifically chosen because it contributes approximately 58 percent of Uganda’s dairy exports and currently there are 11 firms that are actively exporting it. Given the modest number, the study took a census approach.

The unit of analysis was the export firm. The respondents were those personal with understanding and direct involvement in the export function / department of the firm. Open-ended questions trying to capture the respondents experience with the firm’s exporting function and more importantly, their views about their current export markets. The target was mainly senior management and technical personnel in the export department.

Measurements of the research variables:

Non-tariff Barriers: these were measured by; government participation in trade and restrictive practices tolerated by governments, Customs and Administrative entry procedures (customs formalities, border tax adjustments), Technical barriers to trade (Testing certification and other conformity assessment). Other (procedural problems): immigration procedures, transit delays, roadblocks, vehicle registration and licensing. These scales were adopted from the World Trade Organization (WTO) categorization of NTBs

Environmental scanning: Irregular environmental scanning, regular environmental scanning and Continuous environmental scanning aspects’ were used to measure the extent to which economic, technological. Governmental, social, competitor and customer are monitored (Jain, 1993; Lim, Sharkey and Kim, 1996, Costa, 1997 Morgan 1999).

Export Performance: Consensus of the definition and operationalization of export performance is still work in progress (Maurel, 2009, Freeman, styles and Lawley, 2012), however Scales that capture multiple dimensions (objective and subjective) of export performance are preferable (Akyol and Akehurst, 2003). Objective measures such as sales growth, export profitability and subjective measures such as general satisfaction with the overall export performance (Lages and Montgomery, 2004) were used in capturing data in respect to export performance

Reliability and Validity Coefficients

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient	Content Validity Index
Non Tariff Barriers	23	.944	.913
Environmental Scanning	17	.706	.882
Export Performance	4	.681	.750

5. Results and Discussions

The results showed that the majority of the dairy exporters have been in the business for some 06 – 10 years (45.5%) while those that have been operating for the longest period of time had been in existence (for Over 10 years), comprised 36.4% . The majority of the dairy exporters employ way over 50 workers. This is understandable given wide range of operations that these firms are continually engaged in. The results showed that the majority of the respondents were male (90.9%) and in either the middle or lower management positions since each of these positions takes up 45.5% of the sample. Further, there is a great probability of finding an

official in these firms aged between 31 – 35 years of age (.545) than if finding one who is 26 – 30 years (.273). The majority of the respondents had Degrees (81.8%) and were employed on a permanent basis with their respective firms (90.9%). Further, those that had been employed for 05 – 10 years comprised 63.6% while those that had been working for less than 5 years constituted 27.3%.

The results in table I below indicate that earnings from Uganda's dairy exports grew by 315% between 2008 and 2012. However, Uganda's dairy exports are dominated by only two product categories; Milk and cream, concentrated or sweetened (hence force; Milk and Cream-C&S). It accounted for over 50% of Uganda's dairy exports for the last two years (2011 & 2012). This dominance was closely followed by Milk and cream, not concentrated nor sweetened (35%) in 2012.

Table I: Uganda's Dairy Export Structure from 2008-2012 (HS 04)

Product label	2008 (%)	2009 (%)	2010 (%)	2011 (%)	2012 (%)
1. Milk and cream, concentrated or sweetened	34.3	27.0	16.1	51.0	55.8
2. Milk and cream, not concentrated nor sweetened	39.7	61.2	64.1	42.6	35.5
3. Butter and other fats and oils derived from milk	4.8	9.0	3.6	5	5.7
4. Buttermilk and yogurt	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.7	1.5
5. Whey and natural milk products nes	0.1	0.0	0.0	-	0.3
6. Birds' eggs in shell	3.4	1.4	14.2	0.6	0.2
7. Birds' eggs dried	4.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	0.2
8. Cheese and curd	12.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2
9. Natural honey	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL (000) USD	4,995	6,703	16,247	18,191	20,727

Source: Authors' calculations based on ITC / UN COMTRADE statistics

The results in table II show indicate that for the past 5 years (2008-2012), the main export markets for Uganda's milk and cream C&S comprised of Kenya, Democratic republic of Congo, Zambia and Ethiopia. Kenya is the dominant export market, accounting for approximately 80% of milk and cream C&S exports from Uganda. The results also indicate that the top 5 export markets mention, account for almost all (98.2%) of the milk and cream C&S exports.

Table II: Top 5 export markets for Uganda's milk and cream exports 2008-2012

	2008 (%)	2009 (%)	2010 (%)	2011 (%)	2012 (%)
TOTAL (000 USD) 100 %	1,714	1,807	2,622	9,283	11,565
1 KENYA	71	89	28	85	79.5
2 DRC	1	3	1	7	9
3 SUDAN	9	5	16	1	4.6
4 ZAMBIA	-	-	-	3	4.1
5 ETHIOPIA	-	-	-	0	1
	81%	97%	45%	96%	98.2%

Source: Authors' calculations based on ITC / UN COMTRADE statistics

The results in table III indicate that Uganda commands the biggest market share (36.8%) in the Kenyan market for milk and cream C&S imports. This is close to that of Oman (34.1%). However, Oman's exports of Milk and Cream C&S into the Kenyan market are growing faster (41% per annum) than that of Uganda (17% per annum), a trend that could see Oman dominating the Kenyan market.

Table III: Uganda's competitiveness in milk and cream exports (concentrated or sweetened) in Kenya

		Imported growth in value		
		Share in KENYA imports (%)	2008-2012 (% p.a.)	2011-2012 (% p.a.)
	WORLD	100	43	32
1	Uganda	36.8	76	17
2	Oman	34.1	347	41
3	Malaysia	8.4	36	16
4	New Zealand	8.3	-10	11
5	United Kingdom	4	86	4850

Source: Authors' calculations based on ITC / UN COMTRADE statistics

The Descriptive results in table IV below were presented to examine the degree to which specific NTBs are hindering dairy exports from Uganda into the Kenyan dairy market. These results were computed from a scale coded such that 1 represents Large Extent, 2 – Small Extent and 3 – Not at all.

Table IV: Descriptive results

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Other-Procedural Problems	11	2	3	1.98	.44
Charges On Imports	11	1	3	2.42	.68
Customs And Administration Entry Procedures	11	2	3	2.43	.61
Sanitary And Phyto-sanitary Measures	11	2	3	2.48	.43
Specific Limitations	11	2	3	2.52	.62
Government Participation In Trade	11	2	3	2.55	.54
Technical Barriers To Trade	11	2	3	2.58	.40

Source: Primary Data

From the results in table IV, it is evident that the three specific NTBs are hindering dairy exports more than any other are; **Procedural Problems (Mean = 1.98)**; these include- frequent road blocks in Kenya, delays at weigh bridges, the need to hire Kenyan registered tracks to transport the dairy products into Kenya and the lack of information on procedures and charges. **Charges on Imports (Mean = 2.42)**; these include-prior import deposits on cargo, surcharges and border tax adjustments. **Customs and Administration Entry Procedures (Mean = 2.43)**; these include- Insufficient Custom open hours for verifying export documents and clearing cargo, Delays in duty payment for cargo, Frequent cancellation of insurance bonds and Transit parking yards.

The NTBs that have the least effect on the dairy exports are **Specific Limitations (Mean = 2.52)**; these include-regulations on domestic prices. **Government Participation in Trade (Mean = 2.55)**; these include cumbersome business registration processes, limits to the quantity of milk exported and expensive work permits, and **Technical Barriers To Trade (Mean = 2.58)**; these include- difficulty in meeting Kenyan product standards, quality inspection delays and special product, marking and packaging.

Relationships between the study variables

To establish the mediating role of environmental scanning in the relationship between NTBs and export performance of Uganda's dairy exporters into the Kenyan dairy, the researcher first tested for the nature of the relationships between the variables using the Pearson (r) correlation coefficients.

	Mean	SD	Non Tariff Barriers	Environmental Scanning	Export Performance
Non Tariff Barriers	2.73	.47	1.000		
Environmental Scanning	3.00	.45	-.479	1.000	
Export Performance	1.18	.40	-.770**	.553	1.000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: primary data

The results in the table above showed that the Non-Tariff Barriers are negatively related to the Export Performance ($r = -.770^{**}$, $p < .01$). On the other hand, environmental scanning showed no significant relationship with Export Performance.

To test for the mediating role of Environmental Scanning in the relationship between Stakeholder Commitment on the relationship between NTBs and export performance of Uganda's dairy exporters, the researcher employed the approach of Baron and Kenny (1986) was used. Analysis One: The first analysis of the Dependent variable on the Independent variable is shown in the table below, it shows that the

Table VI: showing the first analysis of the dependent variable on the independent variable.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.000	.509		5.892	.000
Non Tariff Barriers	-.667	.184	-.770	-3.618	.006
Dependent Variable: Export Performance					
R	.770				
R Square	.593				
Adjusted R Square	.547				
F Statistic	13.091				
Sig.	.006				

Source: Primary Data

Analysis Two: Analysis two involves examining the nature of the relationship between Non Tariff Barriers and Environmental Scanning. The reason for this is that if the Non-Tariff Barriers are not significantly related to the Environmental scanning then the Environmental scanning cannot play a mediating role in the relationship between the Non Tariff Barriers and export performance

Table VII: showing the relationship between Non-tariff barriers and Environmental scanning.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	4.250	.774		5.489	.000
Non Tariff Barriers	-.458	.280	-.479	-1.636	.136
Dependent Variable: Environmental Scanning					
R	.479				
R Square	.229				
Adjusted R Square	.144				
F Statistic	2.676				
Sig.	.136				

Source: Primary Data

Results in the model above show that the Non Tariff barriers are not a significant predictor of Environmental scanning (Sig. $> .05$). This means that the Environmental scanning cannot play a mediating role in the relationship, and thus does not satisfy the second stage of the approach suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986).

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study established that Uganda's dairy exports are concentrated and dependant on mainly two product categories; - Milk and cream, concentrated or sweetened and Milk and cream, not concentrated nor sweetened, accounting for 92 % of the dairy exports in 2012. The country's dairy exports are also concentrated in only one export market; Kenya (80%). The study also sieved out the most detrimental NTBs to the exporters, these include: Procedural Problems, Charges on Imports and Customs & Administration Entry Procedures. The other NTBs didn't significantly affect the exporters operations in the Kenyan market. They study also established that environmental scanning was not significantly related to NTBs and therefore could not mediate the relationship between NTBs and Export performance.

We therefore recommend that Uganda's dairy exports ought to be diversified and therefore reduce the heavy dependence on only two product categories. Alternative export markets need to be gradually developed to reduce the risks of depending entirely on only one export market. Lastly, Ugandan exporters ought to capitalize on the current efforts to eliminate NTBs in the EAC region by placing much emphasis in the speedy elimination of those NTBs that are most detrimental to their performance in the Kenyan market.

References

- Aguiar, F. (1967), "Scanning the business environment". New York, Macmillan
- Bo Rundh (2011), "linking flexibility and entrepreneurship to the performance of SMEs in export markets", *Journal of Manufacturing Technology*, Vol.22 No. 3, pp.330-347.
- Caorlyne Tumuhimbise and Simon Ihiga (2007), "A survey on non-tariff barriers that affect Uganda imports and exports within the EAC and COMESA countries" EAC secretariat
- David Wozemba and Nsanja Rashid (2008), "Dairy investment opportunities in Uganda-report", SNV Report series
- David Balikowa (2011), "Dairy development in Uganda; a review of Uganda's dairy industry", Dairy Development Authority (DDA), Uganda.
- George Holmes, Gerard McElwee and Rhodri Thomas (1995), "Environmental scanning and the information gathering behaviour of head teachers", *Journal of Educational Management*, Vol.9 No. 5, pp.27-30
- Hambrick, D. C (1982), "specialization of environmental scanning activities among upper level executives", *Journal of Management Studies*, 18, 299-320
- ITC (2012) Peru: Company perspectives- an ITC series on non-tariff measures, The International Trade Center , xviii, doc No MAR,12-221 E
- Jorge Costa (1997), "a study of strategic planning and environmental scanning in the multi-unit Portuguese hotel sector", department of management studies, university of surrey.
- John .C. Beghin (2006) "non-tariff barriers", center for agricultural and rural development, Iowa state university, Iowa 50011-1070.
- Luke Okumu and J. C. okuk Nyankori (2010), Non-tariff barriers in EAC customs union: implications for trade between Uganda and other EAC countries, Economic Policy Research Centre, Uganda, Research series no. 75
- Onesmus Mugenyi and Flavian Zeija (2006), "the East African customs union protocol an Audit of the Stakeholders' Participation in the Negotiation Process", ACODE Policy Research Series, No. 14, 2006
- Richard .A. Slaughter (1999), "A new framework for environmental scanning", *the journal of future studies, strategic thinking and policy*, Vol, 0.1, no.05
- Rakhee Vyas and Anne L. Souchon (2003), "symbolic use of export information, a multi disciplinary approach to conceptual development and key consequences" *International marketing review*, vol, 16, no.1, pp.57-91.
- Tore mysen (2013), "Towards a framework for controls as determinants of export performance, A review and analysis of empirical literature 1995-2011". *European Business Review*. Vol. 25, no.3, pp.224-242
- World Bank (2008), Synthesis report, non tariff measures on goods trade in the East African Community. Washington DC, World Bank

ANNEXES

Table A1: showing EAC Intra Trade and EAC Trade With The Rest Of The World

	IMPORTS FROM THE EAC				IMPORTS FROM THE REST OF THE WORLD			
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2009	2010	2011	2012
KENYA	162,773	256,539	-	-	10,202,001	12,092,926	12,633,996	14,432,732
UGANDA	546,954	576,535	692,615	646,946	4,247,371	4,664,338	5,630,875	6,044,147
RWANDA	324,915	-	384,116	452,842	1,112,015	-	1,356,564	1,624,232
BURUNDI	78,725	83,745	-	174,893	422,996	344,796	404,052	1,015,975
TANZANIA	316,921	295,199	378,129	-	6,530,823	8,012,874	11,184,221	8,279,244

SOURCE: ITC calculations based on UN COMTRADE statistics

VALUES: "000" US dollar

Table A2: Showing the value of milk and cream imported into the EAC over the past ten years.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
KENYA	763	2,533	1,296	3,319	3,586	4,110	9,026	7,960	18,998	24,953
TANZANIA	1,141	1,083	858	1,051	1,251	975	1,167	911	1,663	8,499
BURUNDI	582	361	825	1,953	1,965	873	576	1,181	3,333	1,221
RWANDA	1,094	358	813	556	1,644	810	1,094		1,105	556

SOURCE: ITC Calculations based on UN COMTRADE statistics

VALUES: "000" US dollar

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Recent conferences: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

