



The Effects of an E-marketing Orientation on Performance in Turkish Exporter Firms

Atilla Sürer & Hanifi Murat Mutlu

To cite this article: Atilla Sürer & Hanifi Murat Mutlu (2015) The Effects of an E-marketing Orientation on Performance in Turkish Exporter Firms, Journal of Internet Commerce, 14:1, 123-138, DOI: [10.1080/15332861.2015.1010138](https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2015.1010138)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2015.1010138>



Published online: 16 Mar 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 100



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

The Effects of an E-marketing Orientation on Performance in Turkish Exporter Firms

ATILLA SÜRER

*Department of International Trade and Logistics, Graduate School of Social Sciences,
Gaziantep University, Sehitkamil, Gaziantep, Turkey*

HANIFI MURAT MUTLU

*Department of International Trade and Logistics, Faculty of Economics and Administrative
Sciences, Gaziantep University, Sehitkamil, Gaziantep, Turkey*

This article aims to examine strategic orientations' effects on firms' performance in emerging economies such as Turkey. Strategic orientation directly affects all organizational activities and behaviors. Strategic orientations such as market orientation (MO), e-marketing orientation (EMO), entrepreneurial orientation (EO), and technology orientation (TO) are evaluated in this study. EMO is explained, along with its components and effect on firm performance, financial performance (FP), and marketing performance (MP). EMO has two components: Philosophical E-marketing Orientation (EMO-ph) and Behavioral E-marketing Orientation (EMO-behv). The research hypotheses are tested using data collected from 144 exporting firms in Turkey. The results show that the direct effect of TO on FP is significant; one of MO's components and EO directly affect marketing performance. The findings provide direction for future strategic orientations research.

KEYWORDS *market orientation, e-marketing orientation, strategic orientation, financial performance, marketing performance*

Address correspondence to Hanifi Murat Mutlu, Department of International Trade and Logistics, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Gaziantep University, Sehitkamil, Gaziantep 27310, Turkey. E-mail: mmutlu@gantep.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, strategic orientations (i.e., market, entrepreneurial, and technology orientations) have attracted the interest of academics and practitioners. Strategic orientations have provided a way to develop competitive advantages and theoretically correlated both innovative behavior and superior performance (Ferraresi et al. 2012). Defined by Gatignon and Xuereb (1997) as “a specific approach a firm implements to create the paper behaviors for superior and continuous performance” (Ferraresi et al. 2012, 691), an organization’s strategic orientation comprises a core element of organizational culture and directly affects all organizational activities and behaviors.

Strategic management and marketing studies have increasingly been focused on the relationship between market, entrepreneurial, and technological orientations on the one hand, and business performance on the other. Most of the literature focuses on mature economies (Brik, Rettab, and Mellahi 2011), but there is little research that investigates e-marketing orientations and relationships between an e-marketing orientation and business performance outside these. Here, researchers aim to explore the effects of these strategic orientations on business performance in emerging economies, focusing on a case study from Turkey. First, they overview e-marketing orientation, its components, and its effect on business performance, bearing in mind the following research questions:

- Q1. To what extent do strategic orientations such as market, entrepreneurial, and technology orientations impact on business performance?
- Q2. How is the concept of an e-marketing orientation conceptualized in the literature, and of what is it composed?
- Q3. To what extent do e-marketing orientations impact on business performance?

Narver and Slater (1990, 21) defined market orientation as an “organizational culture that most effectively and efficiently creates the necessary behaviors for the creation of superior value for buyers and thus continued superior performance for the business.” This orientation constitutes one of the major concepts in the marketing literature. According to a meta-analysis of market orientation made by Liao and colleagues (2011), 38 of 514 articles identified were devoted to an examination of the relationship between market orientation and performance. Of these 38 articles, 22 examined the impact of market orientation directly on performance, 6 examined moderators of the relationship, and 5 examined mediating variables. Only 2 of the 38 found no significant relationship between market orientation and performance, with 2 others finding a

weak relationship; the overwhelming majority of studies indicate a significant and positive relationship.

Although the market orientation-performance relationship has been the focus of many studies, as suggested by Kirca, Jayachandran, and Bearden (2005), market orientation is still an area in need of further investigation (Racela, Chaikittisilpa, and Thoumrungroje 2007, 146), especially in the context of developing economies. Within this, e-marketing remains a new and still rapidly growing field. Extensive empirical studies in the strategic orientation area tend to focus on the market, entrepreneurship, technology, or a combination of these, and the relationship between e-marketing orientation and performance goes somewhat overlooked. This study aims to contribute to filling that gap. Thus, the aim of this study is to investigate relationships between market orientation and firm performance, explain the concept of e-marketing orientation and its components, and examine the relationship between e-marketing orientation and firm performance.

Technology orientation refers to a firm's technical skills and R&D resources, to an emphasis on acquiring and incorporating new technologies in product development, and to an organization's openness to new ideas (e.g., Gatignon and Xuereb 1997; Hurley and Hult 1998; Zhou, Yim, and Tse 2005; Jeong, Pae, and Zhou 2006; Gao, Zhou, and Bennett-Yim 2007). It is expected to be closely connected with company performance. Technology-oriented firms may use new, sophisticated production technology, and develop and offer novel, advanced goods and services to meet customer needs, and they have a competitive advantage in terms of technology leadership (Gao et al. 2007). This study also aims to empirically analyze the link between technology orientation and firm performance.

Franco and Haase (2013, 683) pointed out that entrepreneurial orientation is a key concept in understanding the engagement level of entrepreneurial activities and behavior. Most entrepreneurial orientation research focuses on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance (Rauch et al. 2009). However, this research is not universally applicable, since the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance is moderated by factors such as company resources and competencies and industry characteristics (Sciascia et al. 2014), as well as other strategic orientations. This study also investigates the effects of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance.

The study is structured as follows. First, a model of strategic orientation impacts on company performance is developed. Taking financial and marketing performance as marks of company performance, researchers set out hypotheses for the relationships with these of strategic orientations, specifically market, e-marketing, technology and also entrepreneurial strategic orientations, thereby benchmarking the change of research variable effects on two different performances. Then, the case

study is presented, examining the relationships among the research variables of e-marketing orientation and its components for SMEs in Turkey, permitting a cultural comparison from the perspective of research variable effects. Finally, a discussion of limitations, managerial implications, and future research concludes the article.

LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESIS

Market Orientation (MO)

Empirical results show a positive relationship between MO and performance (Lado and Maydeu-Olivares 2001). MO is a central component of modern marketing concepts, with two definitions dominant in the literature. First, MO was defined as a philosophical-cultural perspective: "Market orientation is the organization culture that most effectively and efficiently creates necessary behaviors for the creation of superior value for buyers and, thus continuous superior performance" (Narver and Slater 1990, 21). Narver and Slater (1990) proposed customer orientation, competitor orientation, and interfunctional coordination as components of MO. Then, Kohli and Jaworski (1990, 6) defined MO as "the organization-wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future customer needs, dissemination of the intelligence across departments, and organization wide responsiveness to it." The components of MO, therefore, are generation, dissemination, and responsiveness to information.

Most empirical studies of MO and its components have demonstrated that these improve and lead to superior firm performance (Lai et al. 2009; Smirnova et al. 2011). Pulendran, Speed, and Widing (2003) hypothesized that higher MO leads to improved business performance. Their findings provided further evidence of the significant relationship between MO and business performance. Meta-analysis results by Cano, Carrillat, and Jaramillo (2004) also showed the positive relationship between MO and business performance. Van Raaij and Stoelhorst (2008, 1270) stressed that a firm's degree of MO had a positive effect on (financial) business performance. Although there is generally found to be a positive relationship between MO and performance, this was not supported by Perry and Shao (2002) and Olavarrieta and Friedmann (2008), who found MO to have no direct effect on performance.

Kropp, Lindsay, and Shoham (2006, 508) said that MO was important to improve a firm's marketing capabilities, while Danişman and Erkocaoğlan (2007) indicated that customer orientation had a significant impact on sales growth but not on financial profitability. Turkish studies using company samples have demonstrated a significant relationship between MO and performance. According to Bulut, Yılmaz, and Alpkın (2009), all the dimensions (customer orientation, competitor orientation, and interfunctional

coordination) of MO positively affected the financial performance of firms. Based on data collected from 73 subsidiaries of multinational corporations in Turkey, Kirca (2011) found that the extent of a subsidiary's MO was positively related to its financial performance, and a study of 76 companies in Istanbul by Hamsioglu (2011) similarly showed MO to have a positive effect. Accordingly, researchers now posit the following:

H₁: MO has a positive effect on (a) financial performance and (b) marketing performance.

E-marketing Orientation (EMO)

E-marketing is defined simply as “using the Internet and other interactive technologies to create and mediate dialogue between the firm and identified customers” (Coviello, Milley, and Marcolin 2001, 26) and to achieve, of course, marketing objectives and implementations. The primary advantages of e-marketing are those of reducing costs and enhancing customer access (Sheth and Sharma 2005). EMO is an organization culture considered a strategic necessity that should be internalized in all activities to meet the needs of customers/buyers across the organization (Shaltoni and West 2010). It is made up of philosophical and behavioral components: The “philosophical component may be identified by the degree to which decision makers emphasize e-marketing,” and “behavioral component may be viewed as all the activities that lead to high levels of involvement in e-marketing” (Shaltoni and West 2010, 1099).

The existing literature on EMO is limited, and there have been few empirical studies testing the impact of EMO on performance. Most studies have focused on the impacts of Internet use, e-marketing, and e-marketing strategy or on its implications for business and/or marketing performance. Studies also deal with the effects of e-marketing on the relationships between business and customer (B2C) or business and business (B2B). The present study concentrates on the internal adoption of e-marketing.

Hooper, Huff, and Thirkell (2007) revealed that the alignment of information systems and marketing positively and significantly affect both business performance and marketing performance, while Avlonitis and Karayanni (2000) had found that both Internet budget and the use of Internet tools had no significant effect on sales efficiency in the B2B market. Therefore, Internet budget seemed to significantly affect sales performance, but use of Internet tools did not.

According to Bharadwaj (2000), Kearns and Lederer (2003), and Santhanam and Hartono (2003), information technologies had a direct effect on financial performance (cited in Sanders 2007, 1336). According to Borges, Hoppen, and Luce (2009), the integration of Internet technology with marketing activities had an indirectly effect on performance via MO. Lu

and Julian (2007) researched the effects of different uses of the Internet (for communication, networking, market research, sales volume, image enhancement, cost reduction, and competitive advantage) on export performance. They found uses of the Internet that included cost reduction and competitive advantage to be a predictor for export marketing performance. Abebe (2014) recently found that level of e-commerce adoption in SMEs positively affected SME average sales growth rate and that e-commerce technology adopter firms had higher average sales growth rates than did non-adopter firms. In Turkey, data showed that e-marketing practices improved overall business performance (İlkay and Özdemir 2007). Based on the above, researchers posit the following:

H₂: EMO has a positive effect on (a) financial performance and (b) marketing performance.

Technology Orientation (TO)

Gatignon and Xuereb (1997, 78) explained that “a technology-oriented firm can be defined as a firm with the ability and the will to acquire a substantial technological background and to use it in the development of new products,” adding that a TO also enables a company to “use its technical knowledge to build a new technical solution in order to answer and meet new needs of the users.” A technology-oriented firm champions (a) use of the latest technologies in its new products, (b) R&D, (c) adoption of creativity and invention, and (d) “crazy ideas” (Zhou et al. 2005). Therefore, such a company has an advantage regarding its ability to fulfill the new needs of consumers (Derozier 2003). Hakala and Kohtamaki (2011, 65) argued that the fundamental idea of TO is that “long term success is best created through new technological solutions, products and services” (also Hamel and Prahalad 1991; Gatignon and Xuereb 1997; Grinstein 2008).

Empirical results demonstrated a positive relationship between TO and new product performance and innovation performance (Gatignon and Xuereb 1997; Jeong et al. 2006; Salavou 2005; Zhou et al. 2005), firm performance, sales performance, profitability, and export performance (Voss and Voss 2000; Gao et al. 2007; Solberg and Olsson 2010; Oflazoğlu and Koçak 2012). Gao and colleagues (2007) found that the effect of TO on performance was positive under any circumstance(s) whatsoever, especially when technology changes rapidly. Akman, Özkan, and Eriş (2008) demonstrated that TO positively and significantly affected performance in Turkish manufacturing firms. Thus,

H₃: TO has a positive effect on (a) financial performance and (b) marketing performance.

Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO)

Lumpkin and Dess (1996, 136–137) conceptualized EO as “the processes, practices and decision-making activities that lead to new entry” and defined as the key dimension “a propensity to act autonomously, a willingness to innovate and take risks, and a tendency to be aggressive toward competitors and proactive relative to marketplace opportunities.”

Many studies have focused on the relationship between EO and firm performance (e.g., Lumpkin and Dess 2001; Wiklund and Shepherd 2005; Keh, Nguyen, and Ng 2007; Li, Huang, and Tsai 2009). According to Tajeddini (2010, 222), EO may be regarded as a critical organizational process that contributes to firm survival and performance (e.g., Miller 1983; Barringer and Bluedorn 1999; McDougall and Oviatt 2000; Hitt et al. 2001; Dimitratos and Plakoyiannaki 2003). Li and colleagues (2009) found that EO was critical to business ventures and had a positive impact on firm performance. In a contrary finding, Frank, Kessler, and Fink (2010) did not show a universal relation between EO and business performance. EO plays an important role for a firm’s success (Wang 2008). Yilmaz, Alpan, and Bulut (2009) found that EO had the strongest of the effects measured on overall business performance in Turkish firms, ahead of MO. EO likely has positive performance implications for a firm related to seeking out new opportunities, innovation, creating and introducing new products and markets, and benefiting from first-mover advantage (Wiklund and Shepherd 2003). The current researchers posit the following:

H₄: EO has a positive effect on (a) financial performance and (b) marketing performance.

METHOD

This research focuses on Turkish exporter firms using data from exporter firms in Gaziantep. Located inland from the eastern Mediterranean, near the Syrian border, Gaziantep is the sixth biggest exporter city in Turkey, with an export sales volume valued at around six billion dollars in 2014. Convenience sampling was the sample method employed for this study, with a self-administered questionnaire directed in only Gaziantep. A total of 144 questionnaires were collected.

Researchers used 5-point Likert-type scales. All constructs were measured with reflective scales. Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) scale and Narver and Slater’s (1990) scale have been used most often to operationalize MO; the current researchers preferred Narver and Slater’s (1990) scale. MO consisted of three components: customer orientation (CUSTO, six items), competitor orientation (COMPO, five items), and interfunctional coordination (INTCO, five items). EMO, taken from Shaltoni and West (2010), had two components: philosophical EMO (EMO-ph, four items) and behavioral EMO

(EMO-behv, eight items). In addition, researchers measured the level of e-marketing adoption (EMO-adopt) with four items. In order to capture TO (five items), they used the Gatignon and Xuereb (1997) measures. The EO (five items) scale from Tajeddini (2010) was used. Both TO and EO was measured unidimensional. These 5-point Likert scales were anchored by *strongly disagree* (1) and *strongly agree* (5).

Financial performance (FP) was measured using four indicators: return on assets, general profitability of the firm, return on sales, and cash flow excluding investments. Marketing performance (MP) was measured using three indicators: total sales, market share, and customer satisfaction. Both FP and MP were borrowed from Gunday and colleagues (2011). These 5-point Likert-type scales were anchored by *much worse* (1) and *much better* (5) compared to other competitors. Researchers used control variables such as firm size (SIZE) and firm age (AGE). Firm size was measured by the number of employees and firm age by foundation year.

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Respondents completing the questionnaire were firm owners (11%), in top management (9%), export management (37%), financial management (18%), and others (35%). The participating firms had a firm age ranging between 2 and 77 years and employee numbers of between 10 and 1,500, with mean values of 20 and 246, respectively. The participating firms were from manufacturing firms such as food, textile, carpet, furniture, and packing.

Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, Cronbach alphas, and bivariate Pearson correlations of the constructs. Researchers found positive correlations between FP and CUSTO ($r = .18$; $p < .05$), COMPO ($r = .20$; $p < .05$), TO ($r = .32$; $p < .01$), and EO ($r = .31$; $p < .01$). The correlation matrix shows that MP is significantly and positively correlated with CUSTO ($r = .28$; $p < .01$), COMPO ($r = .24$; $p < .01$), TO ($r = .31$; $p < .01$), EO ($r = .35$; $p < .01$), and EMO-behv ($r = .22$; $p < .01$). Therefore, correlation analyses show significant and positive correlations between EMO-ph and other orientations, EMO-behv and other correlations, and EMO-adopt and other correlations.

Multiple regression analyses were performed to further test the hypotheses (tables 2 and 3). Table 2 shows the effects of CUSTO, COMPO, and INTCO, EMO-ph, EMO-behv, and EMO-adopt, TO and EO, and SIZE and AGE on FP. The regression model possesses a statistically significant F test. This model explains 21% of the variance in FP. The coefficients of TO ($\beta = 0.267$; $p < .05$) and SIZE ($\beta = 0.263$; $p < .01$) are positive and significant. The results show that H_3 was supported but not H_{1a} , H_{2a} , or H_{4a} . TO positively relates to FP.

TABLE 1 Correlation Analyses

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Mean	Std. Dev.	Cronbach α
1. FP	1												4.18	.54	.90
2. MP	.754**	1											4.29	.57	.93
3. CUSTO	.182*	.282**	1										4.46	.54	.82
4. COMPO	.201*	.244**	.491**	1									4.26	.65	.76
5. INTCO	.079	.104	.394**	.447**	1								4.26	.72	.81
6. EMO-ph	.097	.109	.244**	.434**	.211*	1							3.90	.79	.86
7. EMO-behv	.164	.229**	.640**	.911**	.541**	.394**	1						4.32	.54	.92
8. EMO-adopt	.100	.134	.518**	.518**	.953**	.239**	.625**	1					4.28	.64	.82
9. TO	.324**	.312**	.474**	.584**	.542**	.345**	.584**	.579**	1				4.19	.64	.84
10. EO	.314**	.356**	.487**	.587**	.493**	.296**	.627**	.562**	.668**	1			4.20	.53	.77
11. SIZE	.243**	.195*	.004	.028	-.061	-.093	.021	-.031	-.016	.124	1		245.77	331.61	—
12. AGE	.050	.104	.053	.093	.081	-.061	.026	.051	.022	.107	.398**	1	19.54	11.82	—

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed).

TABLE 2 Regression Analysis Results (Dependent Variable: Financial Performance)

Model	Model properties	Dependent variable	Independent variables	Standardized regress. β	<i>t</i> Value
Model 1	$R^2 = .213$ $F = 3.598^{**}$	FP	SIZE	.263	3.027 ^{**}
			AGE	-.104	-1.177
			CUSTO	.157	1.358
			COMPO	.278	1.308
			INTCO	.159	.561
			EMO-ph	-.012	-.139
			EMO-behv	-.368	-1.527
			EMO-adopt	-.296	-.960
			TO	.267	2.280 [*]
			EO	.197	1.688 ⁺

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; + $p \leq .10$.

TABLE 3 Regression Analysis Results (Dependent Variable: Marketing Performance)

Model	Model properties	Dependent variable	Independent variables	Standardized regress. β	<i>t</i> Value
Model 2	$R^2 = .206$ $F = 3.458^{**}$	MP	SIZE	.170	1.957 ⁺
			AGE	-.019	-.212
			CUSTO	.255	2.198 [*]
			COMPO	.226	1.057
			INTCO	.161	.564
			EMO-ph	-.015	-.175
			EMO-behv	-.273	-1.129
			EMO-adopt	-.320	-1.035
			TO	.158	1.344
			EO	.251	2.146 [*]

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; + $p \leq .10$.

Table 3 reports the results of regression analysis for the direct effects of the independent variables on MP. The *F* statistic for the model is statistically significant. The R^2 is 0.20, indicating that the control and the independent variables together explain 20% of the variance in MP. CUSTO has a positive and significant standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.254$; $p < .05$). These results show somewhat support for Hypothesis 1b. It is also seen that there is a positive and significant effect of EO on MP ($\beta = 0.251$; $p < .05$). Thus, H_{4b} was supported.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The study examined relationships between strategic orientations and firm performance, specifically, the direct effects of MO, EMO, TO, and EO on financial performance and marketing performance of exporter firms in Gaziantep, Turkey. It relates to the existing literature by investigating

relationships (a) among strategic orientations, especially EMO, and (b) between strategic orientations and firm performance.

Firstly, researchers tested hypotheses that MO, EMO, TO, and EO affect financial performance positively. They found that TO had only effect on financial performance. The effects of MO, EMO, and EO were not significant. This result was unexpected. The relevant literature indicated a strong relationship between both MO and EO with financial performance.

Interestingly, although Sin and colleagues (2005, 563) emphasized that the studies using samples of U.S. companies found unequivocal support for a positive association between MO and performance, they uncovered mixed findings for non-U.S. samples. This may apply for other orientations. According to Hakala's (2011) study based on interaction among strategic orientations, the strategic orientation literature has focused on just a few factors. He emphasized that different compositions among strategic orientations compete for the best explanation on business performance while at the same time enabling more complex explanations.

Secondly, researchers tested hypotheses that these orientations positively affected marketing performance in Turkish exporter firms. They found that customer orientation and EO had positive and significant effects, as expected. E-marketing implications have been used both for domestic and international trade. The gains from competitive advantage, such as strong brand image, link closely with customer/trading partner and enable efficiency in communication with these for firms. Sürer (2012) found that the philosophical component of EMO had a significant and positive effect on export performance in Turkey, but the behavioral component did not.

The findings of this study have several implications. Previous studies have shown strategic orientations to be important for superior firm performance. The findings of this study offer limited support for the idea that there are significant relationships between strategy orientations and firm performance. These findings can be useful for exporter firms in such a way that their resources should be managed. In addition, there were significant correlations among all strategic orientations. To create a stronger business strategy, therefore, business managers may consider the joint effects of the orientations (e.g., the stronger links between EMO-behv and COMPO and between EMO-adopt and INTCO).

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This study had some limitations that suggest opportunities for future research. Firstly, researchers used convenience sampling, which has limited generalizability. Secondly, research data were only collected from Turkish exporter firms in Gaziantep, implying the need to investigate other locations

for a better national and thus developing country perspective. Thirdly, they did not research interactions among the research variables (future researchers might focus on indirect effects, such as mediating and moderating effects), and they did not classify the sample by firm size (consideration of which could lead to clarified research results). Finally, EO has been studied as a one-dimension concept; in future studies, it should be divided into its components.

REFERENCES

- Abebe, M. 2014. Electronic commerce adoption, entrepreneurial orientation and small- and medium-sized enterprise (SME) performance. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 21 (1): 100–116. doi:10.1108/JSBED-10-2013-0145
- Akman, G., C. Özkan, and E. Eriş. 2008. Analysis the effects of strategy orientation and firm strategies on firm performance. *Istanbul Commerce University Journal of Science* 13 (1): 93–115.
- Avlonitis, G. J., and D. A. Karayanni. 2000. The impact of the Internet use on business-to-business marketing: Examples from American and European companies. *Industrial Marketing Management* 28 (9): 441–459. doi:10.1016/S0019-8501(99)00071-1.
- Barringer, B. R., and A. C. Bluedorn. 1999. The relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal* 20 (5): 421–444. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199905)20:5<421::AID-SMJ30>3.0.CO;2-O.
- Bharadwaj, A. S. 2000. A resource-based perspective on information technology capability and firm performance: An empirical investigation. *MIS Quarterly* 24 (1): 169–196. doi:10.2307/3250983.
- Borges, M., N. Hoppen, and F. B. Luce. 2009. Information technology impact on market orientation in e-business. *Journal of Business Research* 62:883–890. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.10.010.
- Brik, A. B., B. Rettab, and K. Mellahi. 2011. Market orientation, corporate social responsibility, and business performance. *Journal of Business Ethics* 99: 307–324. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0658-z.
- Bulut, Ç., C. Yilmaz, and L. Alpkan. 2009. The effects of market orientation on firm performance: An empirical research in Turkey. *Ege Academic Review* 9 (2): 513–538.
- Cano, C. R., F. A. Carrillat, and F. Jaramillo. 2004. A meta-analysis of the relationship between market orientation and business performance: Evidence from the five continents. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 21:179–200. doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2003.07.001.
- Coviello, N. E., R. Milley, and B. Marcolin. 2001. Understanding IT-enabled interactivity in contemporary marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 15 (4): 18–33. doi:10.1002/dir.1020.
- Danişman, A., and E. Erkocaoğlan. 2007. Corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance: a research study on Istanbul stock exchange firms. *Journal of Economics Business and Finance* 22 (260): 80–101. doi:10.3848/iif.2007.260.5440.

- Derozier, C. 2003. Marketing creativity in new product development: The role of market orientation, technology orientation, and interfunctional coordination. PhD thesis, Texas Tech University.
- Dimitratos, P., and E. Plakoyiannaki. 2003. Theoretical foundations of an international entrepreneurial culture. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* 1:187–215. doi:10.1023/A:1023804318244.
- Ferraresi, A. A., C. O. Quandt, S. A. dos Santos, and J. R. Frega. 2012. Knowledge management and strategic orientation: Leveraging innovativeness and performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management* 16 (5): 688–701. doi:10.1108/13673271211262754.
- Franco, M., and H. Haase. 2013. Firm resources and entrepreneurial orientation as determinants for collaborative entrepreneurship. *Management Decision* 51 (3): 680–696. doi:10.1108/00251741311309724.
- Frank, H., A. Kessler, and M. Fink. 2010. Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance—A replication study. *NCSL Legisbrief* 62 (April): 175–198.
- Gao, G. Y., K. Z. Zhou, and C. K. Bennett-Yim. 2007. On what should firms focus in transitional economies? A study of the contingent value of strategic orientations in China. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 24:3–15. doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2006.09.004.
- Gatignon, H., and J.-M. Xuereb. 1997. Strategic orientation of the firm and new product performance. *Journal of Marketing Research* 34:77–90. doi:10.2307/3152066.
- Grinstein, A. 2008. The relationships between market orientation and alternative strategic orientations: A metaanalysis. *European Journal of Marketing* 42:115–134. doi:10.1108/03090560810840934.
- Gunday, G., G. Ulusoy, K. Kilic, and L. Alpkın. 2011. Effects of innovation types on firm performance. *International Journal of Production Economics* 133:662–676. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2011.05.014.
- Hakala, H. 2011. Strategic orientations in management literature: Three approaches to understanding the interaction between market, technology, entrepreneurial and learning orientations. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 13:199–217. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00292.x.
- Hakala, H., and M. Kohtamaki. 2011. Configurations of entrepreneurial customer and technology orientation: Differences in learning and performance of software companies. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 17:64–81. doi:10.1108/13552551111107516.
- Hamel, G., and C. K. Prahalad. 1991. Corporate imagination and expeditionary marketing. *Harvard Business Review* 69:81–92.
- Hamsioğlu, A. B. 2011. Market orientation, quality orientation and business performance relationship: A study in pharmaceutical industry. *Ege Academic Review* 11 (1): 91–101.
- Hitt, M. A., R. D. Ireland, S. M. Camp, and D. L. Sexton. 2001. Strategic entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial strategies for wealth creation. *Strategic Management Journal* 22 (6/7): 479–491. doi:10.1002/smj.196.
- Hooper, V., S. Huff, and P. C. Thirkell. 2007. IS-marketing alignment: Its impacts on marketing performance and on business performance. In *Proceedings of the 15th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS 2007)*,

- ed. H. Osterlie, J. Schelp, and R. Winter, 669–680. St. Gallen, Switzerland: University of St. Gallen.
- Hurley, R. F., and G. T. M. Hult. 1998. Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: An integration and empirical examination. *Journal of Marketing* 62 (3): 42–54. doi:10.2307/1251742.
- İlkay, M. S., and A. İ. Özdemir. 2007. E-Business applications in Turkey: A research on the top 500 Turkish manufacturing firms. *Journal of Institute of Social Sciences* 23 (2): 285–303.
- Jeong, I., J. H. Pae, and D. Zhou. 2006. Antecedents and consequences of the strategic orientations in new product development: The case of Chinese manufacturers. *Industrial Marketing Management* 35:348–358. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2005.06.010.
- Kearns, G. S., and A. L. Lederer. 2003. A resource-based view of strategic IT alignment: How knowledge sharing creates competitive advantage. *Decision Sciences* 34 (1): 1–29. doi:10.1111/1540-5915.02289.
- Keh, H. T., T. T. M. Nguyen, and H. P. Ng. 2007. The effects of entrepreneurial orientation and marketing information on the performance of SMEs. *Journal of Business Venturing* 22:592–611. doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2006.05.003.
- Kirca, A. H. 2011. The effects of market orientation on subsidiary performance: Empirical evidence from MNCs in Turkey. *Journal of World Business* 46 (4): 447–454. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2010.10.005.
- Kirca, A. H., S. Jayachandran, and W. O. Bearden. 2005. Market orientation: A meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and impact on performance. *Journal of Marketing* 69 (2): 24–41. doi:10.1509/jmkg.69.2.24.60761.
- Kohli, A. K., and B. J. Jaworski. 1990. Market orientation: The construct, research propositions and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing* 54 (2): 1–18. doi:10.2307/1251866.
- Kropp, F., N. J. Lindsay, and A. Shoham. 2006. Entrepreneurial, market, and learning orientations and international entrepreneurial business venture performance in South African firms. *International Marketing Review* 23:504–523. doi:10.1108/02651330610703427.
- Lado, N., and A. Maydeu-Olivares. 2001. Exploring the link between market orientation and innovation in the European and US insurance markets. *International Marketing Review* 18:130–145. doi:10.1108/02651330110389972.
- Lai, C.-S., D.-C. Pai, C.-F. Yang, and H.-J. Lin. 2009. The effects of market orientation on relationship learning and relationship performance in industrial marketing: The dyadic perspectives. *Industrial Marketing Management* 38:166–172. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2008.12.004.
- Li, Y.-H., J.-W. Huang, and M.-T. Tsai. 2009. Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: The role of knowledge creation process. *Industrial Marketing Management* 38 (4): 440–449. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2008.02.004.
- Liao, S.-H., W.-J. Chang, C.-C. Wu, and J. M. Katrichis. 2011. A survey of market orientation research (1995–2008). *Industrial Marketing Management* 40 (2): 301–310. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.09.003.
- Lu, V. N., and C. C. Julian. 2007. The Internet and export marketing performance: The empirical link in export market ventures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 19 (2): 127–144. doi:10.1108/13555850710738480.

- Lumpkin, G. T., and G. G. Dess. 1996. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *The Academy of Management Review* 21 (1): 135–172. doi:10.2307/258632.
- Lumpkin, G. T., and G. G. Dess. 2001. Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing* 16:429–451. doi:10.1016/S0883-9026(00)00048-3.
- McDougall, P. P., and B. M. Oviatt. 2000. International entrepreneurship: The intersection of two research paths. *Academy of Management Journal* 43:902–906. doi:10.2307/1556418.
- Miller, D. 1983. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science* 29 (7): 770–791. doi:10.1287/mnsc.29.7.770.
- Narver, J. C., and S. F. Slater. 1990. The effect of market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing* 54 (4): 20–35. doi:10.2307/1251757.
- Oflazoğlu, S., and A. Koçak. 2012. The effects of strategic orientations on innovation and performance. *Çankırı Karatekin University Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences (JFEAS)* 2 (1): 121–144.
- Olavarrieta, S., and R. Friedmann. 2008. Market orientation, knowledge-related resources and firm performance. *Journal of Business Research* 61 (6): 623–630. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.06.037.
- Perry, M. L., and A. T. Shao. 2002. Market orientation and incumbent performance in dynamic market. *European Journal of Marketing* 36 (9/10): 1140–1153. doi:10.1108/03090560210437370.
- Prasad, V. K., K. Ramamurthy, and G. M. Naidu. 2001. The influence of Internet-marketing integration on marketing competencies and export performance. *Journal of International Marketing* 9 (4): 82–110. doi:10.1509/jimk.9.4.82.19944.
- Pulendran, S., R. Speed, and R. E. Widing, II. 2003. Marketing planning, market orientation and business performance. *European Journal of Marketing* 37 (3): 476–497. doi:10.1108/03090560310459050.
- Racela, O. C., C. Chaikittisilpa, and A. Thoumrungroje. 2007. Market orientation, international business relationships and perceived export performance. *International Marketing Review* 24 (2): 144–163. doi:10.1108/02651330710741794.
- Rauch, A., J. Wiklund, G. T. Lumpkin, and M. Frese. 2009. Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 33 (3): 761–787. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00308.x.
- Salavou, H. 2005. Do customer and technology orientations influence product innovativeness in SMEs? Some new evidence from Greece. *Journal of Marketing Management* 21 (3/4): 307–338. doi:10.1362/0267257053779082.
- Sanders, N. R. 2007. An empirical study of the impact of e-business technologies on organizational collaboration and performance. *Journal of Operations Management* 25:1332–1347. doi:10.1016/j.jom.2007.01.008.
- Santhanam, R., and E. Hartono. 2003. Issues in linking information technology capability to firm performance. *MIS Quarterly* 27 (1): 125–153.
- Sciascia, S., L. D’Oria, M. Bruni, and B. Larrañeta. 2014. Entrepreneurial orientation in low- and medium-tech industries: The need for absorptive capacity to increase

- performance. *European Management Journal* 32 (5): 761–769. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2013.12.007.
- Shaltoni, A. M., and D. C. West. 2010. The measurement of e-marketing orientation (EMO) in business-to-business markets. *Industrial Marketing Management* 39:1097–1102. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2009.06.011.
- Sheth, J. N., and A. Sharma. 2005. International e-marketing: Opportunities and issues. *International Marketing Review* 22 (6): 611–622. doi:10.1108/02651330510630249.
- Sin, L. Y. M., A. C. B. Tse, V. C. S. Heung, and F. H. K. Yim. 2005. An analysis of the relationship between market orientation and business performance in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 24:555–577. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2004.11.002.
- Smirnova, M., P. Naudé, S. C. Henneberg, S. Mouzas, and S. P. Kouchtch. 2011. The impact of market orientation on the development of relational capabilities and performance outcomes: The case of Russian industrial firms. *Industrial Marketing Management* 40:44–53. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.09.009.
- Solberg, C. A., and U. H. Olsson. 2010. Management orientation and export performance: The case of Norwegian ICT companies. *Baltic Journal of Management* 5 (1): 28–50. doi:10.1108/17465261011016540.
- Süreer, A. 2012. Effects of e-marketing orientation on export performance: A research in Gaziantep. Master's thesis, Gaziantep Üniversitesi.
- Tajeddini, K. 2010. Effect of customer orientation and entrepreneurial orientation on innovativeness: Evidence from the hotel industry in Switzerland. *Tourism Management* 31:221–231. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.013.
- Van Raaij, E. M., and J. W. Stoelhorst. 2008. The implementation of a market orientation: A review and integration of the contributions to date. *European Journal of Marketing* 42 (11/12): 1265–1293. doi:10.1108/03090560810903673.
- Voss, G. B., and Z. G. Voss. 2000. Strategic orientation and firm performance in an artistic environment. *Journal of Marketing* 64 (1): 67–83. doi:10.1509/jmkg.64.1.67.17993.
- Wang, C. L. 2008. Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 32 (4): 635–657. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2008.00246.x.
- Wiklund, J., and D. Shepherd. 2003. Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal* 24:1307–1314. doi:10.1002/smj.360.
- Wiklund, J., and D. Shepherd. 2005. Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: A configurational approach. *Journal of Business Venturing* 20: 71–91. doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2004.01.001.
- Yılmaz, C., L. Alpan, and Ç. Bulut. 2009. Effects of firm culture characteristics on performance dimensions: A field study of Turkish manufacturing and service firms. *Journal of Yasar University* 4 (16): 2469–2500.
- Zhou, K. Z., C. K. B. Yim, and D. K. Tse. 2005. The effects of strategic orientations on technology- and market-based breakthrough innovations. *Journal of Marketing* 69:42–60. doi:10.1509/jmkg.69.2.42.60756.