

AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK FOR
MARKETING IN AN ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING:
THE CASE OF TURKEY
(2)

A. EBRU AKKAYA

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY
2004

V. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study will be presented in two main sections. The first section will give the findings obtained from descriptive statistics. The second section will discuss the findings obtained from relational hypotheses.

5.1. Findings Obtained From Descriptive Statistics

This section will present the descriptive results for each variable that was included in the study.

5.1.1. Organizational Orientation

In terms of the four organizational orientation types (production, product, sales and market orientations), market orientation has the highest mean score (4.4197) over 5. This shows that the companies in the sample mostly consider market orientation as the most preferred organizational orientation type. When the mean scores for the dimensions of market orientation, namely customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination are investigated, it is seen that companies have a tendency to apply mostly customer orientation followed by competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination, respectively. Among the individual variables making up the market orientation construct, measuring customer satisfaction has the highest mean score (4.7434) over 5 whereas sharing of customer information among functions has the lowest mean score (4.0789) over 5. Details of the descriptive results for organizational orientation are in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1. Descriptive Results for Organizational Orientation

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Production Orientation	152	2.7434	1.0261
Product Orientation	152	1.9474	0.6386
Sales Orientation	152	2.1711	0.8037
Customer Orientation			
Business objectives are driven by customer needs.	152	4.4474	0.5372
We monitor /assess commitment in serving customer needs.	152	4.4539	0.4995
Competitive advantage is based on understanding customer needs.	152	4.4737	0.5140
Strategies are driven by goal of increasing customer value.	152	4.4737	0.5748
We frequently measure customer satisfaction.	152	4.7434	0.4674
We pay close attention to after sales service.	152	4.5789	0.5214
Competitor Orientation			
We share information about competitors.	152	4.5921	0.5318
We response rapidly to competitor actions.	152	4.2697	0.7455
Management regularly discusses competitor strengths/weaknesses.	152	4.6645	0.5009
We target customers for competitive advantage opportunities.	152	4.4539	0.5619
Interfunctional Coordination			
We share information across departments.	152	4.2829	0.4939
There is sharing of customer information among functions.	152	4.0789	0.4534
We understand how employees can create customer value.	152	4.4737	0.5140
There is functional integration in strategy.	152	4.1711	0.4113
We share resources among business units.	152	4.1382	0.3995
Total Score for Customer Orientation	152	4.5285	0.3859
Total Score for Competitor Orientation	152	4.4951	0.4766
Total Score for Interfunctional Coordination	152	4.2289	0.3022
Total Score for Market Orientation	152	4.4197	0.2973

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree 5=Strongly agree

5.1.2. Strategic Orientation

Among the six strategic orientations (aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness, riskiness), futurity has the highest mean score (4.3503) over 5 and aggressiveness has the lowest means score (2.2961) over 5. This shows that companies in the sample have a tendency to be prepared for future environmental situations, but they show a hesitancy to rapidly deploy their resources to improve their market position. As a result of low mean score for aggressiveness orientation, variables composing this construct have also mean scores lower than 2.5 over 5. The lowest mean score belongs to the variable of seeking market share position at the expense of cash flow and profitability. This is again an indicator for the hesitancy of the firms to put their resources into danger for improving market position. Being prepared for future environmental situations requires the usage of research. This can also be found in the mean results since 'emphasizing basic research to provide future competitive advantage', a variable of futurity, has the highest mean score (4.6513) over 5. For the remaining strategic orientations, it can be said that firms in the sample have a higher tendency to adopt defensiveness (4.2807) and analysis (4.1941) orientations and somewhat a lower tendency to adopt proactiveness (3.9227) and riskiness (3.3520). As a summary these mean scores all together indicate that firms in the sample want to be ready for future situations buy they also prefer to do this without taking too much risk. The mean scores for strategic orientation variables can be found in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2. Descriptive Results for Strategic Orientation

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Aggressiveness			
We often sacrifice profitability to gain market share.	152	2.2632	0.7611
We often cut prices to increase market share.	152	2.2763	0.6827
We often set prices below competition.	152	2.4605	0.8289
We often seek market share position at the expense of cash flow and profitability	152	2.1842	0.6849
Analysis			
We emphasize effective coordination among different functional areas.	152	4.1118	0.3162
Our information systems provide support for decision making.	152	4.1447	0.4661
When confronted with a major decision, we usually try to develop through analysis.	152	4.2829	0.4518
We use several planning techniques.	152	4.3092	0.4914
We use the outputs of management information and control systems	152	4.2237	0.4486
We commonly use manpower planning and performance appraisal of senior managers.	152	4.0921	0.4509
Defensiveness			
We occasionally conduct significant modifications to manufacturing technology. **	152	3.4803	0.7803
We often use cost control systems for monitoring performance.	152	4.1316	0.3933
We often use production management techniques.	152	4.3882	0.5643
We often emphasize product quality through the use of quality circles.	152	4.3224	0.5095
Futurity			
We emphasize basic research to provide us with future competitive edge.	152	4.6513	0.4917
Forecasting key indicators of operations is common.	152	4.1776	0.4003
Formal tracking of significant general trends is common.	152	4.3882	0.5153
We often conduct what if analyses of critical issues.	152	4.1842	0.4663
Proactiveness			
We are constantly seeking new opportunities related to present operations.	152	4.2763	0.6428
We are usually the first ones to introduce new brands or products/services on the market.	152	4.1250	0.7661
We are constantly on the look for businesses that can be acquired.	152	3.8947	0.7560
Operations in later stages of the life cycle are strategically eliminated.	152	3.3947	0.6214
Riskiness			
We seem to adopt a rather conservative view when making major decisions. ***R	152	3.7303	0.7717
New projects are approved on a stage by stage basis rather	152	3.6645	0.7182

than with blanket approval. ***R			
We have a tendency to support projects where the expected returns are certain. ***R	152	3.0263	0.8374
Our operations have generally followed the tried and true paths. ***R	152	2.9868	0.7545
Total Score for Aggressiveness	152	2.2961	0.6065
Total Score for Analysis	152	4.1941	0.2899
Total Score for Defensiveness	152	4.2807	0.3857
Total Score for Futurity	152	4.3503	0.3333
Total Score for Proactiveness	152	3.9227	0.4977
Total Score for Riskiness	152	3.3520	0.5684

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree 5=Strongly agree

**Deleted item according to Cronbach's alpha values

***R = reverse coded.

5.1.3. Organizational Culture

Organizational culture was measured by 16 questions. These 16 questions are given to the respondents in 4 groups, each group having 4 questions in themselves. The respondents are asked to distribute 100 points among each of the four groups. The culture scores were then computed by adding four values for each culture type. Therefore at the maximum, a culture score can be 400, but this is not the most likely case since the businesses usually have some mixture of the four organizational culture types. Among the four cultural types (clan, adhocracy, hierarchy and market), market culture type has the highest mean score (114.5724) followed by adhocracy culture type (111.0855). Clan culture has a mean score of 92.0724 and hierarchical culture type has the lowest mean score (82.0724). Firms in this sample seem to mostly adopt market culture showing their emphasis on competitive advantage and market superiority. Emphasis of competitive actions and achievement (31.9737) together with emphasis on tasks and goal accomplishment (29.5724) have the highest mean scores among all variables. Another mostly adopted culture type is adhocracy culture (111.0855) with its emphasis on innovation and entrepreneurship. Commitment to development and innovation is the variable that has the highest mean (28.9145) among the variables making up the adhocracy culture. Respondents of this

sample indicated that their strategic business units are less likely to adopt clan (92.0724) and hierarchy cultures (82.0724). The descriptive results for organizational culture can be found in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3. Descriptive Results for Organizational Culture

Variable	n	Mean*	s
My organization is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot themselves.	152	23.6513	7.3007
The head of my organization is generally considered to be a mentor, sage or a father or mother figure.	152	20.5263	7.7021
The glue that holds my organization together is loyalty and tradition. Commitment to this firm runs high. .	152	22.7303	6.3516
My organization emphasizes human resources. High cohesion and morale in the firm are important.	152	25.3289	5.2949
Total Score for Clan Culture	152	92.0724	18.5879
My organization is a very dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.	152	28.1250	6.8283
The head of my organization is generally considered to be an entrepreneur, an innovator or a risk taker.	152	27.8289	7.7132
The glue that holds my organization together is a commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being first.	152	28.9145	6.9985
My organization emphasizes growth and acquiring new resources. Readiness to meet new challenges is important.	152	26.0855	5.7231
Total Score for Adhocracy Culture	152	111.0855	19.3599
My organization is a very formalized and structural place. Established procedures generally govern what people do.	152	20.1974	8.4938
The head of my organization is generally considered to be A coordinator, an organizer, or an administrator.	152	27.1711	6.3211
The glue that holds my organization together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running institution is important here.	152	18.9803	7.5103
My organization emphasizes permanence and stability. efficient, smooth operations are important.	152	16.2829	6.0761
Total Score for Hierarchy Culture	152	82.0724	22.1631
My organization is a very production oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done, without much personal involvement.	152	27.8947	7.0833
The head of my organization is generally considered to be a producer, a technician, or a hard-driver.	152	24.8355	7.8144
The glue that holds my organization together is the emphasis on tasks and goal accomplishment. A production orientation is commonly shared.	152	29.5724	6.0883

My organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Measurable goals are important.	152	31.9737	5.6427
Total Score for Market Culture	152	114.5724	18.2871

*Scale: Minimum 0, maximum 400 points.

5.1.4. Organizational Capability

Companies in this sample find spanning capabilities most important (4.7566) immediately followed by outside-in capabilities (4.7155). Importance given to inside-out capabilities is still high, getting a mean score of 4.5150 over 5, but when compared with the importance given to spanning and outside-in capabilities, it stands relatively lower. Among the spanning capabilities, customer service delivery capability (4.9211) and customer order fulfillment capability (4.8882) get the highest mean scores. Customer linking (4.8289) and market sensing (4.8026) capabilities are the two variables getting the highest mean scores among the outside-in capabilities. Finally for the inside-out capabilities, the highest mean score belongs to manufacturing or operational capability (4.6513) and the lowest score belongs to technology development capability (4.3487). The descriptive results with respect to organizational capabilities can be found in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4. Descriptive Results for Organizational Capabilities

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Market sensing capability	152	4.8026	0.3993
Customer linking capability	152	4.8289	0.3949
Channel bonding capability	152	4.7895	0.4832
Technology monitoring capability	152	4.4408	0.6275
Total Score for Outside-In Capabilities	152	4.7155	0.3559
Financial management capability	152	4.5987	0.4917
Cost control capability	152	4.5921	0.5063
Technology development capability	152	4.3487	0.6118
Logistics capability	152	4.6118	0.5643
Manufacturing or operational capability	152	4.6513	0.5306
Human resources management capability	152	4.3816	0.5630
The capability for preserving and improving	152	4.4211	0.6358

health and safety.			
Total Score for Inside-Out Capabilities	152	4.5150	0.3255
Customer order fulfillment capability	152	4.8882	0.3556
Pricing capability	152	4.6382	0.4821
Purchasing capability	152	4.6711	0.4852
Customer service delivery capability	152	4.9211	0.2705
New product/service development capability	152	4.5987	0.5180
Strategy development capability	152	4.8224	0.3834
Total Score for Spanning Capabilities	152	4.7566	0.2824

*Scale: 1=Not important at all 5=Very important

5.1.5. Organizational Form

Among the four organizational forms, network form has the highest mean score over 5 (4.5461) closely followed by relational form (4.4967). Respondents were somewhat neutral for hierarchical form (mean score= 3.3092) being the form type close to their strategic business unit and they were more closer to the negative end of the continuum for the transactional form (mean score= 2.0197). Descriptive results for organizational form are in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5. Descriptive Results for Organizational Form

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Total Score for Hierarchical form	152	3.3092	0.9713
Total Score for Transactional form	152	2.0197	0.5921
Total Score for Relational form	152	4.4967	0.5016
Total Score for Network form	152	4.5461	0.5126

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree 5=Strongly agree

Besides looking at organizational form types in total, it will be more meaningful to analyze frequencies of each typology separately. Valid percents for the organizational form are in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6. Valid Percents for Organizational Form

Scale Values	Hierarchical Form (%)	Transactional Form (%)	Relational Form (%)	Network Form (%)
1	3.3	13.8	0	0
2	21.7	73	0	0
3	20.4	10.5	0	0.7
4	50	2.6	50.3	44.1
5	4.6	0	49.7	55.3
Total	100	100	100	100

For the hierarchical form, 20.4% of the respondents were neutral for the agreement of the question. 25% of the respondents (3.3% for 1, 21.7% for 2) do not agree that this type of organizational is typical of their strategic business unit. More than half of the respondents (50% for 4 and 4.6% for 5) agreed that this organizational form type is typical for their strategic business unit.

For the transactional form, 86.8% of the respondents (13.8% for 1 and 73% for 2) did not agree that this form is typical for their strategic business unit. 10.5 % of the respondents were neutral and 2.6% were somewhat close to the positive end of the continuum. None of the respondents considered the 5th point alternative which shows strong agreement with the typicality of the organizational form with strategic business unit.

For the relational form, all of the respondents were close to the positive end of the continuum indicating that 100 % of the respondents believed that relational form is

the typical organizational form for their strategic business units (50.3 % for 4 and 49.7 % for 5).

Similar to relational form, for the network form nearly (except for the neutral tendency of 0.7 % of the respondents) 100% of the respondents agreed that network form best describes their strategic business units. The percentage of respondents showing strong agreement with the typicality of this form (55.3%) is higher than the percentage of respondents showing strong agreement with the typicality of relational form (49.7). Paralelly, percentage of respondents showing agreement (choosing 4 out of the 5 point continuum) with the typicality of network form (44.1%) is somewhat lower than the percentage of respondents showing agreement with the typicality of relational form (50.3%).

5.1.6. Organizational Innovation

The total mean score for organizational innovation (3.9572) indicates that firms in the sample are close to the positive end of the 5-point continuum. The respondents have considered their strategic business units as innovative since the most positive and also highest mean scores come from the variable of 'first to market new products/services' (4.1645) and from the variable of 'at the cutting edge of technological innovation' (4.1316). The mean scores for the reverse coded items that is for the items denoting a hesitancy for innovation are 3.7697 for later entrance in established but still growing markets and 3.7632 for entrant in stable markets. The descriptive results for organizational innovation is shown in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7. Descriptive Results for Organizational Innovation

Variable	n	Mean*	s
First to market new products and services	152	4.1645	0.7611
Later entrant in established but still growing markets**R	152	3.7697	0.6827
Entrant in mature stable markets **R	152	3.7632	0.8289
At the cutting edge of technological innovation	152	4.1316	0.6849
Total Score for Organizational Innovation.	152	3.9572	0.4361

*Scale: 1=Never 5=Always

**R= Reverse coded

5.1.7. Organizational Learning

The total mean score for organizational learning (4.0121) indicates that strategic business units in the sample have a positive overall tendency for learning. Among the dimensions of organizational learning, the highest mean score belongs to information dissemination (4.0746) immediately followed by information acquisition (4.0241). Shared interpretation dimension has a little bit lower mean score (3.9474) but it still is near to the positive end of the 5 point continuum. These mean scores indicate that strategic business units of the sample have serious attempts for information acquisition, information dissemination and shared interpretation. Overall, they identify themselves as organizational learners when one examines the total mean score of organizational learning (4.0121). When the variables making up the organizational learning construct are investigated, it is seen that the lowest mean score is for 'emphasis given to acquiring information from externally-focused experience by using small-scale market experiments, large-scale demonstration projects' (3.7368). If the deleted variable because of low Cronbach's alpha value is ignored, the variable having the highest mean score (4.1842) is 'encouragement for attending formal developmental activities like training, professional seminars, symposia'. The descriptive results for organizational learning can be found in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8. Descriptive Results for Organizational Learning

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Our strategic business unit does not give emphasis to acquiring information from internally-focused experience. ***R	152	4.1711	0.5118
Our strategic business unit gives emphasis to acquiring information from externally-focused experience by using small-scale market experiments, large-scale demonstration projects, etc.	152	3.7368	0.6783
Our strategic business unit gives emphasis to acquiring information from the experience of others through common practices like benchmarking, forming joint ventures, networking, making strategic alliances, working with lead customers, etc.	152	4.1118	0.4236
Our strategic business unit provides opportunities for individual development other than formal training like work assignments and job rotation.	152	4.0000	0.4603
Our strategic business unit does not encourage its members to attend formal developmental activities like training, professional seminars, symposia. ***R	152	4.1842	0.5569
Important knowledge in our strategic business unit is recorded in information systems, operating procedures, mission statements, strategic business unit stories etc. so that people can have access to this strategic business unit memory.	152	3.9408	0.5426
Total Score for Information Acquisition	152	4.0241	0.3307
In our strategic business unit, information is accessible in a broader context by all strategic business unit players who might use or be affected by it.	152	4.0132	0.4455
Our strategic business unit does not put emphasis on multifunctional activities and discussions. **	152	4.3355	0.6083
Our strategic business unit puts emphasis on information exchange among departments.	152	4.1316	0.3581
Our strategic business unit puts emphasis on the removal of functional barriers that impede the flow of information among departments.	152	4.0789	0.3552
Total Score for Information Dissemination	152	4.0746	0.2951
Our strategic business unit continually attempts to reach a consensus on the meaning of information and its implications for business.	152	3.8487	0.5368
In our strategic business unit, the ramifications of alternative action plans are carefully considered through effective conflict resolution processes.	152	3.9539	0.4042
In our strategic business unit, conflict resolution is enhanced by the development of group norms that encourage open sharing of information.	152	3.9934	0.3728
In our strategic business unit, conflict resolution is not enhanced by the development of group norms that	152	3.9934	0.3902

remove constraints on information and communication flows. ***R			
Total Score for Shared Interpretation	152	3.9474	0.3460
Total Score for Organizational Learning	152	4.0121	0.2702

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree

5=Strongly agree

**Deleted item according to Cronbach's alpha values

***R = reverse coded.

5.1.8. Market-Related Factors

Four market related factors namely market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth are investigated in this study. Respondents in the sample indicated that highest agreement level for competitive intensity (mean score= 4.0855). Strategic business units in this sample believe that they operate in highly competitive markets.

The mean score of 3.9013 over 5 for market growth shows that strategic business units operate in markets that are close to growing markets. It will be more clarifying to investigate the frequencies for market growth. Valid percentages for market growth can be seen in Table 5.13. According to the valid percentages, 75 % of the respondents identify their markets as growing and 9.2% as rapidly growing. 12.5 % of the respondents see their markets as neither declining nor growing. Finally, 3.3 % of the respondents indicated that their markets are declining.

Technological turbulence is the market related factor that has the third highest mean score (3.5592). This shows that strategic business units in the sample are more close to the technologically turbulent end of the 5-point continuum. When the variables composing the technological turbulence dimension are investigated, it is seen that respondents assert that the technological developments in their industries are far from being minor on the average (mean score 3.7171).

The lowest mean score among the four market related factors is for market turbulence with a mean score of 3.4276 over 5. This mean score is still close to the positive end of the continuum indicating that the markets firms operate in are somewhat turbulent. It is interesting to note that strategic business units in the sample witness demand for their products and services from customers who never bought them (mean score 4.0789) indicating high potential of new prospects in their markets. Also, these new customers demand new products and services (mean score 3.8882). The descriptive results for market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth can be found in Tables 5.9, 5.10, 5.11 and 5.12 respectively. The valid percents for market growth can be seen in Table 5.13.

Table 5.9. Descriptive Results for Market Turbulence

Variable	n	Mean*	s
In our kind of business, customers' product/service preferences change quite a bit over time. **R	152	3.4671	1.0093
Our customers tend to look for new products/services all the time.	152	3.8882	0.8101
We are witnessing demand for our products and services from customers who never bought them before.	152	4.0789	0.4534
New customers tend to have product/service related needs that are different from those of our existing customers.	152	3.2500	0.8707
We cater to many of the same customers that we used to in the past. **R	152	2.4539	0.8042
Total Score for Market Turbulence	152	3.4276	0.5782

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree 5=Strongly agree

**R =Reverse coded

Table 5.10. Descriptive Results for Competitive Intensity

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Competition in our industry is cutthroat.	152	4.3816	0.5390
There are many promotion wars in our industry.	152	4.2697	0.6805
Anything that one competitor can offer, others can match readily.	152	3.8553	0.8171
Price competition is a hallmark of our industry.	152	3.9539	0.8561
One hears of a new competitive move almost every day.	152	3.9934	0.8258
Our competitors are relatively weak. **R	152	4.0592	0.6733
Total Score for Competitive Intensity	152	4.0855	0.5651

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree 5=Strongly agree

**R =Reverse coded

Table 5.11. Descriptive Results for Technological Turbulence

Variable	n	Mean*	s
The technology in our industry is changing rapidly.	152	3.5329	0.7713
Technological changes provide big opportunities in our industry.	152	3.500	0.8218
A large number of new product/service ideas have been made possible through technological breakthroughs in our industry.	152	3.4868	0.8534
Technological developments in our industry is rather minor. **R	152	3.7171	0.8567
Total Score for Technological Turbulence	152	3.5592	0.7610

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree 5=Strongly agree

**R =Reverse coded

Table 5.12. Descriptive Results for Market Growth

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Market growth	152	3.9013	0.5841

*Scale: 1=Rapidly declining 5=Rapidly growing

Table 5.13. Valid Percents for Market Growth

Scale Values	Market Growth (%)
1	0
2	3.3
3	12.5
4	75
5	9.2
Total	100

5.1.9. Employee Responses

The total score for employee responses (mean=3.9615) is very close to the positive end of the 5-point continuum. Therefore, on the average respondents in the sample show favorable responses toward their strategic business units. There are two main dimensions of employee responses. These are organizational commitment and esprit de corps. The mean scores for these two dimensions are 4.0000 and 3.9156 respectively. These scores are very close to each other and are in the range of positive end of the 5-point continuum. Respondents agree that they are committed to their strategic business units and there is esprit de corps in their strategic business units. For the variables making up the organizational commitment dimension, the highest mean score belongs to 'being proud to work for the business unit' (4.2895). For the variables making up the esprit de corps dimension, the highest mean score belongs to 'a team spirit pervades all ranks in this business unit' (4.1382). The results of the descriptive analysis for employee responses are in Table 5.14.

Table 5.14. Descriptive Results for Employee Responses

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Employees feel as though their future is intimately linked to that of this strategic business unit.	152	3.8553	0.4801
Employees would be happy to make personal sacrifices if it were important for the business unit's well-being.	152	3.9605	0.5624
The bonds between this strategic business unit and its employees are weak. **R	152	3.9803	0.6140
In general, employees are proud to work for this business unit.	152	4.2895	0.5711
Employees often go above and beyond the call of duty to ensure this business unit's well-being.	152	4.0395	0.5259
Our people have little or no commitment to this business unit. **R	152	3.9737	0.6505
It is clear that employees are fond of this business unit.	152	3.9079	0.4045
Total Score for Organizational Commitment	152	4.0000	0.3551
People in this business unit are genuinely	152	4.0461	0.5190

concerned about the needs and problems of each other.			
A team spirit pervades all ranks in this business unit.	152	4.1382	0.5280
Working for this business unit is like being a part of a big family.	152	3.9211	0.6461
People in this business unit feel emotionally attached to each other.	152	3.9276	0.6208
This business unit lacks an esprit de corps. **RC	152	3.9737	0.6084
People in this business unit view themselves as independent individuals who have to tolerate others around them.	152	3.4868	0.7719
Total Score for Esprit de Corps	152	3.9156	0.3991
Total Score for Employee Responses	152	3.9615	0.3368

*Scale: 1=Strongly disagree

5=Strongly agree

**R =Reverse coded

5.1.10. Customer Satisfaction

Total customer satisfaction mean score (82.7796) over 100 indicates that respondents believe their customers are satisfied on the average. Satisfaction with the business unit in general (mean score=83.9474) is perceived by the respondents to be somewhat higher than satisfaction with the products and services of the business unit (mean score =81.6118). In order to have a more detailed picture for the overall satisfaction scale, it will be helpful to analyze the frequencies. According to the valid percentages, 26.3 % of the respondents believe that their customers are 90% satisfied and 2% of the respondents believe that their customers are 95% satisfied. 51.4% of the respondents indicated customer satisfaction percentages between the range of 80-87.5% (25.7% of the respondents indicated 80% satisfaction, 21.1% of the respondents indicated 85% satisfaction, 3.3% of the respondents indicated 87.5% satisfaction and 1.3% of the respondents indicated 82.5% satisfaction). Finally, 20.5 % of the respondents told that their customers are satisfied between the ranges of 65-77.5% (11.2% of the respondents indicated 75% satisfaction, 6.6 % of the respondents indicated 70% satisfaction, 1.3% of the respondents indicated 65% satisfaction and 0.7% of the respondents indicated 72.5% and 77.5 % satisfaction).

None of the respondents indicated a satisfaction level below 65% which still can be considered more than the average satisfaction out of a 100-point continuum. The descriptive results and valid percentages for customer satisfaction are in Table 5.15. and 5.16 respectively.

Table 5.15. Descriptive Results for Customer Satisfaction

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Satisfaction with products and services of the business unit	152	81.6118	7.4496
Satisfaction with the business unit in general	152	83.9474	6.7508
Total Customer Satisfaction Score	152	82.7796	6.5770

*Scale: 0=Completely Dissatisfied 100=Completely Satisfied

Table 5.16. Valid Percents for Customer Satisfaction

Scale Values	Customer Satisfaction (%)
65	1.3
70	6.6
72,50	0.7
75	11.2
77,50	0.7
80	25.7
82,50	1.3
85	21.1
87,50	3.3
90	26.3
95	2.0
Total	100

5.1.11. Organizational Performance

Organizational performance is assessed by three scales. These scales measured comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and overall performance. Within these three measures, the highest mean score belongs to overall performance (3.9934). It shows strategic business unit's overall performance is near

to the positive end of the 5-point continuum. The total mean score for comparative performance is 3.6867 and this is again close to the positive end of the continuum. Total mean score for performance compared to objectives is 3.5461 and this is the lowest mean score among the three total performance measures. For comparative performance, profitability (mean score= 3.8421) and % sales growth (mean score= 3.7961) has the highest mean scores. The lowest mean scores for the comparative performance dimension belongs to 'sales generated by new products and services' (mean = 3.44934) and 'number of successful products/services' (mean = 3.5461).

For performance compared to objectives dimension, the highest evaluation is for product/service quality (mean = 3.7961), followed by customer retention (mean = 3.7237). the lowest but still positive evaluation was for customer satisfaction (mean = 3.6842). Although the respondents perceived that their customers are on the average 82.77% satisfied (Table 5.15), here they somewhat reported lower levels for customer satisfaction with respect to stated objectives. This may stem from the fact that strategic business unit's targeted customer satisfaction levels are higher than 82.77 %.

For overall performance (total mean = 3.9934), respondents gave positive evaluations. Respondents indicated that overall performance of their business units were good (mean = 4.0197) and their performance with respect to major competitors is also good (mean = 3.9671).

The perceived total performance is computed by averaging all scores for comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and overall performance. The

mean for this evaluation is 3.8957, which is closer to the 'good' evaluations. The companies in the sample perceived themselves to be higher than average performers. It should be noted that the author attempted to assess objective performance, in other words actual figures with respect to total sales revenue, unit sales, market share, new products launches, profit is asked to the respondents. Because these figures change according to the different sectors the firms operate in and according to the products/services of the companies, these criteria is left out of the scope of this study. Further research can investigate similarities and differences among the strategic business units with respect to objective performance measures and compare it with the results obtained from subjective performance measures. Because of the stated reasons, objective performance measures are not reported here and throughout the study. All the further analyses are done with subjective (perceived) performance measures.

The descriptive results with respect to comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, overall performance and total perceived performance can be found in Tables 5.17, 5.18, 5.19, and 5.20 respectively.

Table 5.17. Descriptive Results for Comparative Performance

Variable	n	Mean*	s
When compared with major competitors over the past year			
Business unit's market share	152	3.6842	0.9794
Business unit's market share growth	152	3.7237	0.8929
Business unit's sales growth in %	152	3.7961	0.8083
Number of successful products/services introduced by the business unit	152	3.5461	0.7532
Percentage of sales generated by new products/services in the business unit	152	3.4934	0.7889
Business unit's profitability	152	3.8421	0.8772
Business unit's total sales revenue in TL	152	3.7105	0.9603
Business unit's sales volume in units	152	3.6974	0.9700
Total Score for Comparative Performance	152	3.6867	0.7374

*Scale: 1= Poor 5=Excellent

Table 5.18. Descriptive Results for Performance Compared to Objectives

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Performance of the strategic business unit relative to stated objectives about			
Customer satisfaction	152	3.6842	0.9794
Customer retention	152	3.7237	0.8929
Product/service quality	152	3.7961	0.8083
Total Score for Performance Compared to Objectives	152	3.5461	0.7532

*Scale: 1= Much worse than competition 5=Much better than competition

Table 5.19. Descriptive Results for Overall Performance

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Overall performance of the business unit	152	4.0197	0.5921
Overall performance relative to major competitors	152	3.9671	0.6945
Total Score for Overall Performance	152	3.9934	0.6276

*Scale: 1= Poor 5=Excellent

Table 5.20. Descriptive Results for Total Perceived Performance

Variable	n	Mean*	s
Total score for Perceived Performance (including overall performance, performance compared to objectives and comparative performance)	152	3.8957	0.6168

*Scale: 1= Poor 5=Excellent

5.1.12. Sector

A little over 36% of the strategic business units were in the manufacturing sector, 49% were in the service sector. 5.3% of the strategic business units defined their sectors as retail and 26.3% of the strategic business units define their sectors as FMCG (fast moving consumer goods). The detailed descriptive results are given in Table 5.21.

Table 5.21. Descriptive Results for the Sector of the Business Unit

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
Manufacturing	55	36.2
Service	49	32.2
Retail	8	5.3
FMCG	40	26.3
Total	152	100

5.1.13. Served Market

The descriptive results for the served market reveal that 64.5% of the questionnaires were from consumer market, 30.2% were from service market and 5.3% were from industrial market. Descriptive results can be found in Table 5.22.

Table 5.22. Descriptive Results for the Served Market of the Business Unit

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
Consumer Market	98	64.5
Industrial Market	8	5.3
Service Market	46	30.2
Total	152	100

5.1.14. Operation Area

When descriptive results for operational area are investigated, it is seen that 20.4% of the strategic business units operate in food and drinks area followed by health

(18.4%), household goods (17.8%), and FMCG (11.8%). The remaining 31.6% of the questionnaires were from different operational areas. The details of the descriptive results with respect to operational area can be found in Table 5.23.

Table 5.23. Descriptive Results for the Operational Area

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
Food and drinks	31	20.4
Household goods	27	17.8
Financial services	2	1.3
Health	28	18.4
Cosmetics	2	1.3
Construction/Contracting	9	5.9
Textile	3	2.0
Paints	6	3.9
FMCG	18	11.8
Information Technology	11	7.2
Tourism	1	0.7
Automotive	4	2.6
Pen	1	0.7
Power	1	0.7
Electronics	3	2.0
Tire	2	1.3
Out of Home Usage	1	0.7
Gas	2	1.3
Total	152	100

5.1.15. Product/Brand Specification

It is found that 67.1% of the strategic business units use individual brand names. 25.7% of the strategic business units use company name as their brand name and 7.2% prefers the combination of individual brand name with company name. The details of the product/brand specification can be seemed in Table 5.24.

Table 5.24. Descriptive Results for Product/Brand Specification

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
Individual Brand Name	102	67.1
Company Name	39	25.7
Individual Brand Name with Company Name	11	7.2
Total	152	100

5.1.16. Number of Full-Time Employees of the Company

It is seen that 77.6% of the companies have more than 750 employees and the remaining 22.4% have employees less than 750. The details of the number of employees of the companies can be seen in Table 5.25.

Table 5.25. Descriptive Results for Number of Full-Time Employees of the Company

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
<100	5	3.3
100-250	15	9.9
251-500	10	6.6
501-750	4	2.6
> 750	118	77.6
Total	152	100

5.1.17. Number of Full-Time Employees of the Strategic Business Unit

Table 5.26 shows that 48 % of the strategic business units have more than 750 employees, and 20.4% have less than 100 employees. The details of the number of employees of the strategic business unit can be seen in Table 5.26.

Table 5.26. Descriptive Results for Number of Full-Time Employees of the Strategic Business Unit

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
<100	31	20.4
100-250	19	12.5
251-500	25	16.4
501-750	4	2.6
> 750	73	48
Total	152	100

5.1.18. Title of the Respondent

The descriptive results for the title of respondents reveal that 44.1% of the respondents were marketing managers, 28.3% were product/brand managers, 26.3% were sales managers and 1.3% were assistant general managers. The details for the title of the respondents can be found in Table 5.27.

Table 5.27. Descriptive Results for the Title of the Respondents

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
Marketing managers	67	44.1
Sales managers	40	26.3
Product/brand managers	2	1.3
Assistant general managers	43	28.3
Total	152	100

5.1.19. Distribution of Capital

It is found that 42.8% of the strategic business units in this study have local capital and 40.1% of the strategic business units have foreign capital. 9.2% of the strategic business units have a 50-50 distribution of foreign and local capital. 5.9% of the strategic business units have local capitals lower than foreign capitals and 0.7% of the strategic business units have foreign capital higher than local counterpart. Finally, 1.3% of the strategic business units indicated that their distribution of capital is unknown. The description results for the distribution of capital is in Table 5.28.

Table 5.28. Descriptive Results for Distribution of Capital

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
100 % Local	65	42.8
100 % Foreign	61	40.1
Local>50%	1	0.7
Local<50%	9	5.9
Unknown	2	1.3
50% Local-50%Foreign	14	9.2
Total	152	100

5.1.20. Information Collection Method

It is seen that 38.8 % of the strategic business units utilize market research and salesforce interpersonal relationships together as their data collection method. 19.7% of the strategic business units use market research, call center and salesforce interpersonal relationships together. The detailed descriptive results of the information collection method can be found in Table 5.29.

When information collection methods are analyzed separately, it can be seen that market research is used nearly by all strategic business units (99.3%). The second most preferred method of information collection is salesforce interpersonal relationships (93.4%). 36.1% of the strategic business units use call centers, 32.2% of the strategic business units use database marketing and 21.7% of the strategic business units use customer relationship management packages. The descriptive results for individual information collection methods can be found in Table 5.30.

Table 5.29. Descriptive Results for Information Collection Methods

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
Salesforce interpersonal relationships	1	0.7
Market research, call center, database marketing, CRM packages, salesforce interpersonal relationships	10	6.6
Market research and database marketing	1	0.7
Market research and CRM packages	7	4.6
Market research and salesforce interpersonal relationships	59	38.8
Market research, call center, database marketing	1	0.7
Market research, salesforce interpersonal relationships and call center	30	19.7
Market research, call center, database marketing, CRM packages	1	0.7
Market research, call center, database marketing, salesforce interpersonal relationships	13	8.6
Market research, database marketing, CRM packages, salesforce interpersonal relationships	9	5.9
Market research, CRM packages, salesforce interpersonal relationships	6	3.9
Market research, database marketing, salesforce interpersonal relationships	14	9.2
Total	152	100

Table 5.30. Descriptive Results for Individual Information Collection Methods

	Frequencies	Valid Percent
Salesforce interpersonal relationships		
Yes	142	93.4
No	10	6.6
Total	152	100
Market research		
Yes	151	99.3
No	1	0.7
Total	152	100
Call center		
Yes	55	36.1
No	97	63.9
Total	152	100
Database Marketing		
Yes	49	32.2
No	103	67.8
Total	152	100
CRM packages		
Yes	33	21.7
No	119	78.3
Total	152	100

5.2. Findings Obtained From Relational Hypotheses

This section will present the findings obtained from relational hypotheses. Organizational orientation (production, product, sales and market orientations), strategic orientation (aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness), organizational culture (clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, market), organizational capabilities (outside-in , inside-out and spanning capabilities), and organizational form (hierarchical, transactional, relational, network) are the independent variables of this study. Organizational learning, organizational innovation, market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth are the moderators of this study. Performance (overall performance, performance compared to objectives, comparative performance and total perceived performance), employee responses (organizational commitment and esprit de corps),

customer satisfaction are the dependent variables of the study. For all of these variables reliability analyses have been conducted and except for organizational form scale, all of the scales were found to be reliable. This justifies the usage of the variables on the total level instead of item level. Only for the rejected scale of organizational form, analyses will be done on item level.

This section will analyze the correlations between the independent and dependent variables and the moderating effects of organizational learning, organizational innovation, market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth.

5.2.1. Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

Correlation analyses were conducted between production, product, sales, market orientations, customer, competitor orientations and interfunctional coordination and four performance measures (overall performance, performance compared to objectives, comparative performance and total perceived performance). Table 5.31 gives the correlation analysis of production, product and sales orientations with performance measures whereas Table 5.32 shows the correlation analysis of market orientation, customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination with performance measures.

Table 5.31. Correlation Analysis of Production, Product and Sales Orientations With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Production Orientation and Overall Performance (H1.1a)	152	-0.039	0.637
Production Orientation and Comparative Performance (H1.1b)	152	-0.095	0.245
Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H1.1c)	152	-0.234	0.004
Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H1.1d)	152	-0.121	0.136
Product Orientation and Overall Performance (H1.2a)	152	0.082	0.317
Product Orientation and Comparative Performance (H1.2b)	152	-0.107	0.188
Product Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H1.2c)	152	-0.158	0.053
Product Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H1.2d)	152	-0.097	0.236
Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (H1.3a)	152	0.160	0.049
Sales Orientation and Comparative Performance (H1.3b)	152	-0.014	0.867
Sales Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H1.3c)	152	-0.017	0.832
Sales Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H1.3d)	152	0.012	0.888

Production orientation and performance compared to objectives are found to be correlated and H1.1.c is confirmed in terms of the existence of relation but disconfirmed in terms of the direction of the relation: The greater the production orientation of a firm, the higher is its performance compared to objectives. Since the correlation is found to be negative ($r = -0.234$) it can be concluded that the greater the production orientation of a firm, the lower is its performance compared to objectives. Sales orientation and overall performance are also significantly correlated ($r = 0.160$) and thereby H1.3a is confirmed: The greater the sales orientation of a firm, the higher is its overall performance. The remaining hypotheses are rejected due to lack of significant correlations.

Table 5.32. Correlation Analysis of Market, Customer, Competitor Orientations and Interfunctional Coordination With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Market Orientation and Overall Performance (H1.4a)	152	0.244	0.002
Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (H1.4b)	152	0.367	0.000
Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H1.4c)	152	0.344	0.000
Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H1.4d)	152	0.375	0.000
Customer Orientation and Overall Performance (H1.4e)	152	0.204	0.012
Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance (H1.4f)	152	0.328	0.000
Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H1.4g)	152	0.302	0.000
Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H1.4h)	152	0.332	0.000
Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance (H1.4i)	152	0.177	0.029
Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance (H1.4j)	152	0.263	0.001
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H1.4k)	152	0.211	0.009
Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H1.4l)	152	0.262	0.001
Interfunctional Coordination Orientation and Overall Performance (H1.4m)	152	0.186	0.022
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (H1.4n)	152	0.249	0.002
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (H1.4o)	152	0.288	0.000
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (H1.4p)	152	0.268	0.001

The correlations of market orientation, customer orientation, competitor orientation, interfunctional coordination with performance measures is analyzed and it is found that all of the correlations are significant. Therefore H1.4a to H1.4p are all confirmed. The highest correlation is found between market orientation and total perceived performance with $r = 0.375$ and $p=0.000$. For the correlations between

customer orientation and performance measures, the highest correlation is between customer orientation and total perceived performance ($r = 0.332$). For the correlations between competitor orientation and performance measures, the highest correlation is between competitor orientation and comparative performance ($r = 0.263$). For the correlations between interfunctional coordination and performance measures, the highest correlation is between interfunctional coordination and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.288$).

5.2.2. Organizational Orientation and Employee Responses

Correlation analyses were conducted between production, product, sales, market orientations, customer, competitor orientations and interfunctional coordination and employee responses (organizational commitment, esprit de corps, total employee responses). Table 5.33 gives the correlation analysis of production, product and sales orientations with employee responses measures whereas Table 5.34 shows the correlation analysis of market orientation, customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination with employee responses measures.

Table 5.33. Correlation Analysis of Production, Product and Sales Orientations With Employee Responses Measures

	n	r	p
Production Orientation and Employee Responses (H2.1a)	152	-0.119	0.145
Production Orientation and Organizational Commitment (H2.1b)	152	-0.140	0.086
Production Orientation and Esprit de Corps (H2.1c)	152	-0.072	0.377
Product Orientation and Employee Responses (H2.2a)	152	-0.260	0.001
Product Orientation and Organizational Commitment (H2.2b)	152	-0.229	0.004
Product Orientation and Esprit de Corps	152	-0.238	0.003

(H2.2c)			
Sales Orientation and Employee Responses (H2.3a)	152	-0.139	0.087
Sales Orientation and Organizational Commitment (H2.3b)	152	-0.090	0.270
Sales Orientation and Esprit de Corps (H2.3c)	152	-0.161	0.047

Product orientation and employee responses, organizational commitment, esprit de corps are found to be correlated and H2.2 a, H2.2b, H2.2c are confirmed in terms of the existence of the relation, but disconfirmed in terms of the direction of the relation: The greater the product orientation of a firm, the more favorable will be its employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. Since the correlations are found to be negative ($r = -0.260$, -0.229 and -0.238 for H2.2.a, b and c respectively) it can be concluded that the greater the product orientation of a firm, the less favorable will be its employee responses, and the lower will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps. Sales orientation and esprit de corps are also significantly correlated ($r = -0.161$) and thereby H1.3a is confirmed. Again due to the negative correlation it will be asserted that the greater the sales orientation of a firm, the lower is its esprit de corps. The remaining hypotheses (H2.1a, H2.1b, H2.1c, H2.3a, H2.3b) are rejected due to lack of significant correlations.

Table 5.34. Correlation Analysis of Market, Customer, Competitor Orientations and Interfunctional Coordination With Employee Responses Measures

	n	r	p
Market Orientation and Employee Responses (H2.4a)	152	0.327	0.000
Market Orientation and Organizational Commitment (H2.4b)	152	0.320	0.000
Market Orientation and Esprit de Corps (H2.4c)	152	0.266	0.001
Customer Orientation and Employee Responses (H2.4d)	152	0.190	0.019
Customer Orientation and Organizational	152	0.197	0.015

Commitment (H2.4e)			
Customer Orientation and Esprit de Corps (H2.4f)	152	0.144	0.078
Competitor Orientation and Employee Responses (H2.4g)	152	0.251	0.002
Competitor Orientation and Organizational Commitment (H2.4h)	152	0.277	0.001
Competitor Orientation and Esprit de Corps (H2.4i)	152	0.172	0.034
Interfunctional Coordination and Employee Responses (H2.4j)	152	0.357	0.000
Interfunctional Coordination and Organizational Commitment (H2.4k)	152	0.294	0.000
Interfunctional Coordination and Esprit de Corps (H2.4l)	152	0.348	0.000

All of the hypotheses except H2.4.f are confirmed: The greater the market orientation of a firm, the more favorable will be the responses of employees (H2.4a), the higher will be the organizational commitment (H2.4b) and esprit de corps (H2.4c). The greater the customer orientation of a firm, the more favorable will be the responses of employees (H2.4d) and the higher will be the organizational commitment (H2.4e). The greater the competitor orientation of a firm, the more favorable will be the responses of employees (H2.4g), the higher will be the organizational commitment (H2.4h) and esprit de corps (H2.4i). Finally, the greater the interfunctional coordination of a firm, the more favorable will be the responses of employees (H2.4j), the higher will be the organizational commitment (H2.4k) and esprit de corps (H2.4l). Market orientation has the highest correlation with employee responses ($r = 0.327$). Competitor orientation has the highest correlation with organizational commitment ($r = 0.277$). Interfunctional coordination has the highest correlation with employee responses (0.357).

5.2.3. Organizational Orientation and Customer Responses

Correlation analyses were conducted between production, product, sales, market orientations, customer, competitor orientations and interfunctional coordination and customer satisfaction. Table 5.35 gives the correlation analysis of production, product and sales orientations with customer responses whereas, Table 5.36 shows the correlation analysis of market orientation, customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination with customer responses.

Table 5.35. Correlation Analysis of Production, Product and Sales Orientations With Customer Satisfaction

	n	r	p
Production Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (H3.1a)	152	-0.146	0.072
Product Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (H3.1b)	152	0.000	0.996
Sales Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (H3.1c)	152	0.119	0.143

None of the hypotheses are accepted since there are no significant correlations between the analyzed variables.

Table 5.36. Correlation Analysis of Market, Customer, Competitor Orientations and Interfunctional Coordination With Customer Satisfaction

	n	r	p
Market Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (H3.2a)	152	0.179	0.027
Customer Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (H3.2b)	152	0.188	0.020
Competitor Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (H3.2c)	152	0.107	0.188
Interfunctional Coordination and Customer Satisfaction (H3.2d)	152	0.106	0.194

According to the results H3.2a and H3.2b are accepted: The greater the market orientation and customer orientation of a firm, the higher will be the customer satisfaction. No significant correlation is for the relation of customer satisfaction with competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination and thereby H3.2c and H3.2d are rejected.

5.2.4. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between organizational orientations and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational innovation is grouped into two as; low organizational innovation and high organizational innovation at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational innovation is 3.9572) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between organizational orientations and organizational performance. Table 5.37 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational innovation for the relationship between production, product and sales orientations and performance measures. Table 5.38 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational innovation for the relationship between market orientation and performance measures.

Table 5.37. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Innovation vs. High Organizational Innovation for Production, Product, Sales Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Innovation 'r'	High Organizational Innovation 'r'	Fisher's Z
Production orientation and Overall Performance (H4.1a)	0.018	0.029	-0.064
Production orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.1b)	-0.030	-0.014	-0.093
Production orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.1c)	-0.116	-0.131	0.088
Production orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.1d)	-0.043	-0.028	-0.087
Product orientation and Overall Performance (H4.1e)	0.236	0.104	7.297*
Product orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.1f)	-0.075	-0.022	-0.308
Product orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.1g)	-0.177	0.028	-1.202
Product orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.1h)	-0.052	0.005	-0.334
Sales orientation and Overall Performance (H4.1i)	0.333	0.175	0.984
Sales orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.1j)	0.092	-0.037	0.751
Sales orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.1k)	0.111	0.103	0.047
Sales orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.1l)	0.148	0.073	0.441

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. A significant result is found only for the moderating effect of organizational innovation on the relationship between product orientation and overall performance. Therefore H4.1e is confirmed. All of the remaining hypotheses (from H4.1a to H4.1l except for H4.1e) are rejected. A significant correlation between sales orientation and comparative performance is found only in the low organizational innovation sample ($r = 0.33$).

Table 5.38. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Innovation vs. High Organizational Innovation for Market Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Innovation 'r'	High Organizational Innovation 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market orientation and Overall Performance (H4.1m)	0.099	0.257	-0.950
Market orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.1n)	0.221	0.381	6.106*
Market orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.1o)	0.450	0.219	1.522
Market orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.1p)	0.274	0.364	-0.582
Customer orientation and Overall Performance (H4.1r)	-0.065	0.265	-1.955
Customer orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.1s)	0.090	0.375	-1.766
Customer orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.1t)	0.271	0.220	0.315
Customer orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.1u)	0.111	0.361	-1.548
Competitor orientation and Overall Performance (H4.1v)	0.219	0.139	0.480
Competitor orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.1w)	0.222	0.261	-0.240
Competitor orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.1x)	0.413	0.101	1.963*
Competitor orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.1y)	0.287	0.235	0.324
Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (H4.1z)	0.132	0.169	-0.220
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (H4.1aa)	0.254	0.204	0.306
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.1ab)	0.422	0.173	2.063*
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (H4.1ac)	0.299	0.209	1.110

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

According to Table 5.38, moderating effects of organizational innovation were found for the relationships between market orientation and comparative performance, between competitor orientation and performance compared to objectives, between interfunctional coordination and performance compared to objectives. Hypotheses H4.1n, H4.1x and H4.1ab are confirmed. The remaining hypotheses (from H4.1m to H4.1ac except H4.1n, H4.1x and H4.1ab) are rejected. Also, for the low organizational innovation group, significant correlations were found between market orientation and performance compared to objectives, between market orientation and total perceived performance, between customer orientation and performance compared to objectives, between competitor orientation and performance compared to objectives, between competitor orientation and total perceived performance, between interfunctional coordination and performance compared to objectives and finally between interfunctional coordination and total perceived performance. For the high organizational innovation group, all of the relationships in Table 5.39 were significant except for the relationship between competitor orientation and overall performance, between competitor orientation and performance compared to objectives, between interfunctional coordination and overall performance and between interfunctional coordination and performance compared to objectives.

5.2.5. Organizational Learning as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational orientations and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational learning is grouped into two as; low organizational learners and high organizational learners at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of

organizational learning is 4.0121) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational orientations and organizational performance. Table 5.39 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational learning for the relationship between production, product and sales orientations and performance measures. Table 5.40 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational learning for the relationship between market orientation and performance measures.

Table 5.39. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Learners vs. High Organizational Learners for Production, Product, Sales Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Learners 'r'	High Organizational Learners 'r'	Fisher's Z
Production orientation and Overall Performance (H4.2a)	0.071	-0.070	0.797
Production orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.2b)	0.023	-0.117	0.793
Production orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.2c)	-0.117	-0.256	0.814
Production orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.2d)	-0.006	-0.147	0.802
Product orientation and Overall Performance (H4.2e)	0.161	0.075	0.492
Product orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.2f)	-0.029	-0.107	0.442
Product orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.2g)	-0.025	-0.176	0.863
Product orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.2h)	0.002	-0.103	0.594
Sales orientation and Overall Performance (H4.2i)	0.254	0.104	0.876
Sales orientation and Comparative	-0.016	-0.016	0.000

Performance (H4.2j)			
Sales orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.2k)	0.024	-0.044	0.384
Sales orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.2l)	0.038	-0.005	0.242

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. No significant result is found for the moderating effect of organizational innovation on the investigated relationships. Therefore all of the hypotheses (from H4.2a to H4.2l) are rejected. A significant correlation between production orientation and performance compared to objectives is found only in the high organizational learners sample ($r = -0.256$).

Table 5.40. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Learners vs. High Organizational Learners for Market Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Learners 'r'	High Organizational Learners 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market orientation and Overall Performance (H4.2m)	0.109	0.254	-0.848
Market orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.2n)	0.203	0.375	-1.063
Market orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.2o)	0.198	0.312	-0.689
Market orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.2p)	0.205	0.378	-1.071
Customer orientation and Overall Performance (H4.2r)	0.029	0.245	-1.248
Customer orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.2s)	0.145	0.357	-1.284
Customer orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.2t)	0.138	0.298	-0.951
Customer orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.2u)	0.137	0.360	-1.349
Competitor orientation and Overall Performance (H4.2v)	0.077	0.191	-0.656
Competitor orientation and Comparative Performance	0.112	0.290	-1.050

(H4.2w)			
Competitor orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.2x)	0.096	0.196	-0.577
Competitor orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.2y)	0.113	0.282	-0.995
Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (H4.2z)	0.188	0.132	0.324
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (H4.2aa)	0.223	0.194	0.171
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.2ab)	0.247	0.213	0.202
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (H4.2ac)	0.243	0.206	0.220

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

According to Table 5.40, no moderating effects of organizational learning were found for the analyzed relationships and therefore all of the hypotheses from H.4.2m to H4.2ac are rejected. For high organizational learners, significant correlations were found for all the investigated relationships except for the relationship between competitor orientation and overall performance, between interfunctional coordination and overall performance and between interfunctional coordination and comparative performance.

5.2.6. Market Related Factors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if market related factors (market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, and market growth) moderate the relationships between organizational orientations and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, market turbulence is grouped into two as; low market turbulence and high market turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.4 (since the mean of

market turbulence is 3.4276) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Competitive intensity is grouped into as; low competitive intensity and high competitive intensity at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of competitive intensity is 4.0855) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Technological turbulence is grouped into as; low technological turbulence and high technological turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.5 (since the mean of technological turbulence is 3.5592) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Market growth is grouped into two as; low market growth and high market growth at the cutoff point of 3.9 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.9013) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients for these variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if market related factors moderate the relationships between organizational orientations and organizational performance. Table 5.41 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationship between production orientation and performance measures. Table 5.42 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationship between product orientation and performance measures. Table 5.43 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationship between sales orientation and performance measures. Finally, Table 5.44 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationship between market orientation, customer orientation, competitor orientation, interfunctional coordination and performance measures.

Table 5.41. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Production Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Production Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.3a)	-0.139	0.078	-1.285
Production Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.3b)	-0.135	-0.096	-0.233
Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.3c)	-0.274	-0.198	-0.475
Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.3d)	-0.175	-0.097	-0.469
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Production Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.3e)	-0.245	0.092	-2.050*
Production Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.3f)	-0.407	0.066	-2.982*
Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.3g)	-0.485	-0.064	-2.787*
Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.3h)	-0.444	0.051	-3.163*
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Production Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.3i)	0.047	-0.080	0.768
Production Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.3j)	-0.113	-0.039	-0.450
Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.3k)	-0.142	-0.246	0.654
Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.3l)	-0.104	-0.088	-0.097
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Production Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.3m)	-0.311	0.029	-1.487
Production Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.3n)	-0.554	0.005	-2.668*
Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.3o)	-0.448	-0.176	-1.290

Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.3p)	-0.559	-0.025	-2.571*
--	---------------	--------	----------------

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$. According to Table 5.41, moderating effects of competitive intensity were found for the relationships between production orientation and overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. Therefore H4.3e, H4.3f, H4.3g, H4.3h are accepted. Also moderating effects of market growth were found for the relationships between production orientation and comparative performance and total perceived performance. As a result, H4.3n and H4.3p are accepted. All of the remaining hypotheses are rejected. A significant correlation is found for the relationship between production orientation and performance compared to objectives in the low market turbulence group ($r = -0.274$). All of the relationships between production orientation and performance measures were significantly and negatively correlated in the low competitive intensity group. A significant correlation is found for the relation between production orientation and performance compared to objectives in the high technological turbulence group ($r = -0.246$). Finally, the relationships between production orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance in the low market growth group and the relationship between production orientation and performance compared to objectives in the high market group are found significantly correlated.

Table 5.42. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Product Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Product Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.4a)	0.041	0.124	-0.493
Product Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.4b)	-0.116	-0.104	-0.072
Product Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.4c)	-0.166	-0.145	-0.127
Product Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.4d)	-0.110	-0.087	-0.137
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Product Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.4e)	-0.017	0.159	-1.062
Product Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.4f)	-0.146	-0.076	-0.425
Product Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.4g)	-0.381	-0.001	-2.395*
Product Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.4h)	-0.192	-0.032	-0.972
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Product Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.4i)	0.090	0.088	0.012
Product Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.4j)	-0.172	-0.032	-0.856
Product Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.4k)	-0.240	-0.052	-1.165
Product Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.4l)	-0.159	-0.020	-0.848
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Product Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.4m)	0.040	0.114	-0.316
Product Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.4n)	-0.183	-0.072	-0.479
Product Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.4o)	-0.299	-0.100	-0.882

Product Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.4p)	-0.191	-0.055	-0.587
---	--------	--------	--------

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

It is found that competitive intensity moderates the relationship between product orientation and performance compared to objectives since Fisher's z value of 2.395 exceeds 1.96. Therefore H4.4g is accepted and all the remaining hypotheses are rejected. Significant correlations are found for the relationships between product orientation and performance compared to objectives in the low competitive intensity and in the low technological turbulence group.

Table 5.43. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Sales Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.5a)	0.191	0.132	0.357
Sales Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.5b)	-0.007	-0.015	0.047
Sales Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.5c)	-0.017	-0.030	0.076
Sales Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.5d)	0.023	0.003	0.118
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.5e)	-0.004	0.295	-1.844
Sales Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.5f)	-0.141	0.084	-1.354
Sales Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.5g)	-0.279	0.182	-2.818*
Sales Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.5h)	-0.164	0.140	-1.835
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.5i)	0.241	0.096	0.903

Sales Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.5j)	-0.018	-0.018	0
Sales Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.5k)	-0.033	-0.018	-0.090
Sales Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.5l)	0.020	-0.002	0.133
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.5m)	0.316	0.124	0.859
Sales Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.5n)	-0.049	-0.032	-0.072
Sales Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.5o)	-0.135	-0.037	-0.419
Sales Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.5p)	-0.009	-0.011	0.008

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

According to table 5.43, a moderating effect of competitive intensity is found for the relationship between sales orientation and performance compared to objectives. Accordingly, H4.5g is accepted and the remaining hypotheses are rejected. Also a significant correlation is found for the relationship between sales orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.279$).

Table 5.44. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Market Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6a)	0.413	0.106	1.963*
Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6b)	0.498	0.271	1.584
Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6c)	0.417	0.291	0.851
Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6d)	0.510	0.274	1.660

	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6e)	0.259	0.237	0.140
Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6f)	0.316	0.395	-0.542
Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6g)	0.443	0.288	1.075
Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6h)	0.371	0.380	-0.063
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6i)	0.233	0.255	-0.141
Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6j)	0.287	0.438	-1.054
Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6k)	0.266	0.418	-1.043
Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6l)	0.301	0.442	-0.991
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6m)	0.252	0.255	-0.013
Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6n)	0.113	0.433	-1.485
Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6o)	0.377	0.378	-0.005
Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6p)	0.204	0.432	-1.083
	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Customer Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6r)	0.350	0.079	1.688
Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6s)	0.511	0.208	2.081*
Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6t)	0.331	0.274	0.370
Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6u)	0.492	0.219	1.864

	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Customer Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6v)	0.272	0.158	0.717
Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6w)	0.313	0.340	-0.181
Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6x)	0.405	0.236	1.132
Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6y)	0.362	0.318	0.298
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Customer Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6z)	0.258	0.152	0.669
Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6aa)	0.333	0.314	0.128
Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6ab)	0.286	0.296	-0.066
Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6ac)	0.343	0.311	0.216
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Customer Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6ad)	0.165	0.232	-0.296
Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6ae)	0.050	0.404	-1.605
Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6af)	0.380	0.349	0.151
Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6ag)	0.143	0.401	-1.191
	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6ah)	0.417	0.034	2.417*
Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6ai)	0.475	0.129	2.280*
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6aj)	0.459	0.058	2.582*

Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6ak)	0.502	0.112	2.591*
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6al)	0.129	0.209	-0.493
Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6am)	0.126	0.343	-1.382
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6an)	0.172	0.244	-0.450
Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6ao)	0.151	0.329	-1.135
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6ap)	0.100	0.255	-0.969
Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6ar)	0.117	0.404	-1.878
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6as)	0.157	0.279	-0.775
Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6at)	0.133	0.390	-1.680
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance (H4.6au)	0.242	0.161	0.358
Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance (H4.6av)	0.059	0.293	-1.029
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6aw)	0.313	0.190	0.557
Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6ax)	0.149	0.278	-0.574
	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (H4.6ay)	0.257	0.134	0.755
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (H4.6az)	0.210	0.279	-0.432

Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6ba)	0.247	0.325	-0.501
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6bb)	0.243	0.290	-0.298
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (H4.6bc)	0.153	0.205	-0.322
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (H4.6bd)	0.263	0.241	0.140
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6be)	0.431	0.200	1.547
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6bf)	0.311	0.245	0.428
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (H4.6bg)	0.177	0.201	-0.150
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (H4.6bh)	0.205	0.303	-0.633
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6bi)	0.160	0.433	-1.826
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6bj)	0.211	0.337	-0.825
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (H4.6bk)	0.213	0.189	0.106
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (H4.6bl)	0.178	0.277	-0.443
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (H4.6bm)	0.209	0.333	-0.568
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (H4.6bn)	0.212	0.298	-0.390

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

According to Table 5.44, moderating effects are found for market turbulence for the relationship between market orientation and overall performance; for the relationship between customer orientation and comparative performance; for the relationships between competitor orientation and overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance. Therefore H4.6a, H4.6s, H4.6ah, H4.6ai, H4.6aj, H4.6ak are accepted and the remaining hypotheses are rejected.

As can be seen in Table 5.44, all of the relationships were significantly correlated except for the relationships between market orientation and overall performance in the high market turbulence group, for the relationships between market orientation and the all performance measures in the low market growth group, for the relationship between customer orientation and overall performance in the high market turbulence group, for the relationship between customer orientation and overall performance in the high competitive intensity group and in the high technological turbulence group, for the relationships between customer orientation and all performance measures in the low market growth group, for the relationships between competitor orientation and all performance measures in the high market turbulence group, in the low competitive intensity group, in the low technological turbulence group, in the low market growth group, for the relationships between competitor orientation and overall performance in the high competitive intensity group and in the high market growth group, for the relationship between interfunctional coordination and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance in the low market turbulence group, for the relationship between interfunctional coordination and overall performance in the high

market turbulence group, in the low and high competitive intensity group, in the high technological turbulence group, for the relationships between interfunctional coordination and all performance measures in the low technological and low market growth groups.

5.2.7. Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

This section will give the results of the Pearson correlation analyses conducted between strategic orientation dimensions (aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness) and organizational performance measures. Reliability tests were conducted for each of the strategic orientation dimension and all of the scales were found to be reliable. Therefore the analyses can be conducted on the total level. Table 5.45, 5.46, 5.47, 5.48, 5.49, 5.50 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness, riskiness respectively and performance measures.

Table 5.45. Correlation Analysis of Aggressiveness With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Aggressiveness and Overall Performance (H5.1a)	152	-0.071	0.385
Aggressiveness and Comparative Performance (H5.1b)	152	-0.260	0.001
Aggressiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (H5.1c)	152	-0.379	0.000
Aggressiveness and Total Perceived Performance (H5.1d)	152	-0.276	0.001

According to Table 5.45, significant correlations were found between aggressiveness and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. H5.1b, H5.1c, H5.1d were in opposite direction confirmed. Due to the negative sign of the correlations, the confirmed hypotheses can be stated

as: The greater the aggressiveness of the firm, the lower will be its comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.46. Correlation Analysis of Analysis With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Analysis and Overall Performance (H5.2a)	152	0.110	0.177
Analysis and Comparative Performance (H5.2b)	152	0.201	0.013
Analysis and Performance Compared to Objectives (H5.2c)	152	0.334	0.000
Analysis and Total Perceived Performance (H5.2d)	152	0.230	0.004

The results of Table 5.46 indicate that there are significant correlations between analysis and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. These results confirm H5.2b, H5.2c, H5.2d and it can be stated that the greater the analysis orientation of a firm, the higher is its comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.47. Correlation Analysis of Defensiveness With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Defensiveness and Overall Performance (H5.3a)	152	0.012	0.881
Defensiveness and Comparative Performance (H5.3b)	152	0.110	0.176
Defensiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (H5.3c)	152	0.227	0.005
Defensiveness and Total Perceived Performance (H5.3d)	152	0.127	0.118

The relationship between defensiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives is found to be significantly correlated and H5.3c is accepted. It can be said that the greater the defensiveness orientation of the firm, the higher will be its

performance compared to objectives. The remaining hypotheses, H5.3a, H5.3b, H5.3d are rejected.

Table 5.48. Correlation Analysis of Futurity With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Futurity and Overall Performance (H5.4a)	152	0.066	0.416
Futurity and Comparative Performance (H5.4b)	152	0.195	0.016
Futurity and Performance Compared to Objectives (H5.4c)	152	0.306	0.000
Futurity and Total Perceived Performance (H5.4d)	152	0.213	0.008

Significant correlations were found between futurity and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. H5.4b, H5.4c and H5.4d were confirmed: The greater the futurity orientation of the firm, the higher will be its comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.49. Correlation Analysis of Proactiveness With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Proactiveness and Overall Performance (H5.5a)	152	0.422	0.000
Proactiveness and Comparative Performance (H5.5b)	152	0.464	0.000
Proactiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (H5.5c)	152	0.509	0.000
Proactiveness and Total Perceived Performance (H5.5d)	152	0.507	0.000

According to Table 5.49, all the correlations between proactiveness and performance measures are significant. H5.5a to H5.5d are confirmed: The greater the proactiveness orientation of the firm, the higher will be its overall performance,

comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.50. Correlation Analysis of Riskiness With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Riskiness and Overall Performance (H5.6a)	152	0.141	0.083
Riskiness and Comparative Performance (H5.6b)	152	0.299	0.000
Riskiness and Performance Compared to Objectives (H5.6c)	152	0.366	0.000
Riskiness and Total Perceived Performance (H5.6d)	152	0.313	0.000

The relationships between riskiness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are found to be significantly correlated and thereby H5.6b, H5.6c, H5.6d were confirmed: The greater the riskiness orientation of the firm, the higher will be its comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

5.2.8. Strategic Orientation and Employee Responses

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between strategic orientation dimensions (aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness) and employee responses measures. Reliability tests were conducted for each of the strategic orientation dimension employee responses and all of the scales were found to be reliable. Therefore the analyses can be conducted on the total level. Table 5.51, 5.52, 5.53, 5.54, 5.55, 5.56 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness, riskiness respectively and employee responses.

Table 5.51. Correlation Analysis of Aggressiveness With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Aggressiveness and Employee Responses (H6.1a)	152	-0.223	0.006
Aggressiveness and Organizational Commitment (H6.1b)	152	-0.202	0.012
Aggressiveness and Esprit de Corps (H6.1c)	152	-0.197	0.015

According to Table 5.51, significant correlations were found between aggressiveness and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. H6.1a, H6.1b, H6.1c were confirmed in opposite direction. Due to the negative sign of the correlations, the confirmed hypotheses can be stated as: The greater the aggressiveness of the firm, the less favorable will be the employee responses and the lower will be organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Table 5.52. Correlation Analysis of Analysis With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Analysis and Employee Responses (H6.2a)	152	0.194	0.016
Analysis and Organizational Commitment (H6.2b)	152	0.144	0.077
Analysis and Esprit de Corps (H6.2c)	152	0.206	0.011

The results of Table 5.52 indicate that there are significant correlations between analysis orientation and employee responses and esprit de corps. These results confirm H6.2a and H6.2c and it can be stated that the greater the analysis orientation of a firm, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its esprit de corps.

Table 5.53. Correlation Analysis of Defensiveness With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Defensiveness and Employee Responses (H6.3a)	152	0.123	0.132
Defensiveness and Organizational Commitment (H6.3b)	152	0.046	0.570
Defensiveness and Esprit de Corps (H6.3c)	152	0.176	0.030

The relationship between defensiveness orientation and esprit de corps is found to be significantly correlated and H6.3c is accepted. It can be said that the greater the defensiveness orientation of the firm, the higher will be its esprit de corps. The remaining hypotheses, H6.3a and H6.3b are rejected.

Table 5.54. Correlation Analysis of Futurity With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Futurity and Employee Responses (H6.4a)	152	0.239	0.003
Futurity and Organizational Commitment (H6.4b)	152	0.175	0.031
Futurity and Esprit de Corps (H6.4c)	152	0.255	0.002

Significant correlations were found between futurity and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. H6.4a, H6.4b, and H6.4c were confirmed: The greater the futurity orientation of the firm, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Table 5.55. Correlation Analysis of Proactiveness With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Proactiveness and Employee Responses (H6.5a)	152	0.245	0.002
Proactiveness and Organizational Commitment (H6.5b)	152	0.205	0.011
Proactiveness and Esprit de Corps (H6.5c)	152	0.235	0.004

According to Table 5.55, significant correlations were found between proactiveness and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. H6.5a, H6.5b, and H6.5c were confirmed: The greater the proactiveness orientation of the firm, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Table 5.56. Correlation Analysis of Riskiness With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Riskiness and Employee Responses (H6.6a)	152	0.221	0.006
Riskiness and Organizational Commitment (H6.6b)	152	0.236	0.003
Riskiness and Esprit de Corps (H6.6c)	152	0.160	0.049

According to Table 5.56, significant correlations were found between riskiness and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. H6.6a, H6.6b, and H6.6c were confirmed: The greater the riskiness orientation of the firm, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

5.2.9. Strategic Orientation and Customer Satisfaction

This section will give the results of the Pearson correlation analyses conducted between strategic orientation dimensions (aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness) and customer satisfaction. Table 5.57 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness, riskiness orientations and customer satisfaction.

Table 5.57. Correlation Analysis of Strategic Orientation Dimensions With Customer Satisfaction

	n	r	p
Aggressiveness and Customer Satisfaction (H7a)	152	-0.127	0.120
Analysis and Customer Satisfaction (H7b)	152	0.145	0.075
Defensiveness and Customer Satisfaction (H7c)	152	0.171	0.035
Futurity and Customer Satisfaction (H7d)	152	0.202	0.012
Proactiveness and Customer Satisfaction (H7e)	152	0.491	0.000
Riskiness and Customer Satisfaction (H7f)	152	0.202	0.013

According to Table 5.57, the relations between defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations and customer satisfaction are found to be significantly correlated and H7c, H7d, H7e and H7f are confirmed: The greater the defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations of the firm, the higher will be its customer satisfaction. The highest correlation is found between proactiveness and customer satisfaction ($r = 0.491$).

5.2.10. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between strategic orientations and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational innovation is grouped into two as; low organizational innovation and high organizational innovation at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational innovation is 3.9572) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between strategic orientations and organizational performance. Table 5.58 will give the results for the moderating effects of

organizational innovation for the relationship between aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations and performance measures.

Table 5.58. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Innovation vs. High Organizational Innovation for Aggressiveness, Analysis, Defensiveness, Futurity, Proactiveness And Riskiness Orientations and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Innovation 'r'	High Organizational Innovation 'r'	Fisher's Z
Aggressiveness and Overall Performance (H8.1a)	-0.156	0.061	-1,268
Aggressiveness and Comparative Performance (H8.1b)	-0.290	-0.149	-0,863
Aggressiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.1c)	-0.144	-0.327	1,130
Aggressiveness and Total Perceived Performance (H8.1d)	-0.277	-0.159	-0,721
Analysis and Overall Performance (H8.1e)	0.109	0.022	0,508
Analysis orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.1f)	0.221	0.094	0,758
Analysis orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.1g)	0.296	0.210	0,534
Analysis orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.1h)	0.245	0.110	0,811
Defensiveness orientation and Overall Performance (H8.1i)	0.085	-0.093	1,031
Defensiveness orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.1j)	0.128	0.021	0,625
Defensiveness orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.1k)	0.215	0.118	0,580
Defensiveness orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.1l)	0.154	0.022	0,774
Futurity orientation and Overall Performance (H8.1m)	-0.018	-0.007	-0,064
Futurity orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.1n)	0.165	0.089	0,449

Futurity orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.1o)	0.344	0.102	1,489
Futurity orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.1p)	0.190	0.083	0,634
Proactiveness orientation and Overall Performance (H8.1r)	0.194	0.432	-1,545
Proactiveness orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.1s)	0.220	0.455	-1,554
Proactiveness orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.1t)	0.278	0.403	-0,824
Proactiveness orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.1u)	0.255	0.479	-1,516
Riskiness orientation and Overall Performance (H8.1v)	-0.023	0.092	-0,673
Riskiness orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.1w)	0.179	0.227	-0,291
Riskiness orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.1x)	0.218	0.218	0
Riskiness orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.1y)	0.176	0.222	-0,278

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. Since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96 in Table 5.5 all of the hypotheses (from H8.1a to H8.1y) are rejected. It can be concluded that organizational innovation does not moderate the relations between each of the strategic orientations and performance measures. Significant correlations are found between aggressiveness and comparative performance ($r = -0.290$), between aggressiveness and total perceived performance ($r = -0.277$), between analysis orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.296$), between futurity orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.344$), between proactiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.278$) in the low organizational innovation sample. In the high organizational innovation sample, the relations between aggressiveness orientation and performance compared to

objectives ($r = -0.327$), between analysis orientations and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.210$), between proactiveness orientation and overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance ($r = 0.432, 0.455, 0.403, 0.479$ respectively), between riskiness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance ($r = 0.227, 0.218, 0.222$ respectively) are found to be statistically significant.

5.2.11. Organizational Learning as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational learning moderates the relationship between strategic orientations and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational learning is grouped into two as; low organizational learners and high organizational learners at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational learning is 4.0121) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational learning moderates the relationship between strategic orientations and organizational performance. Table 5.59 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational learning for the relationship between aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations and performance measures.

Table 5.59. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Learners vs. High Organizational Learners for Aggressiveness, Analysis, Defensiveness, Futurity, Proactiveness And Riskiness Orientations and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Learners 'r'	High Organizational Learners 'r'	Fisher's Z
Aggressiveness and Overall Performance (H8.2a)	0.109	-0.145	1.443
Aggressiveness and Comparative Performance (H8.2b)	-0.135	-0.303	0.999
Aggressiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.2c)	-0.116	-0.489	2.361*
Aggressiveness and Total Perceived Performance (H8.2d)	-0.101	-0.341	1.433
Analysis and Overall Performance (H8.2e)	0.179	0.038	0.807
Analysis orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.2f)	0.191	0.158	0.192
Analysis orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.2g)	0.375	0.267	0.681
Analysis orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.2h)	0.243	0.174	0.407
Defensiveness orientation and Overall Performance (H8.2i)	-0.068	0.039	-0.605
Defensiveness orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.2j)	0.055	0.115	-0.341
Defensiveness orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.2k)	0.127	0.257	-0.763
Defensiveness orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.2l)	0.053	0.140	-0.496
Futurity orientation and Overall Performance (H8.2m)	0.017	0.001	0.090
Futurity orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.2n)	0.188	0.112	0.439
Futurity orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.2o)	0.318	0.193	0.756
Futurity orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.2p)	0.201	0.121	0.464
Proactiveness orientation and Overall Performance (H8.2r)	0.218	0.511	-1.934
Proactiveness orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.2s)	0.213	0.551	-2.278*

Proactiveness orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.2t)	0.392	0.524	-0.947
Proactiveness orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.2u)	0.269	0.588	-2.252*
Riskiness orientation and Overall Performance (H8.2v)	0.024	0.156	-0.753
Riskiness orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.2w)	0.123	0.333	-1.257
Riskiness orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.2x)	0.282	0.342	-0.376
Riskiness orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.2y)	0.148	0.337	-1.139

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to Table 5.59, moderating effect of organizational learning is found for the relationships between aggressiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives, between proactiveness orientation and comparative performance, between proactiveness orientation and total perceived performance. Therefore H8.2c, H8.2s and H8.2u are confirmed. In the low organizational learners group, significant correlations are found between analysis orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.375$), between futurity orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.318$), between proactiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.392$), between riskiness orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.282$). In the high organizational learners group, significant correlation are found between aggressiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance ($r = -0.303, -0.489, 0.341$ respectively), between analysis orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.267$), between defensiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r =$

0.257), between proactiveness orientation and overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance ($r = 0.511, 0.551, 0.524, 0.588$, respectively), between riskiness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance ($r = 0.333, 0.342, 0.337$, respectively).

5.2.12. Market Related Factors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if market related factors (market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, and market growth) moderate the relationships between strategic orientations and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, market turbulence is grouped into two as; low market turbulence and high market turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.4 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.4276) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Competitive intensity is grouped into as; low competitive intensity and high competitive intensity at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of competitive intensity is 4.0855) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Technological turbulence is grouped into as; low technological turbulence and high technological turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.5 (since the mean of technological turbulence is 3.5592) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Market growth is grouped into two as; low market growth and high market growth at the cutoff point of 3.9 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.9013) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if market related factors moderate the relationships between strategic orientations and organizational

performance. Table 5.60, Table 5.61, Table 5.62, Table 5.63, Table 5.64, Table 5.65 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationships between aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations and performance measures, respectively.

Table 5.60. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Aggressiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.3a)	-0.021	-0.084	0.373
Aggressiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.3b)	-0.065	-0.341	1.711
Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.3c)	-0.237	-0.449	1.426
Aggressiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.3d)	-0.098	-0.352	1.588
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Aggressiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.3e)	-0.188	0.012	-1.210
Aggressiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.3f)	-0.455	-0.157	-1.991*
Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.3g)	-0.599	-0.210	-2.863*
Aggressiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.3h)	-0.494	-0.152	-2.322*
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Aggressiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.3i)	-0.007	-0.108	0.613
Aggressiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.3j)	-0.220	-0.274	0.348
Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to	-0.279	-0.431	1.055

Objectives (H8.3k)			
Aggressiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.3l)	-0.218	-0.301	0.538
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Aggressiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.3m)	-0.259	-0.036	-0.971
Aggressiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.3n)	-0.462	-0.229	-1.131
Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.3o)	-0.236	-0.408	0.817
Aggressiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.3p)	-0.438	-0.252	0.899

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

According to Table 5.60, it is found that market turbulence, technological turbulence and market growth does not moderate the relations between aggressiveness orientation and performance measures. Thereby, H8.3a to H8.3d, H8.3i to H8.3l, H8.3m to H8.3p are rejected. Also it is found that competitive intensity does not moderate the relation between aggressiveness orientation and overall performance and H8.3e is rejected. However, as hypothesized, competitive intensity moderates the relations between aggressiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. H8.3f, H8.3g, and H8.3h are all confirmed.

For the high market turbulence group, significant correlations are found between aggressiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = -0.341, -0.449, -0.352$ respectively). For the low competitive intensity group, significant correlations are found between aggressiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to

objectives and total perceived performance ($r = -0.455, -0.599, -0.494$ respectively). For the low technological turbulence group, the relation between aggressiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.279$) and in the high technological turbulence group, the relations between aggressiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = -0.274, -0.431, -0.301$ respectively) are significantly correlated. Finally for both the low and high market growth group, the relations between aggressiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are found to be significantly correlated.

Table 5.61. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Analysis Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Analysis Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.4a)	0.098	0.100	-0.012
Analysis Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.4b)	0.171	0.222	-0.313
Analysis Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.4c)	0.279	0.359	-0.526
Analysis Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.4d)	0.195	0.249	-0.335
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Analysis Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.4e)	0.222	0.032	1.159
Analysis Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.4f)	0.407	0.076	2.129*
Analysis Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.4g)	0.613	0.119	3.555*
Analysis Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.4h)	0.468	0.083	2.539*

	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Analysis Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.4i)	0.082	0.118	-0.219
Analysis Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.4j)	0.071	0.251	-1.120
Analysis Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.4k)	0.240	0.365	-0.833
Analysis Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.4l)	0.113	0.273	-1.007
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Analysis Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.4m)	0.325	0.074	1.116
Analysis Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.4n)	0.438	0.167	1.277
Analysis Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.4o)	0.378	0.345	0.161
Analysis Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.4p)	0.460	0.200	1.249

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

According to table 5.61, it is found that market turbulence, technological turbulence and market growth does not moderate the relations between analysis orientation and performance measures. Thereby, H8.4a to H8.4d, H8.4i to H8.4l, H8.4m to H8.4p are rejected. Also it is found that competitive intensity does not moderate the relation between analysis orientation and overall performance and H8.4e is rejected. However, as hypothesized, competitive intensity moderates the relations between analysis orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. H8.4f, H8.4g, and H8.4h are all confirmed.

For the high market turbulence group, significant correlations are found between analysis orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.222, 0.359, 0.249$, respectively). For the low market turbulence group, the relation between analysis orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.279$) is significantly correlated. For the low competitive intensity group, significant correlations are found between analysis orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.470, 0.613, 0.468$, respectively). For the low technological turbulence group, the relation between analysis orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.240$) and in the high technological turbulence group, the relations between analysis orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.251, 0.365, 0.273$ respectively) are significantly correlated. Finally for the low market growth group, the relations between analysis orientation and comparative performance, total perceived performance ($r = 0.438, 0.460$, respectively) significantly correlated. In the high market growth group, the relations between analysis orientations and performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.345$ and 0.200 , respectively).

Table 5.62. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Defensiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.5a)	0.024	-0.010	0.200
Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.5b)	0.151	-0.093	1.447
Defensiveness Orientation and	0.333	-0.162	3.004*

Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.5c)			
Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.5d)	0.179	-0.098	1.646
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Defensiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.5e)	0.191	-0.100	1.758
Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.5f)	0.361	-0.020	2.382*
Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.5g)	0.507	0.034	3.139*
Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.5h)	0.406	-0.024	2.721*
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Defensiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.5i)	-0.164	0.145	-1.882
Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.5j)	-0.100	0.250	-2.149*
Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.5k)	0.031	0.349	-2.014*
Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.5l)	-0.094	0.273	-2.262*
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Defensiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.5m)	0.399	-0.052	2.012*
Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.5n)	0.488	0.058	2.016*
Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.5o)	0.550	0.197	1.775
Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.5p)	0.545	0.072	2.286*

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

According to Table 5.62, market turbulence moderates the relationship between defensiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives. This result makes H8.5c confirmed. Competition intensity and technological turbulence moderate the relations between defensiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. Therefore, H8.5f, H8.5g, H8.5h, H8.5j, H8.5k and H8.5l are accepted. Market growth moderates the relations between defensiveness orientation and overall performance, comparative performance and total perceived performance. H8.5m, H8.5n and H8.5p are accepted. In the low market turbulence group, there is a significant correlation between defensiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.333$). In the low competitive intensity group, significant correlations exist between defensiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.361, 0.507, 0.406$, respectively). In the high technological turbulence group, significant correlations exist between defensiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.250, 0.349, 0.273$, respectively). In the low market growth group, relations between defensiveness orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.488, 0.550, 0.545$, respectively). Finally in the high market growth group, the relation between defensiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives is significantly correlated ($r = 0.197$).

Table 5.63. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Futurity Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Futurity Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.6a)	0.093	0.028	0.384
Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.6b)	0.254	0.166	0.543
Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.6c)	0.295	0.303	-0.051
Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.6d)	0.257	0.186	0.440
	Low Competitive Intensity 2r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Futurity Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.6e)	0.102	0.041	0.367
Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.6f)	0.257	0.154	0.644
Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.6g)	0.527	0.153	2.584*
Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.6h)	0.319	0.148	1.086
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Futurity Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.6i)	0.085	0.034	0.309
Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.6j)	0.187	0.175	0.075
Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.6k)	0.244	0.309	-0.425
Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.6l)	0.199	0.193	0.038
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Futurity Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.6m)	0.307	-0.012	1.990*
Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.6n)	0.431	0.118	3.502*
Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.6o)	0.522	0.222	4.863*

Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.6p)	0.481	0.127	3.939*
--	--------------	-------	---------------

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

No moderating effects of market turbulence and technological turbulence is found for the relationships between futurity orientation and performance measures. Therefore, H8.6a to H8.6d and H8.6i to H8.6l are rejected. Competitive intensity moderates the relation between futurity orientation and performance compared to objectives and this makes H8.6g accepted while H8.6e, H8.6f and H8.6h are rejected. It is found that market growth moderates the relation between futurity orientation and all performance measures making H8.6 m to H8.6p confirmed.

In the low market turbulence group, relations between futurity orientation and performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.295$ and 0.257 , respectively). In the high market turbulence group, relation between futurity orientation and performance compared to objectives is significantly correlated ($r = 0.303$). In the low competitive intensity group, relations between futurity orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.257, 0.527, 0.319$, respectively). In both the low and high technological turbulence group, the relation between futurity orientation and performance compared to objectives is significantly correlated ($r = 0.244$ and 0.309 , respectively). In the low market growth group, the relations between futurity orientation and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.431, 0.522, 0.481$, respectively). In the high market growth group, the relation between futurity

orientation and performance compared to objectives is significantly correlated ($r = 0.222$).

Table 5.64. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.7a)	0.486	0.360	0.907
Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.7b)	0.626	0.367	2.062*
Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.7c)	0.471	0.531	-0.472
Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.7d)	0.625	0.428	1.626
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.7e)	0.593	0.337	1.984*
Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.7f)	0.597	0.406	1.542
Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.7g)	0.598	0.495	0.882
Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.7h)	0.665	0.441	1.965*
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.7i)	0.479	0.397	0.614
Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.7j)	0.532	0.414	0.921
Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.7k)	0.498	0.510	-0.097
Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.7l)	0.567	0.463	0.857

	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.7m)	0.297	0.445	-0.730
Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.7n)	0.407	0.481	-0.391
Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.7o)	0.502	0.536	-0.197
Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.7p)	0.457	0.527	-0.392

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

Market turbulence moderates the relation between proactiveness orientation and comparative performance and this makes H8.7b accepted. Competitive intensity moderates the relation between proactiveness orientation and overall performance and total perceived performance. Therefore H8.7e and H8.7h are accepted. Since there is no other moderating effect of market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth found, H8.7a, H8.7c, H8.7d, H8.7f, H8.7g, H8.7i to H8.7l and H8.7m to H8.7p are rejected.

All of the relations between proactiveness orientation and all performance measures are found to be significantly correlated in the low and high market turbulence, in the low and high competitive intensity, in the low and high technological turbulence and in the low and high market growth groups. The only exception for this is the insignificant correlation between proactiveness orientation and overall performance in the low market growth sample ($r = 0.297$).

Table 5.65. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Riskiness Orientation and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Riskiness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.8a)	0.342	-0.016	2.195*
Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.8b)	0.385	0.248	0.899
Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.8c)	0.462	0.292	1.173
Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.8d)	0.426	0.238	1.252
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Riskiness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.8e)	0.213	0.093	0.736
Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.8f)	0.403	0.240	1.092
Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.8g)	0.579	0.214	2.654*
Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.8h)	0.456	0.230	1.544
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Riskiness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.8i)	0.121	0.148	-0.166
Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.8j)	0.223	0.343	-0.789
Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.8k)	0.303	0.386	-0.569
Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.8l)	0.244	0.349	-0.696
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Riskiness Orientation and Overall Performance (H8.8m)	0.609	0.036	2.846*
Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance (H8.8n)	0.578	0.227	1.816
Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H8.8o)	0.521	0.303	1.123

Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (H8.8p)	0.642	0.231	2.232*
---	--------------	--------------	---------------

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

Market turbulence moderates the relation between riskiness orientation and overall performance: H8.8a is accepted. Competitive intensity moderates the relation between riskiness orientation and performance compared to objectives: H8.8g is confirmed. No moderating effect of technological turbulence is found for the relation between riskiness orientation and performance measures. Market growth moderates the relations between riskiness orientation and overall and total perceived performance making H8.8m and H8.8p confirmed.

In the low and high market turbulence group and in the low and high competitive intensity group and in the high technological turbulence group and in the high market growth group, all the relations except the one between riskiness orientation and overall performance are significantly correlated. In the low technological turbulence group, relations between riskiness orientation and performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.303$ and 0.244 , respectively). Finally, all the relations between riskiness orientation and performance measures are significantly correlated in the low market growth group.

5.2.14 Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational culture types (market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan cultures) and organizational performance measures. Reliability tests were conducted for each of the organizational culture types and all of the scales were found to be

reliable. Therefore the analyses can be conducted on the total level for these cultural typologies. Table 5.66, 5.67, 5.68, 5.69, 5.70 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan culture types respectively and performance measures.

Table 5.66. Correlation Analysis of Market Culture With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Market Culture and Overall Performance (H9.1a)	152	0.053	0.516
Market Culture and Comparative Performance (H9.1b)	152	0.115	0.160
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H9.1c)	152	0.180	0.026
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H9.1d)	152	0.128	0.117

According to Table 5.66, significant correlation is found between market culture and performance compared to objectives and H9.1c is confirmed. The remaining hypotheses (H9.1a, H9.1b and H9.1d) are rejected.

Table 5.67. Correlation Analysis of Adhocracy Culture With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (H9.2a)	152	0.205	0.011
Adhocracy Culture and Comparative Performance (H9.2b)	152	0.224	0.006
Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H9.2c)	152	0.351	0.000
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H9.2d)	152	0.265	0.001

The results of Table 5.67 indicate that all of the relations between adhocracy culture and overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to

objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated. These results confirm H9.2a, H9.2b, H9.2c and H9.2d.

Table 5.68. Correlation Analysis of Hierarchy Culture With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Hierarchy Culture and Overall Performance (H9.3a)	152	-0.138	0.089
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (H9.3b)	152	-0.165	0.042
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H9.3c)	152	-0.322	0.000
Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H9.3d)	152	-0.206	0.011

The relationships between hierarchy culture and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are found to be significantly correlated and H9.3b, H9.3c, H9.3d are confirmed in negative direction. Due to the negative sign of the correlations it can be said that the dominant the hierarchy culture of the firm, the lower will be its comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.69. Correlation Analysis of Clan Culture With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Clan Culture and Overall Performance (H9.4a)	152	-0.090	0.272
Clan Culture and Comparative Performance (H9.4b)	152	-0.132	0.106
Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H9.4c)	152	-0.123	0.132
Clan Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H9.4d)	152	-0.135	0.098

No significant correlations are found between clan culture and performance measures. Therefore H9.4a to H9.4d are all rejected.

5.2.14. Organizational Culture and Employee Responses

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational culture types (market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan cultures) and employee responses measures. Reliability tests were conducted for each of the organizational culture types and employee responses and all of the scales were found to be reliable. Therefore, the analyses can be conducted on the total level. Table 5.70, 5.71, 5.72, and 5.73 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan cultures respectively and employee responses.

Table 5.70. Correlation Analysis of Market Culture With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Market Culture and Employee Responses (H10.1a)	152	0.053	0.519
Market Culture and Organizational Commitment (H10.1b)	152	0.070	0.392
Market Culture and Esprit de Corps (H10.1c)	152	0.024	0.771

According to Table 5.70, none of the correlations between market culture and employee responses are significant and therefore H10.1a, H10.1b and H10.1c are rejected.

Table 5.71. Correlation Analysis of Adhocracy Culture With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Adhocracy Culture and Employee Responses (H10.2a)	152	0.265	0.001
Adhocracy Culture and Organizational Commitment (H10.2b)	152	0.313	0.000
Adhocracy Culture and Esprit de Corps (H10.2c)	152	0.160	0.048

The results of Table 5.71 indicate that all the relations between adhocracy culture and employee responses are significantly correlated. Therefore, H10.2a, H10.2b and H10.2c are all confirmed.

Table 5.72. Correlation Analysis of Hierarchy Culture With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Hierarchy Culture and Employee Responses (H10.3a)	152	-0.350	0.000
Hierarchy Culture and Organizational Commitment (H10.3b)	152	-0.289	0.000
Hierarchy Culture and Esprit de Corps (H10.3c)	152	-0.341	0.000

All of the relations between hierarchy culture and employee responses are found to be statistically significant and H10.3a, H10.3b and H10.3c are all confirmed in negative direction. Due to the negative sign of the correlations, it can be said that the dominant the hierarchy culture in a firm, the less favorable will be the employee responses and the lower will be organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Table 5.73. Correlation Analysis of Clan Culture With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Clan Culture and Employee Responses (H10.4a)	152	0.105	0.199
Clan Culture and Organizational Commitment (H10.4b)	152	-0.040	0.627
Clan Culture and Esprit de Corps (H10.4c)	152	0.233	0.004

The only significantly correlated relation was between clan culture and esprit de corps according to Table 5.73. H10.4c is confirmed and it can be stated that the dominant the clan culture in a firm, the higher will be its esprit de corps. The remaining hypotheses of H10.4a and H10.4b are rejected.

5.2.15. Organizational Culture and Customer Satisfaction

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational culture types (market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan cultures) and customer satisfaction. Reliability tests were conducted for each of the organizational culture types and customer satisfaction and all of the scales were found to be reliable. Therefore the analyses can be conducted on the total level. Table 5.74 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan cultures respectively and customer satisfaction.

Table 5.74. Correlation Analysis of Organizational Culture Types With Customer Satisfaction

	n	r	p
Market Culture and Customer Satisfaction (H11a)	152	0.042	0.605
Adhocracy Culture and Customer Satisfaction (H11b)	152	0.314	0.000
Hierarchy Culture and Customer Satisfaction (H11c)	152	-0.358	0.000
Clan Culture and Customer Satisfaction (H11d)	152	0.058	0.481

According to Table 5.74, there are significant correlations between adhocracy culture and customer satisfaction ($r = 0.314$) and between hierarchy culture and customer satisfaction ($r = -0.358$). H11b is confirmed and it can be asserted that the dominant the adhocracy culture in a firm, the higher will be customer satisfaction. Since the correlation between hierarchy culture and customer satisfaction is negative, it can be said that the dominant the hierarchy culture in a firm, the lower will be the customer satisfaction. Thereby, H11c is confirmed in negative direction.

5.2.16. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between organizational culture types and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational innovation is grouped into two as; low organizational innovation and high organizational innovation at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational innovation is 3.9572) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between organizational culture types and organizational performance. Table 5.75 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational innovation for the relationship between market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan culture types and performance measures.

Table 5.75. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Innovation vs. High Organizational Innovation for Market, Adhocracy, Hierarchy and Clan Culture Types and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Innovation 'r'	High Organizational Innovation 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Culture and Overall Performance (H12.1a)	-0.159	0.134	-1.715
Market Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.1b)	-0.098	0.191	-1.695
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.1c)	0.062	0.181	-0.703
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.1d)	-0.089	0.196	-0.635
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.1e)	0.148	0.112	0.213
Adhocracy Culture and	-0.046	0.205	-1.476

Comparative Performance (H12.1f)			
Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.1g)	0.096	0.246	-0.899
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.1h)	0.009	0.214	-1.210
Hierarchy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.1i)	-0.062	-0.081	0.111
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.1j)	0.095	-0.179	1.605
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.1k)	-0.296	-0.172	-0.763
Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.1l)	0.004	-0.177	1.063
Clan Culture and Overall Performance (H12.1m)	0.107	-0.158	1.550
Clan Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.1n)	0.051	-0.180	1.354
Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.1o)	0.162	-0.187	2.049*
Clan Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.1p)	0.089	-0.192	1.648

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. The only Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96 belong to the moderating effect of organizational innovation on the relation between clan culture and performance compared to objectives. This makes H12.1o confirmed while all the remaining hypotheses (H12.1a to H12.1p except H12.1o) are rejected.

In the low organizational innovation group, the relation between hierarchy culture and performance compared to objectives is negatively and significantly correlated ($r = -0.296$). In the high organizational innovation group, the relations between adhocracy culture and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.205, 0.246, 0.214$, respectively).

5.2.17. Organizational Learning as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance *

This section analyzes if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational culture types and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational learning is grouped into two as; low organizational learners and high organizational learners at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational learning is 4.0121) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational culture types and organizational performance. Table 5.76 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational learning for the relationship between market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan culture types and performance measures.

Table 5.76. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Learners vs. High Organizational Learners for Market, Adhocracy, Hierarchy and Clan Culture Types and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Learners 'r'	High Organizational Learners 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Culture and Overall Performance (H12.2a)	-0.231	0.277	-2.934*
Market Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.2b)	-0.169	0.298	-2.698*
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.2c)	0.075	0.350	-2.488*
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.2d)	-0.178	0.331	-2.958*
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.2e)	0.262	0.084	1.039
Adhocracy Culture and	0.139	0.172	-0.191

Comparative Performance (H12.2f)			
Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.2g)	0.226	0.298	-0.437
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.2h)	0.191	0.198	-0.041
Hierarchy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.2i)	-0.006	-0.145	0.790
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.2j)	0.089	-0.225	1.796
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.2k)	-0.055	-0.381	1.954
Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.2l)	0.052	-0.263	1.815
Clan Culture and Overall Performance (H12.2m)	0.018	-0.159	1.007
Clan Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.2n)	-0.055	-0.173	0.676
Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.2o)	-0.048	-0.165	0.669
Clan Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.2p)	-0.046	-0.185	0.797

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to Table 5.76, organizational learning moderates the relations between market culture and overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. Therefore, H12.2a to H12.2d are all confirmed. No moderating effect of organizational learning on the relationships between adhocracy, hierarchy and clan cultures and performance measures is found and thereby H12.2e to H12.2p are all rejected.

The relations between market culture and all performance measures are found to be significantly correlated in the high organizational learners group ($r = 0.277, 0.298, 0.350, 0.331$, respectively). Significant correlations were also found for adhocracy

culture and performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance in the high organizational learners group. Finally, significantly negative correlations exist between hierarchy culture and comparative culture, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance in the high organizational learners group ($r = -0.225, -0.381, -0.263$, respectively).

5.2.18. Market Related Factors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if market related factors (market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, and market growth) moderate the relationships between organizational culture types and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, market turbulence is grouped into two as; low market turbulence and high market turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.4 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.4276) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Competitive intensity is grouped into as; low competitive intensity and high competitive intensity at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of competitive intensity is 4.0855) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Technological turbulence is grouped into as; low technological turbulence and high technological turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.5 (since the mean of technological turbulence is 3.5592) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Market growth is grouped into two as; low market growth and high market growth at the cutoff point of 3.9 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.9013) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if market related factors moderate the relationships between organizational culture types and organizational

performance. Table 5.77, Table 5.78, Table 5.79, and Table 5.80 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationships between market, adhocracy, hierrachy and clan cultures and performance measures respectively.

Table 5.77. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Market Culture and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Culture and Overall Performance (H12.3a)	0.145	-0.041	1.103
Market Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.3b)	0.245	0.038	1.250
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.3c)	0.145	0.189	-0.267
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.3d)	0.229	0.058	1.032
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Culture and Overall Performance (H12.3e)	0.185	-0.065	1.509
Market Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.3f)	0.249	0.007	1.480
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.3g)	0.398	-0.012	2.593*
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.3h)	0.299	-0.007	1.887
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Culture and Overall Performance (H12.3i)	0.036	0.053	-0.103
Market Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.3j)	0.090	0.108	-0.109
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.3k)	0.133	0.175	-0.260
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.3l)	0.098	0.121	-0.141

	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Market Culture and Overall Performance (H12.3m)	-0.317	0.151	-2.037*
Market Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.3n)	-0.304	0.221	-2.284*
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.3o)	-0.117	0.271	-1.677
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.3p)	-0.305	0.238	-2.365*

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to Table 5.77, competitive intensity moderates the relation between market culture and performance compared to objectives. Therefore H12.3g is confirmed. Also market growth moderates the relations between market culture and overall performance, comparative performance and total perceived performance since corresponding Fisher's Z values exceeds 1.96. H12.3m, H12.3n and H12.3p are accepted. The remaining hypotheses are all rejected.

There are significant correlations between market culture and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.249, 0.398, 0.299$, respectively) in the low competitive intensity group. Also, there are significant correlations between market culture and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.221, 0.271, 0.238$, respectively) in the high market growth group.

Table 5.78. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Adhocracy Culture and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.4a)	0.239	0.176	0.388
Adhocracy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.4b)	0.232	0.222	0.062
Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.4c)	0.318	0.367	-0.327
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.4d)	0.269	0.262	0.044
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.4e)	0.098	0.283	-1.153
Adhocracy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.4f)	0.169	0.277	-0.681
Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.4g)	0.358	0.354	0.027
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.4h)	0.218	0.311	-0.599
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.4i)	0.089	0.303	-1.351
Adhocracy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.4j)	0.139	0.272	-0.840
Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.4k)	0.200	0.443	-1.651
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.4l)	0.156	0.331	-1.128
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.4m)	0.455	0.155	1.419
Adhocracy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.4n)	0.477	0.174	1.455

Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.4o)	0.348	0.338	0.048
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.4p)	0.560	0.217	1.748

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

According to table 5.78, since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96, it can be said that market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth does not moderate the relations between adhocracy culture and performance measures. Therefore, all the hypotheses from H12.4a to H12.4p are rejected.

For the high market turbulence group, significant correlations are found between adhocracy culture and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.222, 0.367, 0.262$, respectively). For the low market turbulence group, the relations between adhocracy culture and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.318$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.269$) are significantly correlated.

For the low competitive intensity group, significant correlation is found between adhocracy culture and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.358$) For both the high competitive intensity group and the high technological turbulence group, all the relations between adhocracy culture and performance measures are significantly correlated.

For the low market growth group, the relations between adhocracy culture and overall performance, comparative performance, and total perceived performance ($r =$

0.455, 0.477, 0.560, respectively) are significantly correlated. In the high market growth group, the relations between adhocracy culture and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.174, 0.338$ and 0.217 , respectively).

Table 5.79. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Hierarchy Culture and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.5a)	-0.302	-0.066	-1.448
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.5b)	-0.319	-0.097	-1.375
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.5c)	-0.298	-0.347	0.322
Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.5d)	-0.339	-0.148	-1.202
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.5e)	-0.199	-0.099	-0.613
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.5f)	-0.136	-0.188	0.319
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.5g)	-0.415	-0.256	-1.076
Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.5h)	-0.222	-0.201	-0.132
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.5i)	-0.067	-0.234	1.035
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.5j)	-0.058	-0.279	1.380
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.5k)	-0.198	-0.460	1.792

Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.5l)	-0.093	-0.329	1.501
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchy Culture and Overall Performance (H12.5m)	-0.066	-0.141	0.322
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.5n)	0.210	-0.219	1.848
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.5o)	-0.317	-0.316	-0.005
Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.5p)	0.082	-0.244	1.405

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

According to Table 5.79, since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96, it can be said that market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth does not moderate the relations between hierarchy culture and performance measures. Therefore, all the hypotheses from H12.5a to H12.5p are rejected.

In the low market turbulence group, all the relations between hierarchy culture and performance measures are significantly and negatively correlated. In the high market turbulence group, there is a significant correlation between hierarchy culture and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.347$).

In the low competitive intensity group, significant correlations exist between hierarchy culture and performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = -0.415$ and -0.222 respectively). In the high competitive intensity group, the relation between hierarchy culture and performance compared to objectives is significantly and negatively correlated ($r = -0.256$). In the high

technological turbulence group, all the relations between hierarchy culture and performance measures are significantly and negatively correlated. In the high market growth group, relations between hierarchy culture and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = -0.219, -0.316, -0.244$, respectively).

Table 5.80. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Clan Culture and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Clan Culture and Overall Performance (H12.6a)	-0.118	-0.024	-0.557
Clan Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.6b)	-0.180	-0.117	-0.379
Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.6c)	-0.130	-0.090	-0.239
Clan Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.6d)	-0.175	-0.108	-0.413
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Clan Culture and Overall Performance (H12.6e)	-0.035	-0.135	0.603
Clan Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.6f)	-0.211	-0.084	-0.778
Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.6g)	-0.201	-0.058	-0.872
Clan Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.6h)	-0.204	-0.093	-0.680
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Clan Culture and Overall Performance (H12.6i)	-0.063	-0.102	0.297
Clan Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.6j)	-0.168	-0.083	-0.522
Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.6k)	-0.046	-0.151	0.641
Clan Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.6l)	-0.143	-0.106	-0.227

	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Clan Culture and Overall Performance (H12.6m)	0.070	-0.127	0.838
Clan Culture and Comparative Performance (H12.6n)	-0.247	-0.114	-0.584
Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (H12.6o)	0.212	-0.204	1.790
Clan Culture and Total Perceived Performance (H12.6p)	-0.130	-0.143	0.056

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

According to Table 5.80, since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96, it can be said that market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth does not moderate the relations between clan culture and performance measures. Therefore, all the hypotheses from H12.6a to H12.6p are rejected. The only significantly correlated relation exists between clan culture and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.204$) in the high market growth group.

5.2.19. Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational capabilities (outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities) and organizational performance measures. Reliability tests were conducted for each of the organizational capabilities dimension and all of the scales were found to be reliable. Therefore the analyses can be conducted on the total level. Table 5.81, 5.82, 5.83 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities respectively and performance measures.

Table 5.81. Correlation Analysis of Outside-In Capabilities With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Outside-in Capabilities and Overall Performance (H13.1a)	152	0.181	0.026
Outside-in Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H13.1b)	152	0.221	0.006
Outside-in Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H13.1c)	152	0.309	0.000
Outside-in Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H13.1d)	152	0.251	0.002

According to Table 5.81, significant correlations were found between outside-in capabilities and overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.181, 0.221, 0.309, .0251$ respectively). H13.1a, H13.1b, H13.1c, H13.1d were confirmed. It can be stated that the more excelled a firm's outside-in capabilities, the higher will be its overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.82. Correlation Analysis of Inside-Out Capabilities With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Inside-out Capabilities and Overall Performance (H13.2a)	152	0.206	0.011
Inside-out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H13.2b)	152	0.239	0.003
Inside-out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H13.2c)	152	0.259	0.001
Inside-out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H13.2d)	152	0.258	0.001

The results of Table 5.82 indicate that there are significant correlations between inside-out capabilities and overall performance, comparative performance,

performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.206$, 0.239 , 0.259 , 0.258 , respectively). These results confirm H13.2a, H13.2b, H13.2c, H13.2d and it can be stated that the more excelled a firm's inside-out capabilities, the higher is its overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.83. Correlation Analysis of Spanning Capabilities With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Spanning Capabilities and Overall Performance (H13.3a)	152	0.109	0.181
Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H13.3b)	152	0.137	0.091
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H13.3c)	152	0.297	0.000
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H13.3d)	152	0.176	0.030

There are significant correlations between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.297$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.176$). Therefore H13.3c and H13.3d are confirmed: The more excelled a firm's spanning capabilities, the higher will be its performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. The remaining hypotheses, H13.3a and H13.3b are rejected.

5.2.20. Organizational Capabilities and Employee Responses

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational capabilities dimensions (outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities) and employee responses measures. Reliability tests were conducted for each of the organizational capability dimension and employee responses and all of the scales were found to be reliable. Therefore the analyses can be conducted on the

total level. Table 5.84, 5.85, 5.86 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities respectively and employee responses.

Table 5.84. Correlation Analysis of Outside-In Capabilities With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Outside-In Capabilities and Employee Responses (H14.1a)	152	0.307	0.000
Outside-In Capabilities and Organizational Commitment (H14.1b)	152	0.288	0.000
Outside-In Capabilities and Esprit de Corps (H14.1c)	152	0.263	0.001

According to Table 5.84, significant correlations were found between outside-in capabilities and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. H14.1a, H14.1b, H14.1c were confirmed. The confirmed hypotheses can be stated as: The more excelled a firm's outside-in capabilities, the more favorable will be the employee responses and the higher will be organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Table 5.85. Correlation Analysis of Inside-Out Capabilities With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Inside-Out Capabilities and Employee Responses (H14.2a)	152	0.371	0.000
Inside-Out Capabilities and Organizational Commitment (H14.2b)	152	0.253	0.002
Inside-Out Capabilities and Esprit de Corps (H14.2c)	152	0.416	0.000

The results of Table 5.85 indicate that there are significant correlations between inside-out capabilities and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. These results confirm H14.2a, H14.2b and H14.2c and it can be stated that the more excelled a firm's inside-out capabilities, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Table 5.86. Correlation Analysis of Spanning Capabilities With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Spanning Capabilities and Employee Responses (H14.3a)	152	0.284	0.000
Spanning Capabilities and Organizational Commitment (H14.3b)	152	0.315	0.000
Spanning Capabilities and Esprit de Corps (H14.3c)	152	0.192	0.018

The results of Table 5.86 indicate that there are significant correlations between spanning capabilities and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. These results confirm H14.3a, H14.3b and H14.3c and it can be stated that the more excelled a firm's spanning capabilities, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

5.2.21. Organizational Capabilities and Customer Satisfaction

This section will give the results of the Pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational capabilities dimensions (outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities) and customer satisfaction. Table 5.87 will give the results of the

correlation analyses conducted between outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities and customer satisfaction.

Table 5.87. Correlation Analysis of Organizational Capabilities Dimensions With Customer Satisfaction

	n	r	p
Outside-In Capabilities and Customer Satisfaction (H15a)	152	0.091	0.266
Inside-Out Capabilities and Customer Satisfaction (H15b)	152	0.162	0.046
Spanning Capabilities and Customer Satisfaction (H15c)	152	-0.098	0.228

According to Table 5.87, the relation between inside-out capabilities and customer satisfaction is significantly correlated ($r = 0.162$) and this makes H15b confirmed. It can be stated that the more excelled a firm's inside-out capabilities, the higher will be the customer satisfaction. The remaining hypotheses of H15a and H15c are rejected due to the insignificant correlations.

5.2.22. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between organizational capabilities and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational innovation is grouped into two as; low organizational innovation and high organizational innovation at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational innovation is 3.9572) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational innovation

moderates the relationship between organizational capabilities and organizational performance. Table 5.88 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational innovation for the relationship between outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities and performance measures.

Table 5.88. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Innovation vs. High Organizational Innovation for Outside-In, Inside-Out and Spanning Capabilities and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Innovation 'r'	High Organizational Innovation 'r'	Fisher's Z
Outside-in Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.1a)	0.030	0.139	-0.638
Outside-in Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.1b)	-0.051	0.238	-1.706
Outside-in Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.1c)	0.114	0.122	-0.047
Outside-in Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.1d)	-0.012	0.221	-1.375
Inside-out Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.1e)	0.159	0.156	0.017
Inside-out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.1f)	0.032	0.268	-1.410
Inside-out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.1g)	0.073	0.206	-0.789
Inside-out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.1h)	0.066	0.261	-1.168
Spanning Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.1i)	0.156	-0.061	1.268
Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.1j)	0.112	-0.009	0.706
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.1k)	0.219	0.120	0.593
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.1l)	0.154	0.005	0.873

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. Since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96 in Table 5.88, it can be said that organizational innovation does not act as a moderating variable for the relationships between outside-in capabilities, inside-out capabilities and spanning capabilities and all performance measures. This makes all the hypotheses from H16.1a to H16.1l to be rejected. In the high organizational innovation group, the relationships between outside-in capabilities and comparative performance ($r = 0.238$), between outside-in capabilities and total perceived performance ($r = 0.221$), between inside-out capabilities and comparative performance ($r = 0.268$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.206$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.261$) are found to be significantly correlated.

5.2.23. Organizational Learning as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational capabilities and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational learning is grouped into two as; low organizational learners and high organizational learners at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational learning is 4.0121) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z -test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational capabilities and organizational performance. Table 5.89 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational learning for the relationship between outside-in, inside-in and spanning capabilities and performance measures.

Table 5.89. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Learners vs. High Organizational Learners for Outside-In, Inside-Out and Spanning Capabilities and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Learners 'r'	High Organizational Learners 'r'	Fisher's Z
Outside-in Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.2a)	0.166	0.145	0.122
Outside-in Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.2b)	0.135	0.229	-0.549
Outside-in Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.2c)	0.280	0.269	0.067
Outside-in Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.2d)	0.181	0.244	-0.373
Inside-out Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.2e)	0.253	0.099	0.899
Inside-out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.2f)	0.264	0.139	0.736
Inside-out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.2g)	0.298	0.109	1.117
Inside-out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.2h)	0.293	0.140	0.908
Spanning Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.2i)	0.224	-0.061	1.632
Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.2j)	0.207	0.017	1.282
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.2k)	0.320	0.207	0.687
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.2l)	0.251	0.043	1.205

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. Since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96 in Table 5.89, it can be said that organizational learning does not act as a moderating variable for the relationships between outside-in capabilities, inside-out

capabilities and spanning capabilities and all performance measures. This makes all the hypotheses from H16.2a to H16.2l all rejected.

In the low organizational learners group, the relationship between outside-in capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.280$) is significantly correlated. Again in the low organizational learners group, the relationships between inside-out capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.298$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.293$) are significantly correlated. Finally in the low organizational learners group, the relation between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.320$) is significantly correlated.

For the high organizational learners group, the relations between outside-in capabilities and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance ($r = 0.229, 0.269, 0.244$, respectively) are significantly correlated. The relations between inside-out capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.109$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.140$) are significantly correlated in the high organizational learners group. Finally, again in the high organizational learners group a significantly correlated relation exist between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.207$).

5.2.24. Market Related Factors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if market related factors (market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, and market growth) moderate the relationships between organizational capabilities and organizational performance. According to

the frequency results, market turbulence is grouped into two as; low market turbulence and high market turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.4 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.4276) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Competitive intensity is grouped into as; low competitive intensity and high competitive intensity at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of competitive intensity is 4.0855) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Technological turbulence is grouped into as; low technological turbulence and high technological turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.5 (since the mean of technological turbulence is 3.5592) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Market growth is grouped into two as; low market growth and high market growth at the cutoff point of 3.9 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.9013) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients for these variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if market related factors moderate the relationships between organizational capabilities and organizational performance. Table 5.90, Table 5.91, Table 5.92 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationships between outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities and performance measures respectively.

Table 5.90. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Outside-In Capabilities and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Outside-In Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.3a)	0.218	0.184	0.209
Outside-In Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.3b)	0.379	0.152	1.449
Outside-In Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.3c)	0.269	0.349	-0.522

Outside-In Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.3d)	0.362	0.207	1.530
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Outside-In Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.3e)	0.218	0.157	0.378
Outside-In Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.3f)	0.318	0.160	1.006
Outside-In Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.3g)	0.405	0.254	1.017
Outside-In Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.3h)	0.357	0.188	1.096
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Outside-In Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.3i)	0.151	0.202	-0.318
Outside-In Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.3j)	0.230	0.193	0.234
Outside-In Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.3k)	0.317	0.266	0.337
Outside-In Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.3l)	0.257	0.224	0.211
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Outside-In Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.3m)	-0.091	0.211	-1.295
Outside-In Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.3n)	-0.178	0.265	-1.914
Outside-In Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.3o)	-0.016	0.348	-1.608
Outside-In Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.3p)	-0.152	0.295	-1.939

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to Table 5.90, since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96, it can be said that market turbulence, competition intensity, technological turbulence and market growth do not moderate the

relationships between outside-in capabilities and performance measures. This result makes H16.3a to H16.3p all rejected.

In the low market turbulence group, significant correlations exist between outside-in capabilities and comparative performance ($r = 0.379$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.269$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.362$). In the high market turbulence group, the relations between outside-in capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.349$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.207$) are significantly correlated.

In the low competitive intensity group, significant correlations exist between outside-in capabilities and comparative performance ($r = 0.318$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.405$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.357$). In the high competitive intensity group, the relation between outside-in capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.254$) is significantly correlated.

In the low technological turbulence group, significant correlations exist between outside-in capabilities and comparative performance ($r = 0.230$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.317$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.257$). In the high technological turbulence group, the relation between outside-in capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.266$) is significantly correlated.

Finally in the high market growth group, all the relations between outside-in capabilities and performance measures of overall performance ($r = 0.211$),

comparative performance ($r = 0.265$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.348$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.295$) are significantly correlated.

Table 5.91. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Inside-Out Capabilities and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Inside-Out Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.4a)	0.308	0.192	0.731
Inside-Out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.4b)	0.362	0.170	1.223
Inside-Out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.4c)	0.366	0.232	0.869
Inside-Out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.4d)	0.384	0.199	1.197
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Inside-Out Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.4e)	0.245	0.184	0.382
Inside-Out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.4f)	0.328	0.192	0.875
Inside-Out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.4g)	0.319	0.226	0.602
Inside-Out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.4h)	0.350	0.211	0.905
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Inside-Out Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.4i)	0.187	0.225	-0.239
Inside-Out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.4j)	0.212	0.260	-0.307
Inside-Out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.4k)	0.302	0.197	0.677
Inside-Out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.4l)	0.246	0.264	-0.116

	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Inside-Out Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.4m)	0.130	0.233	-0.452
Inside-Out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.4n)	-0.037	0.310	-1.516
Inside-Out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.4o)	0.322	0.274	0.224
Inside-Out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.4p)	0.060	0.317	-1.137

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to Table 5.91, since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96, it can be said that market turbulence, competition intensity, technological turbulence and market growth do not moderate the relationships between inside-out capabilities and performance measures. This result makes H16.4a to H16.4p all rejected.

In the low market turbulence group, all the relations between inside-out capabilities and performance measures of overall performance ($r = 0.308$), comparative performance ($r = 0.362$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.366$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.384$) are significantly correlated. In the high market turbulence group, the relation between inside-out capabilities and performance compared to objectives is significantly correlated ($r = 0.232$).

In the low competitive intensity group, all the relations between inside-out capabilities and performance measures of overall performance ($r = 0.245$), comparative performance ($r = 0.328$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.319$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.350$) are significantly correlated. In the

high competitive intensity group, the relation between inside-out capabilities and performance compared to objectives is significantly correlated ($r = 0.226$).

In the low technological turbulence group, significant correlations exist between inside-out capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.302$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.246$). In the high technological turbulence group, the relations between inside-out capabilities and comparative performance ($r = 0.260$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.264$) are significantly correlated.

Finally in the high market growth group, all the relations between inside-out capabilities and performance measures of overall performance ($r = 0.233$), comparative performance ($r = 0.310$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.274$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.317$) are significantly correlated.

Table 5.92. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Spanning Capabilities and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Spanning Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.5a)	0.063	0.137	-0.440
Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.5b)	0.111	0.152	-0.246
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.5c)	0.172	0.373	-1.286
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.5d)	0.125	0.205	-0.485
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Spanning Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.5e)	-0.043	0.207	-1.514

Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.5f)	0.095	0.157	-0.377
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.5g)	0.323	0.287	0.237
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.5h)	0.132	0.200	-0.418
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Spanning Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.5i)	0.190	-0.002	1.174
Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.5j)	0.209	-0.038	1.511
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.5k)	0.317	-0.259	3.585*
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.5l)	0.247	-0.077	1.990*
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Spanning Capabilities and Overall Performance (H16.5m)	-0.185	0.154	-1.452
Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (H16.5n)	-0.304	0.204	-2.208*
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (H16.5o)	-0.010	0.329	-1.491
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (H16.5p)	-0.261	0.237	-2.157*

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to Table 5.92, technological turbulence moderates the relation between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives and between spanning capabilities and total perceived performance. These results confirm H16.5k and H16.5l. Also, market growth moderates the relations between spanning capabilities and comparative performance and between spanning capabilities and total perceived performance making H16.5n and H16.5p confirmed.

In the high market turbulence group, a significant correlations exists between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.373$). Both in the low and high competitive intensity group, the relation between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives is significantly correlated ($r = 0.323$ and 0.287 , respectively).

In the low technological turbulence group, significant correlations exist between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.317$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.247$). In the high technological turbulence group, the relation between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.259$) is significantly and negatively correlated.

Finally, in the high market growth group, the relations between spanning capabilities and comparative performance ($r = 0.204$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.329$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.237$) are significantly correlated.

5.2.25. Organizational Form and Organizational Performance

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational forms (hierarchical, transactional, relational, network forms) and organizational performance measures. Total organizational form scale is rejected due to insufficient reliability values. Therefore the analyses are conducted on the item level for organizational form types. Table 5.93, 5.94, 5.95, 5.96 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between hierarchical, transactional, relational, network forms respectively and performance measures.

Table 5.93. Correlation Analysis of Hierarchical Form With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (H17.1a)	152	-0.105	0.197
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (H17.1b)	152	-0.163	0.045
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H17.1c)	152	-0.270	0.001
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (H17.1d)	152	-0.189	0.020

According to Table 5.93, significant correlations were found between hierarchical form and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = -0.163, -0.270, -0.189$, respectively). H17.1b, H17.1c, H17.1d were confirmed in negative direction. Due to the negative sign of the correlations it can be stated that the more hierarchical a firm's organizational form is, the lower will be its comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.94. Correlation Analysis of Transactional Form With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Transactional Form and Overall Performance (H17.2a)	152	-0.062	0.448
Transactional Form and Comparative Performance (H17.2b)	152	-0.065	0.424
Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H17.2c)	152	-0.140	0.086
Transactional Form and Total Perceived Performance (H17.2d)	152	-0.085	0.298

The results of Table 5.94 indicate that there are no significant correlations between transactional form and overall performance, comparative performance, performance

compared to objectives and total perceived performance. Therefore, H17.2a, H17.2b, H17.2c, H17.2d are rejected.

Table 5.95. Correlation Analysis of Relational Form With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Relational Form and Overall Performance (H17.3a)	152	0.105	0.198
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (H17.3b)	152	0.209	0.010
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H17.3c)	152	0.214	0.008
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (H17.3d)	152	0.212	0.009

According to Table 5.95, significant correlations were found between relational form and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance ($r = 0.209, 0.214, 0.212$, respectively). H17.3b, H17.3c, H17.3d were confirmed. It can be stated that the more relational a firm's organizational form is, the higher will be its comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.96. Correlation Analysis of Network Form With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Network Form and Overall Performance (H17.4a)	152	0.042	0.606
Network Form and Comparative Performance (H17.4b)	152	0.136	0.095
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H17.4c)	152	0.177	0.029
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (H17.4d)	152	0.141	0.083

There is a significant correlation between network form and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.177$). This makes H17.4c confirmed: The more network a firm's

organizational form is, the higher will be its performance compared to objectives.

The remaining hypotheses, H17.4a, H17.4b and H17.4d are rejected.

5.2.26. Organizational Form and Employee Responses

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational forms (hierarchical, transactional, relational, network forms) and employee responses measures. Total organizational form scale is rejected due to insufficient reliability values. Therefore the analyses are conducted on the individual level for organizational form types. Table 5.97, 5.98, 5.99, 5.100 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between hierarchical, transactional, relational, network forms respectively and employee responses.

Table 5.97. Correlation Analysis of Hierarchical Form With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Hierarchical Form and Employee Responses (H18.1a)	152	-0.279	0.000
Hierarchical Form and Organizational Commitment (H18.1b)	152	-0.357	0.000
Hierarchical Form and Esprit de Corps (H18.1c)	152	-0.140	0.085

According to Table 5.97, significant correlations were found between hierarchical form and employee responses and organizational commitment ($r = -0.279$ and -0.357 respectively). H18.1a and H18.1b were confirmed in negative directions. Due to the negative correlations, the confirmed hypotheses can be stated as: The more hierarchical a firm's organizational form is, the less favorable will be the employee responses and the lower will be organizational commitment.

Table 5.98. Correlation Analysis of Transactional Form With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Transactional Form and Employee Responses (H18.2a)	152	-0.144	0.076
Transactional Form and Organizational Commitment (H18.2b)	152	-0.203	0.012
Transactional Form and Esprit de Corps (H18.2c)	152	-0.054	0.512

The results of Table 5.98 indicate that there is a significant correlation between transactional form and organizational commitment ($r = -0.203$). This confirms H18.2b in negative direction. By taking the negative sign of the correlation into consideration, it can be stated that the more transactional a firm's organizational form, the lower will be its organizational commitment. H18.2a and H18.2c are rejected due to insignificant correlations.

Table 5.99. Correlation Analysis of Relational Form With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Relational Form and Employee Responses (H18.3a)	152	0.272	0.001
Relational Form and Organizational Commitment (H18.3b)	152	0.305	0.000
Relational Form and Esprit de Corps (H18.3c)	152	0.179	0.028

The results of Table 5.99 indicate that there are significant correlations between relational form and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps ($r = 0.272, 0.305, 0.179$ respectively). These results confirm H18.3a, H18.3b and H18.3c and it can be stated that the more relational a firm's organizational form is, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Table 5.100. Correlation Analysis of Network Form With Employee Responses

	n	r	p
Network Form and Employee Responses (H18.4a)	152	0.364	0.000
Network Form and Organizational Commitment (H18.4b)	152	0.371	0.000
Network Form and Esprit de Corps (H18.4c)	152	0.281	0.000

The results of Table 5.100 indicate that there are significant correlations between network form and employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps ($r = 0.364, 0.371, 0.281$ respectively). These results confirm H18.4a, H18.4b and H18.4c and it can be stated that the more network a firm's organizational form is, the more favorable will be its employee responses and the higher will be its organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

5.2.27. Organizational Form and Customer Satisfaction

This section will give the results of the pearson correlation analyses conducted between organizational forms (hierarchical, transactional, relational, network forms) and customer satisfaction. Total organizational form scale is rejected due to insufficient reliability values. Therefore the analyses are conducted on the individual level for each organizational form types. Table 5.101 will give the results of the correlation analyses conducted between hierarchical, transactional, relational, network forms respectively and customer satisfaction.

Table 5.101. Correlation Analysis of Organizational Form Dimensions With Customer Satisfaction *

	n	r	p
Hierarchical Form and Customer Satisfaction (H19a)	152	-0.050	0.541
Transactional Form and Customer Satisfaction (H19b)	152	0.007	0.931
Relational Form and Customer Satisfaction (H19c)	152	-0.015	0.856
Network Form and Customer Satisfaction (H19c)	152	-0.026	0.751

The results of Table 5.101 indicate that there are no significant correlations between organizational form types and customer satisfaction. Therefore, H19a, H19b, H19c, H19d are rejected.

5.2.28. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Form and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between organizational form types and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational innovation is grouped into two as; low organizational innovation and high organizational innovation at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational innovation is 3.9572) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational innovation moderates the relationship between organizational form types and organizational performance. Table 5.102 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational innovation for the relationship between hierarchical, transactional, relational, network form types and performance measures.

Table 5.102. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Innovation vs. High Organizational Innovation for Hierarchical, Transactional, Relational, Network Form Types and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Innovation 'r'	High Organizational Innovation 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (H20.1a)	-0.173	-0.007	-0.974
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (H20.1b)	-0.222	-0.056	-0.986
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.1c)	-0.274	-0.144	-0.791
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.1d)	-0.253	-0.068	-1.107
Transactional Form and Overall Performance (H20.1e)	-0.187	0.082	-0.622
Transactional Form and Comparative Performance (H20.1f)	0.007	0.002	0.029
Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.1g)	-0.137	0.028	-0.964
Transactional Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.1h)	-0.053	0.020	-0.424
Relational Form and Overall Performance (H20.1i)	-0.249	0.169	-2.469*
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (H20.1j)	-0.084	0.236	-1.887
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.1k)	0.014	0.130	-0.678
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.1l)	-0.103	0.226	-1.937
Network Form and Overall Performance (H20.1m)	-0.186	0.080	-1.559
Network Form and Comparative Performance (H20.1n)	-0.052	0.146	-1.156
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.1o)	0.220	0.021	1.177
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.1p)	-0.028	0.125	-0.893

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. The only Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96 belong to the moderating effect of organizational innovation on the relation between relational form and overall performance. This makes H20.1i confirmed while all the remaining hypotheses (H20.1a to H20.1p except H20.1i) are rejected.

In the low organizational innovation group, the relation between hierarchical form and performance compared to objectives is negatively and significantly correlated ($r = -0.274$). In the high organizational innovation group, the relations between relational form and comparative performance and total perceived performance are significantly correlated ($r = 0.236$ and 0.226 , respectively).

5.2.29. Organizational Learning as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Form and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational form types and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, organizational learning is grouped into two as; low organizational learners and high organizational learners at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of organizational learning is 4.0121) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these two variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z -test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if organizational learning moderates the relationship between organizational form types and organizational performance. Table 5.103 will give the results for the moderating effects of organizational learning for the relationship between hierarchical, transactional, relational, network form types and performance measures.

Table 5.103. Fisher's Z Values for Low Organizational Learners vs. High Organizational Learners for Hierarchical, Transactional, Relational, Network Form Types and Performance Dimensions

	Low Organizational Learners 'r'	High Organizational Learners 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (H20.2a)	-0.130	-0.043	-0.495
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (H20.2b)	-0.180	-0.101	-0.455
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.2c)	-0.144	-0.258	0.672
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.2d)	-0.182	-0.131	-0.295
Transactional Form and Overall Performance (H20.2e)	0.070	-0.109	1.013
Transactional Form and Comparative Performance (H20.2f)	0.169	-0.144	1.782
Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.2g)	0.105	-0.220	1.857
Transactional Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.2h)	0.156	-0.166	1.834
Relational Form and Overall Performance (H20.2i)	-0.090	0.185	1.566
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (H20.2j)	0.038	0.258	-1.275
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.2k)	0.022	0.264	-1.403
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.2l)	0.016	0.271	-1.479
Network Form and Overall Performance (H20.2m)	-0.028	0.034	-0.350
Network Form and Comparative Performance (H20.2n)	0.022	0.141	0.609
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.2o)	0.121	0.135	-0.080
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.2p)	0.034	0.136	-0.580

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical z value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. Since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96, there is no moderating effect of organizational innovation on the relation between organizational form types and performance measures. This makes all the hypotheses from H20.2a to H20.2p rejected.

In the low organizational learners group, there are no significantly correlated relationships. In the high organizational learners group, the relation between hierarchical form and performance compared to objectives is negatively and significantly correlated ($r = -0.258$). In the high organizational innovation group, the relations between transactional form and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.220$ between relational form and comparative performance ($r = 0.258$), between relational form and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.264$) and between relational form and total perceived performance ($r = 0.271$) are significantly correlated.

5.2.30. Market Related Factors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Organizational Form and Organizational Performance

This section analyzes if market related factors (market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, and market growth) moderate the relationships between organizational form types and organizational performance. According to the frequency results, market turbulence is grouped into two as; low market turbulence and high market turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.4 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.4276) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Competitive intensity is grouped into as; low competitive intensity and high competitive intensity at the cutoff point of 4 (since the mean of competitive intensity is 4.0855) on a scale

ranging from 1 to 5. Technological turbulence is grouped into as; low technological turbulence and high technological turbulence at the cutoff point of 3.5 (since the mean of technological turbulence is 3.5592) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Market growth is grouped into two as; low market growth and high market growth at the cutoff point of 3.9 (since the mean of market turbulence is 3.9013) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. To investigate the significance of the the difference between the correlation coefficients for these variables occurring from two different samples, Fisher's Z-test is conducted. Fisher's Z values will indicate if market related factors moderate the relationships between organizational form types and organizational performance. Table 5.104, Table 5.105, Table 5.106, and Table 5.107 will give the results for the moderating effects of market related factors for the relationships between hierarchical, transactional, relational and network form types and performance measures respectively.

Table 5.104. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Hierarchical Form and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (H20.3a)	-0.122	-0.104	-0.107
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (H20.3b)	-0.079	-0.215	0.821
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.3c)	-0.293	-0.262	-0.198
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.3d)	-0.135	-0.226	0.555
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (H20.3e)	0.101	-0.292	2.406*

Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (H20.3f)	0.033	-0.344	2.343*
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.3g)	-0.306	-0.252	-0.350
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.3h)	-0.025	-0.343	1.989*
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (H20.3i)	0.085	-0.254	2.084*
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (H20.3j)	0.111	-0.362	2.964*
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.3k)	-0.098	-0.392	1.908
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.3l)	0.076	-0.380	2.877*
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (H20.3m)	-0.596	-0.001	-2.909*
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (H20.3n)	-0.570	-0.069	-2.453*
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.3o)	-0.456	-0.195	-1.249
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.3p)	-0.622	-0.088	-2.714*

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

The critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to Table 5.104, competitive intensity moderates the relations between hierarchical form and overall performance, comparative performance and total perceived performance. Therefore H20.3e, H20.3f and H20.3h are confirmed. Technological turbulence moderates the relations between hierarchical form and overall performance, comparative performance and total perceived performance. Thereby H20.3i, H20.3j and H20.3l are confirmed. Finally, market growth moderates the relations between hierarchical form and overall

performance, comparative performance and total perceived performance making H20.3m, H20.3n and H20.3p confirmed. The remaining hypotheses are all rejected.

All the relations between hierarchical form and performance measures are significantly correlated in the high competitive intensity, high technological turbulence and in the low market growth groups. There are significant correlations between hierarchical form and comparative performance ($r = -0.215$), performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.262$) and total perceived performance ($r = -0.226$) in the high market turbulence group. In the low market turbulence group and in the low competitive intensity group, there is a significant correlation between hierarchical form and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.293$ and -0.306 respectively). Finally, there is a significant correlation between hierarchical form and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.195$) in the high market growth group.

Table 5.105. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Transactional Form and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Transactional Form and Overall Performance (H20.4a)	-0.066	-0.058	-0.047
Transactional Form and Comparative Performance (H20.4b)	-0.052	-0.073	0.214
Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.4c)	-0.225	-0.093	-0.799
Transactional Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.4d)	-0.094	-0.080	-0.083
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Transactional Form and Overall Performance (H20.4e)	-0.122	-0.016	-0.638
Transactional Form and Comparative Performance (H20.4f)	-0.041	-0.082	0.246

Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.4g)	-0.121	-0.159	0.232
Transactional Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.4h)	-0.077	-0.092	0.090
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Transactional Form and Overall Performance (H20.4i)	-0.104	-0.029	-0.455
Transactional Form and Comparative Performance (H20.4j)	-0.182	0.019	-1.226
Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.4k)...	-0.325	-0.003	-2.055*
Transactional Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.4l)	-0.215	0.009	-1.374
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Transactional Form and Overall Performance (H20.4m)	-0.065	-0.065	0
Transactional Form and Comparative Performance (H20.4n)	-0.149	-0.058	-0.390
Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.4o)	-0.166	-0.150	-0.069
Transactional Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.4p)	-0.156	-0.082	-0.318

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

The critical value at $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.96. According to table 5.105, the only Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96 belongs to the moderating effect of technological turbulence on the relation between transactional form and performance compared to objectives. This result makes H20.4k confirmed. All the remaining hypotheses are rejected. The only significant correlation exists between transactional form and performance compared to objectives ($r = -0.325$) in the low technological turbulence group.

Table 5.106. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Relational Form and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Relational Form and Overall Performance (H20.5a)	0.188	0.044	0.862
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (H20.5b)	0.341	0.129	1.329
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.5c)	0.179	0.236	-0.351
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.5d)	0.312	0.147	1.029
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Relational Form and Overall Performance (H20.5e)	0.156	0.071	0.515
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (H20.5f)	0.195	0.218	-0.144
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.5g)	0.263	0.180	0.522
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.5h)	0.226	0.204	0.138
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Relational Form and Overall Performance (H20.5i)	0.026	0.170	-0.880
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (H20.5j)	0.221	0.186	0.220
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.5k)	0.224	0.178	0.289
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.5l)	0.211	0.197	0.088
	Low Market Growth 'r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Relational Form and Overall Performance (H20.5m)	-0.258	0.155	-1.782
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (H20.5n)	-0.141	0.252	-1.694
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.5o)	-0.038	0.229	-1.149
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.5p)	-0.142	0.254	-1.708

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

According to Table 5.106, since there is no Fisher's Z value exceeding 1.96, it can be said that market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth does not moderate the relations between relational form and performance measures. Therefore, all the hypotheses from H20.5a to H20.5p are rejected.

In the low market turbulence group, there are significant correlations between relational form and comparative performance ($r = 0.341$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.312$). In the high market turbulence group, there is a significant correlation between relational form and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.236$).

In the low competitive intensity group, there is a significant correlation between relational form and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.263$). In the high competitive intensity group, there is a significant correlation between relational form and comparative performance ($r = 0.218$). There are no significant correlations in the low and high technological turbulence and in the low market growth groups. Finally, in the high market growth group, there are significant correlations between relational form and comparative performance ($r = 0.252$), performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.229$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.254$).

Table 5.107. Fisher's Z Values for Market Related Factors for Network Form and Performance Dimensions

	Low Market Turbulence 'r'	High Market Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Network Form and Overall Performance (H20.6a)	0.228	-0.087	1.882
Network Form and Comparative Performance (H20.6b)	0.313	-0.031	2.092*
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.6c)	0.199	-0.161	2.146*
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.6d)	0.302	-0.041	2.079*
	Low Competitive Intensity 'r'	High Competitive Intensity 'r'	Fisher's Z
Network Form and Overall Performance (H20.6e)	-0.053	0.102	-0.930
Network Form and Comparative Performance (H20.6f)	0.030	0.195	-1.002
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.6g)	0.092	0.240	-0.913
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.6h)	0.033	0.203	-1.034
	Low Technological Turbulence 'r'	High Technological Turbulence 'r'	Fisher's Z
Network Form and Overall Performance (H20.6i)	0.031	0.046	-0.091
Network Form and Comparative Performance (H20.6j)	0.180	0.084	0.591
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.6k)	0.215	0.123	0.573
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.6l)	0.180	0.092	0.542
	Low Market Growth 2r'	High Market Growth 'r'	Fisher's Z
Network Form and Overall Performance (H20.6m)	-0.112	0.061	-0.736
Network Form and Comparative Performance (H20.6n)	-0.026	0.154	-0.768
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (H20.6o)	0.287	0.156	0.585
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (H20.6p)	0.019	0.153	-0.573

Bold values indicate significant correlation coefficients at $\alpha = 0.05$

* Indicates a moderating effect

According to Table 5.107, market turbulence moderates the relations between network form and comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance since the corresponding Fisher's Z values exceed the critical value of 1.96. H20.6b, H20.6c and H20.6d are confirmed while the remaining hypotheses are all rejected.

There are significant correlations between network form and comparative performance ($r = 0.313$) and total perceived performance ($r = 0.302$) in the low market turbulence group. There is a significant correlation between network form and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.240$) in the high competitive intensity group. There are no significant correlations between network form and all performance measures in the low and high market growth, in the low and high technological turbulence groups, in the low competitive intensity group and in the high market turbulence group.

5.2.31. Moderators of the Study and Their Impact on Organizational Performance

This section will present the findings on the relationships between moderators of the study and organizational performance measures. Table 5.108 will give the relations between organizational innovation and performance measures, Table 5.109 will give the relations between organizational learning and performance measures, Table 5.110 will give the relations between market turbulence and performance measures, Table 5.111 will give the relations between competitive intensity and performance measures, Table 5.112 will give the relations between technological turbulence and

performance measures and finally Table 5.113 will give the relations between market growth and performance measures.

Table 5.108. Correlation Analysis of Organizational Innovation With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Organizational Innovation and Overall Performance (H21.1a)	152	0.310	0.000
Organizational Innovation and Comparative Performance (H21.1b)	152	0.419	0.000
Organizational Innovation and Performance Compared to Objectives (H21.1c)	152	0.532	0.000
Organizational Innovation and Total Perceived Performance (H21.1d)	152	0.460	0.000

The results of Table 5.108 indicate that all the relations between organizational innovation and performance measures are statistically significant. The highest correlation is found between organizational innovation and performance compared to objectives ($r = 0.532$). H21.1a to H21.1d are confirmed: The greater the organizational innovation of a firm, the higher will be its overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.109. Correlation Analysis of Organizational Learning With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Organizational Learning and Overall Performance (H21.2a)	152	0.292	0.000
Organizational Learning and Comparative Performance (H21.2b)	152	0.325	0.000
Organizational Learning and Performance Compared to Objectives (H21.2c)	152	0.387	0.000
Organizational Learning and Total Perceived Performance (H21.2d)	152	0.360	0.000

The results of Table 5.109 indicate that all the relations between organizational learning and performance measures are statistically significant. H21.2a to H21.2d are confirmed: The greater the organizational learning in a firm, the higher will be its overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

Table 5.110. Correlation Analysis of Market Turbulence With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Market Turbulence and Overall Performance (H21.3a)	152	0.004	0.959
Market Turbulence and Comparative Performance (H21.3b)	152	-0.023	0.778
Market Turbulence and Performance Compared to Objectives (H21.3c)	152	0.077	0.344
Market Turbulence and Total Perceived Performance (H21.3d)	152	-0.001	0.987

No significant correlations are found between market turbulence and performance measures and H21.3a to H21.3d are rejected.

Table 5.111. Correlation Analysis of Competitive Intensity With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Competitive Intensity and Overall Performance (H21.4a)	152	-0.072	0.381
Competitive Intensity and Comparative Performance (H21.4b)	152	-0.005	0.950
Competitive Intensity and Performance Compared to Objectives (H21.4c)	152	-0.064	0.436
Competitive Intensity and Total Perceived Performance (H21.4d)	152	-0.027	0.738

No significant correlations are found between competitive intensity and performance measures and H21.4a to H21.4d are rejected.

Table 5.112. Correlation Analysis of Technological Turbulence With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Technological Turbulence and Overall Performance (H21.5a)	152	0.004	0.958
Technological Turbulence and Comparative Performance (H21.5b)	152	0.049	0.548
Technological Turbulence and Performance Compared to Objectives (H21.5c)	152	0.142	0.080
Technological Turbulence and Total Perceived Performance (H21.5d)	152	0.065	0.430

No significant correlations are found between technological turbulence and performance measures and H21.5a to H21.5d are rejected.

Table 5.113. Correlation Analysis of Market Growth With Performance Measures

	n	r	p
Market Growth and Overall Performance (H21.6a)	152	0.170	0.036
Market Growth and Comparative Performance (H21.6b)	152	0.189	0.020
Market Growth and Performance Compared to Objectives (H21.6c)	152	0.345	0.000
Market Growth and Total Perceived Performance (H21.6d)	152	0.233	0.004

All the relations between market growth and performance measures are statistically significant making H21.6a to H21.6d confirmed: The greater the market growth, the higher will be the firm's overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance.

5.3. Findings About Model Fit

This section will test the fit of the model with the help of the multiple regression analysis. For the determination of the model fit, 'R' gives the correlation between observed and predicted values of the dependent variable. ' R^2 ' is the proportion of variance of the dependent variable that is explained by the proposed regression model. It would be better to use 'Adjusted R^2 ' for interpretation since the original ' R^2 ' may sometimes present over-optimistic model fit values. The 'F' value is the proportion between the regression sum of squares (measured variation) and residual sum of squares (unmeasured variation). Significant 'F' values indicate that the portion of the explained variance is meaningfully higher than the unexplained part (Churchill and Iacobucci 2004). Finally, beta (b) values allow to compare the impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable to the effect on the dependent variable of other independent variables. Relative importance of each variable in the proposed regression model and the corresponding significance level is caught by the 't' values.

All the independent variables have not been included in the regression analysis because they were not normally distributed. These variables are organizational culture types and organizational capabilities. As dependent variables, overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance, employee responses, organizational commitment, esprit de corps, and customer satisfaction have been chosen. The combinations used are shown in Table 5.114.

Table 5.114. Regression Analysis Variable Combinations

Analysis 1		
Dependent Variable:	Overall Performance	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 2		
Dependent Variable:	Comparative Performance	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 3		
Dependent Variable:	Performance Compared to Objectives	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 4		
Dependent Variable:	Total Perceived Performance	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 5		
Dependent Variable:	Total Perceived Performance	Independent Variables: Production, Product, Sales and Market Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 6		
Dependent Variable:	Employee Responses	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 7		
Dependent Variable:	Organizational Commitment	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning,

	Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 8	
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Aggressiveness, Analysis, Defensiveness, Futurity, Proactiveness, Riskiness, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 9	
Dependent Variable: Esprit De Corps	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 10	
Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth
Analysis 11	
Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction	Independent Variables: Organizational Orientation, Aggressiveness, Analysis, Defensiveness, Futurity, Proactiveness, Riskiness, Hierarchical Form, Transactional Form, Relational Form, Network Form, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market Turbulence, Competitive Intensity, Technological Turbulence, Market Growth

In the following tables, the fit of each model and the independent variables that become more important than the remaining independent variables in explaining the selected dependent variables will be analyzed.

Table 5.115. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Overall Performance

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.223	2.672	0.008
Strategic Orientation	0.120	1.205	0.230
Hierarchical Form	0.132	1.557	0.122
Transactional Form	-0.068	-0.797	0.427
Relational Form	0.073	0.621	0.535
Network Form	-0.121	-1.051	0.295
Organizational Innovation	0.282	2.993	0.003
Organizational Learning	0.176	2.029	0.044
Market Turbulence	0.039	0.417	0.678
Competitive Intensity	-0.182	-2.176	0.031
Technological Turbulence	-0.284	-2.679	0.008
Market Growth	0.157	1.976	0.050
Constant	-1.990	-1.581	0.116

R = 0.513	Adj. R ² = 0.200	F = 4.142	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.513 and %20 of the variance in the dependent variable of overall performance is explained by this model. The significant F value (4.142) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of overall performance are: organizational orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth. As organizational orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, and market growth increase, and as competitive intensity and technological turbulence decrease, overall performance increases.

Table 5.116. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Comparative Performance

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.232	2.943	0.004
Strategic Orientation	0.117	1.244	0.215
Hierarchical Form	0.062	0.777	0.439
Transactional Form	0.015	0.183	0.855
Relational Form	0.146	1.316	0.190
Network Form	-0.090	-0.822	0.412
Organizational Innovation	0.379	4.262	0.000
Organizational Learning	0.150	1.829	0.070
Market Turbulence	-0.008	-0.091	0.928
Competitive Intensity	-0.106	-1.338	0.014
Technological Turbulence	-0.251	-2.500	0.102
Market Growth	0.123	1.646	0.050
Constant	-4.656	-3.335	0.001

R = 0.586	Adj. R ² = 0.287	F = 6.061	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.586 and 29% of the variance in the dependent variable of comparative performance is explained by this model. The significant F value (6.060) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of comparative performance are: organizational orientation, organizational innovation, competitive intensity and market growth. As comparative performance increases, organizational orientation, organizational innovation and market growth increase, and competitive intensity decreases.

Table 5.117. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Performance Compared to Objectives

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.130	1.852	0.066
Strategic Orientation	0.204	2.444	0.016
Hierarchical Form	0.029	0.408	0.684
Transactional Form	-0.077	-1.062	0.290
Relational Form	0.015	0.154	0.878
Network Form	0.012	0.127	0.899
Organizational Innovation	0.403	5.082	0.000
Organizational Learning	0.177	2.424	0.017
Market Turbulence	0.038	0.488	0.626
Competitive Intensity	-0.163	-2.318	0.022
Technological Turbulence	-0.288	-3.228	0.002
Market Growth	0.273	4.090	0.000
Constant	-1.746	-1.993	0.048

R = 0.692	Adj. R ² = 0.434	F = 10.668	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	------------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.692 and 43% of the variance in the dependent variable of performance compared to objectives is explained by this model. The highly significant F value (10.668) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of performance compared to objectives are: strategic orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, and market growth. As strategic orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning and market growth increase, and as competitive intensity and technological turbulence decrease, performance compared to objectives increases.

Table 5.118. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Total Perceived Performance

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.231	3.078	0.003
Strategic Orientation	0.144	1.616	0.108
Hierarchical Form	0.072	0.946	0.346
Transactional Form	-0.015	-0.191	0.849
Relational Form	0.122	1.154	0.251
Network Form	-0.083	-0.796	0.428
Organizational Innovation	0.402	4.741	0.000
Organizational Learning	0.172	2.208	0.029
Market Turbulence	0.008	0.091	0.927
Competitive Intensity	-0.138	-1.835	0.069
Technological Turbulence	-0.285	-2.987	0.003
Market Growth	0.168	2.361	0.020
Constant	-3.574	-3.216	0.002

R = 0.637	Adj. R ² = 0.354	F = 7.899	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.637 and %35 of the variance in the dependent variable of total perceived performance is explained by this model. The significant F value (7.899) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of total perceived performance are: organizational orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, technological turbulence, and market growth. As organizational orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning and market growth increase, and as technological turbulence decreases, total perceived performance increases.

Table 5.119. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation Types, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Total Perceived Performance

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Production Orientation	-0.023	-0.251	0.803
Product Orientation	0.051	0.493	0.623
Sales Orientation	0.016	0.157	0.875
Market Orientation	0.257	3.167	0.002
Strategic Orientation	0.133	1.461	0.146
Hierarchical Form	0.078	1.014	0.312
Transactional Form	0.002	0.021	0.983
Relational Form	0.135	1.251	0.213
Network Form	-0.101	-0.925	0.357
Organizational Innovation	0.387	4.439	0.000
Organizational Learning	0.175	2.184	0.031
Market Turbulence	-0.009	-0.098	0.922
Competitive Intensity	-0.115	-1.326	0.187
Technological Turbulence	-0.295	-3.047	0.003
Market Growth	0.178	2.327	0.021
Constant	-3.521	-2.297	0.003

R = 0.640	Adj. R ² = 0.344	F = 6.286	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results from Table 5.118 indicate that one of the best estimates of the total perceived performance is organizational orientation. To understand which organizational orientation contributes to total perceived performance more, this regression model is analyzed. In this model, production, product, sales and market orientations are included instead of the total organizational orientation variable. The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.640 and %34 of the variance in the dependent variable of total perceived performance is explained by this model. The significant F value (6.286) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to

the t-values, the best predictors of total perceived performance are: market orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, technological turbulence, and market growth. As market orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning and market growth increase, and as technological turbulence decreases, total perceived performance increases.

Table 5.120. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Employee Responses

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.055	0.747	0.456
Strategic Orientation	-0.115	-1.305	0.194
Hierarchical Form	-0.178	-2.378	0.019
Transactional Form	0.057	0.749	0.455
Relational Form	-0.002	-0.022	0.983
Network Form	0.198	1.941	0.054
Organizational Innovation	0.098	1.177	0.241
Organizational Learning	0.451	5.888	0.000
Market Turbulence	-0.186	-2.273	0.025
Competitive Intensity	0.032	0.430	0.668
Technological Turbulence	0.128	1.363	0.175
Market Growth	0.027	0.386	0.700
Constant	1.388	2.328	0.021

R = 0.653	Adj. R ² = 0.376	F = 8.597	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.653 and %38 of the variance in the dependent variable of employee responses is explained by this model. The significant F value (8.597) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of employee responses are: organizational learning, hierarchical

form, network form and market turbulence. As organizational learning and network form increase, and as hierarchical form and market turbulence decrease, employee responses become more favorable.

Table 5.121. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Organizational Commitment

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.094	1.298	0.196
Strategic Orientation	-0.248	-2.893	0.004
Hierarchical Form	-0.304	-4.137	0.000
Transactional Form	0.060	0.526	0.600
Relational Form	0.171	1.718	0.088
Network Form	0.198	1.941	0.054
Organizational Innovation	0.093	1.145	0.254
Organizational Learning	0.387	5.155	0.000
Market Turbulence	-0.166	-2.065	0.041
Competitive Intensity	0.060	0.833	0.406
Technological Turbulence	0.259	2.825	0.005
Market Growth	-0.009	-0.126	0.900
Constant	2.090	3.399	0.001

R = 0.671	Adj. R ² = 0.403	F = 9.505	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.671 and %40 of the variance in the dependent variable of organizational commitment is explained by this model. The significant F value (9.505) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of organizational commitment are: organizational learning, strategic orientation, hierarchical form, network form, market turbulence and technological turbulence. As organizational learning, network form and

technological turbulence increase, and as strategic orientation, hierarchical form and market turbulence decrease, organizational commitment increases.

Table 5.122. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation *Types*, Organizational Form *Types*, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Organizational Commitment

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.102	1.401	0.163
Aggressiveness	-0.212	-2.345	0.020
Analysis	-0.124	-1.193	0.235
Defensiveness	-0.167	-1.775	0.078
Futurity	-0.049	-0.523	0.602
Proactiveness	-0.002	-0.023	0.982
Riskiness	-0.051	-0.653	0.515
Hierarchical Form	-0.304	-3.970	0.000
Transactional Form	0.066	0.840	0.402
Relational Form	0.045	0.439	0.661
Network Form	0.196	1.903	0.059
Organizational Innovation	0.001	0.011	0.991
Organizational Learning	0.363	4.625	0.000
Market Turbulence	-0.183	-2.275	0.024
Competitive Intensity	0.035	0.429	0.669
Technological Turbulence	0.290	3.101	0.002
Market Growth	-0.002	-0.031	0.975
Constant	2.749	4.000	0.000

R = 0.687	Adj. R ² = 0.405	F = 7.049	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results from Table 5.121 indicate that one of the best estimates of the organizational commitment is strategic orientation. To understand which strategic orientation contributes to organizational commitment more, this regression model is analyzed. In this model, aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness, riskiness are included instead of the total strategic orientation variable. The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values

predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.687 and %40 of the variance in the dependent variable of organizational commitment is explained by this model. The significant F value (7.049) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of organizational commitment are: organizational learning, aggressiveness, hierarchical form, network form, market turbulence and technological turbulence. As organizational learning, network form and technological turbulence increase, and as aggressiveness orientation, hierarchical form and market turbulence decrease, organizational commitment increases.

Table 5.123. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Esprit de Corps

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.004	0.044	0.965
Strategic Orientation	0.048	0.502	0.616
Hierarchical Form	-0.011	-0.134	0.894
Transactional Form	0.041	0.497	0.620
Relational Form	-0.060	-0.523	0.602
Network Form	0.184	1.645	0.102
Organizational Innovation	0.082	0.902	0.368
Organizational Learning	0.424	5.043	0.000
Market Turbulence	-0.169	-1.877	0.063
Competitive Intensity	-0.004	-0.054	0.957
Technological Turbulence	-0.035	-0.343	0.732
Market Growth	0.058	0.760	0.449
Constant	0.569	0.734	0.464

R = 0.556	Adj. R ² = 0.249	F = 5.177	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.556 and %25 of the

variance in the dependent variable of esprit de corps is explained by this model. The significant F value (5.177) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictor of esprit de corps is organizational learning. As organizational learning increases, esprit de corps also increases.

Table 5.124. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation, Organizational Form Types, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Customer Satisfaction

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.060	0.760	0.449
Strategic Orientation	0.361	3.813	0.000
Hierarchical Form	0.211	2.612	0.010
Transactional Form	-0.031	-0.382	0.703
Relational Form	-0.104	-0.924	0.357
Network Form	-0.105	-0.960	0.339
Organizational Innovation	0.320	3.572	0.000
Organizational Learning	0.201	2.432	0.016
Market Turbulence	-0.069	-0.777	0.438
Competitive Intensity	-0.252	-3.168	0.002
Technological Turbulence	-0.214	-2.117	0.036
Market Growth	-0.021	-0.285	0.776
Constant	24.368	1.942	0.054

R = 0.577	Adj. R ² = 0.276	F = 5.790	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.577 and 28% of the variance in the dependent variable of customer satisfaction is explained by this model. The significant F value (5.790) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of customer satisfaction are: strategic orientation,

organizational innovation and learning, hierarchical form, competitive intensity, technological turbulence. As strategic orientation, organizational innovation organizational learning and hierarchical form increase, and as technological turbulence and competitive intensity decrease, customer satisfaction increases.

Table 5.125. Model Fit Statistics About the Relationship Between Organizational Orientation, Strategic Orientation *Types*, Organizational Form *Types*, Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, Market-Related Factors and Customer Satisfaction

Independent Variables	b	t	p
Organizational Orientation	0.055	0.711	0.478
Aggressiveness	0.051	0.534	0.594
Analysis	-0.016	-0.146	0.884
Defensiveness	0.169	1.698	0.092
Futurity	-0.017	-0.171	0.864
Proactiveness	0.475	4.978	0.000
Riskiness	0.039	0.474	0.636
Hierarchical Form	0.125	1.534	0.127
Transactional Form	-0.036	-0.427	0.670
Relational Form	-0.102	-0.936	0.351
Network Form	-0.084	-0.767	0.445
Organizational Innovation	0.159	1.579	0.117
Organizational Learning	0.178	2.139	0.034
Market Turbulence	-0.071	-0.833	0.406
Competitive Intensity	-0.277	-3.251	0.001
Technological Turbulence	-0.208	-2.098	0.038
Market Growth	0.058	0.741	0.460
Constant	41.878	3.105	0.002

R = 0.638	Adj. R ² = 0.332	F = 5.417	p = 0.000
-----------	-----------------------------	-----------	-----------

The results from Table 5.124 indicate that one of the best estimates of the customer satisfaction is strategic orientation. To understand which strategic orientation contributes to customer satisfaction more, this regression model is analyzed. In this model, aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness, riskiness are

included instead of the total strategic orientation variable. The results show that the observed values of the dependent variable and the values predicted by this model are correlated with a coefficient of 0.638 and %33 of the variance in the dependent variable of customer satisfaction is explained by this model. The significant F value (5.417) at 0.01 level indicates a meaningfully higher portion of explained variance compared to the unexplained part. According to the t-values, the best predictors of customer satisfaction are: proactiveness orientation, organizational learning, competitive intensity, technological turbulence. As proactiveness, organizational learning, technological turbulence and competitive intensity increase, customer satisfaction increases.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This section will give the conclusions of the study. Implications will be presented under two headings, implications for managers and implications for researchers. Suggestions for further research will also be discussed in this section.

6.1. Conclusions

The objectives of this study are (1) to assess the relationships between each of the organizational dimensions of organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities, organizational form and the consequences created by these dimensions, namely organizational performance, employee responses and customer responses; (2) to assess the relationships between organizational innovation, organizational learning, market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth and organizational performance measures; (3) to find out whether the relationships between organizational dimensions (organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities and organizational form) and organizational performance are moderated by organizational innovation and organizational learning; (4) to capture whether the relationships between organizational dimensions (organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities and organizational form) and organizational performance is moderated by market related factors, namely by market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth.

Data is collected from 152 strategic business units during December 2003 and April 2004. The sectoral division of the sample gives a picture such that 64.5% of this sample is in the consumer market, 5.3% is in the industrial market and 30.2% of the sample is in the service market. When the operational areas of the strategic business units are investigated, it is seen that 20.4% is in the food and drinks area, 18.4% is in the health area, 17.8% is in the household goods area, 11.8% is in the fast moving consumer goods area and finally the remaining 31.6% operates in mixed areas such as electronics, information technology, textile, construction, cosmetics, tourism, and automotive.

The questionnaire, which is designed to be structured and undisguised, is composed of a total of 150 questions. Most of the questions were scaled by continuous measures, although some were also categorical. The continuous questions were measured by either Likert or rating scales ranging from 1 to 5. The categorical questions were used in order to collect general information about the strategic business unit and the firm the strategic business unit operates in.

6.1.1. Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

Organizational orientation has four main dimensions: Production orientation, product orientation, sales orientation and market orientation. Production orientation focuses on mass distribution of the products and on the low costs. Product orientation deals with making superior products and assumes that consumers will buy well-made, quality products. Sales orientation concentrates on the selling and promotion activities in order to coax consumers into buying.

Market orientation is defined by Kohli and Jaworski (1990) as the organization wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future customer needs, dissemination of intelligence across departments and organization-wide responsiveness to it. This stream of research is known as the behavioral conceptualization of market orientation. Another conceptualization of market orientation is the philosophical conceptualization and market orientation, in this research, has been investigated with this approach. The pioneers of this perspective are Narver and Slater (1990) who see market orientation as the organization culture that most effectively and efficiently creates the necessary behaviors for the creation of superior value for buyers and thus continuous superior performance for the business. Narver and Slater (1990) assert that market orientation consists of three components that are customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination. Customer and competitor orientation deal with all the activities involved in collecting information about the buyers and competitors in the target market and disseminating it throughout the business. Interfunctional coordination is based on the customer and competitor information and deals with the business' coordinated efforts to create superior value for customers.

Performance is assessed by four main measures derived after a thorough literature survey. These measures are overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. Overall performance tries to derive an overall evaluation about the performance of the business unit from the perspective of the managers. Comparative performance tries to capture performance against major competitors in terms of market share, market share growth, sales growth, profitability, sales revenue, sales volume, number of

successful products introduced and percentage of sales generated by these new products and services. Performance compared to objectives assesses performance relative to strategic business unit's stated objectives about customer satisfaction, customer retention, and product/service quality. Finally, total perceived performance is a derived scale from the three above mentioned scales.

The relation between organizational orientation, especially market orientation and business performance is highly investigated in the literature. Table 6.1. gives the tested relationships between organizational orientation dimensions and business performance which are found statistically significant.

Table 6.1. Relationships Between Dimensions of Organizational Orientation and Performance Measures

Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (+)
Market Orientation and Overall Performance (+)
Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Customer orientation and Overall Performance (+)
Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance (+)
Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (+)
Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (+)
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance (+)

With respect to production orientation, the only significant relation was with performance compared to objectives and this relation was negative. This shows that

as firms concentrate on production orientation more and more, they experience lower levels of performance compared to their stated objectives. Too much focus on production orientation and thereby too much focus on mass distribution and low prices may take firms away from their customers' needs and wants. As a result, performance compared to business' stated objectives like customer satisfaction, customer retention and product quality may decrease.

Sales orientation is positively related to overall performance showing that a firm's selling and promotion efforts may contribute to its overall performance.

Among the four organizational orientations (production, product, sales and market orientations), only market orientation showed the most number of positive relations with all performance measures. This overview indicates above all that market orientation outperforms the other organizational orientations in terms of its impact on business performance. Both market orientation on the total level and its three parts (customer orientation, competitor orientation, interfunctional coordination) separately have a positive impact on overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. Therefore it can be concluded that for achieving higher levels of business performance, the right path goes into implementing market orientation with special interest on customers, competitors and on interfunctional coordination. Firms that consistently acquire information about their competitors and customers and that disseminate this information throughout the organization and then firms that create superior value for their customers based on this information with the coordinated efforts of all the

related departments have the chance to achieve higher levels of business performance.

Most of the research on market orientation concentrated on its impact on performance (e.g. Jaworski and Kohli 1993, Ruekert 1992, Narver and Slater 1990, Slater and Narver 1994a, Deshpande et.al. 1993). Again most of these studies empirically found a positive relation between market orientation and business performance (Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Narver and Slater 1990; Slater and Narver 1994a, 1994b, 2000; Liu, Luo and Shi 2003; Tse, Sin, Yau, Lee and Chow 2003; Hooley, Fahy, Greenley, Beracs, Fonfara and Snoj 2003; Ruekert 1992; Subramanian and Gopalakrishna 2001; Deng and Dart 1994; Selnes et.al. 1996; Pitt et.al. 1996; Deshpande et.al. 1993; Ngai and Ellis 1998; Yau et.al. 2000; Hooley et.al. 2000; Matsuno, Mentzer and Özsomer 2002, Yalman 2003). However, it should be noted that there are some studies reporting no direct relationship between market orientation and business performance like the study of Han, Kim and Srivastava (1998).

As a result, it can be concluded that like most of the studies in the literature, this research confirms the positive relationship between market orientation and performance for the market represented by the sample firms.

6.1.2. Organizational Orientation and Employee Responses

Organizational commitment and esprit de corps are the two variables that have been investigated throughout this research as dependent variables. Employee responses

scale is created by the inclusion of both organizational commitment and esprit de corps scales.

Table 6.2. presents the statistically significant relations found in this research between organizational orientation dimensions and employee responses.

Table 6.2. Relationships Between Dimensions of Organizational Orientation and Employee Responses

Product Orientation and Employee Responses (-)
Product Orientation and Organizational Commitment (-)
Product Orientation and Esprit de Corps (-)
Sales Orientation and Esprit de Corps (-)
Market Orientation and Employee Responses (+)
Market Orientation and Organizational Commitment (+)
Market Orientation and Esprit de Corps (+)
Customer Orientation and Employee Responses (+)
Customer Orientation and Organizational Commitment (+)
Competitor Orientation and Employee Responses (+)
Competitor Orientation and Organizational Commitment (+)
Competitor Orientation and Esprit de Corps (+)
Interfunctional Coordination and Employee Responses (+)
Interfunctional Coordination and Organizational Commitment (+)
Interfunctional Coordination and Esprit de Corps (+)

Product orientation is negatively related to employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. Firms implementing a product orientation concentrate on making superior products. The main objective of these firms is to improve product attributes and product quality. Too much focus with the product without the common objective of customer satisfaction may be a factor decreasing esprit de corps and commitment and thereby making employee responses less favorable.

Sales orientation is negatively related with esprit de corps. Firms implementing a sales orientation concentrate their efforts on selling and promotion activities. The mere concentration of individuals on achieving sales goals may prevent the formation of team spirit in the organization. Therefore, firms with higher levels of sales orientation show lower levels of esprit de corps.

Within the organizational orientation dimensions, market orientation is the one that shows the most number of positive relations with employee responses. It is found that on the total level market orientation is positively related to employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. Both competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination affect positively employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. Finally, customer orientation affects positively employee responses and organizational commitment.

The positive effect of market orientation on employee responses shows that market orientation creates a bonding between employees and the organization, as well as promoting a feeling of belonging to a family dedicated to meeting and exceeding market needs. Market orientation is the true organizational orientation for the creation of favorable employee responses. Among the dimensions of market orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination were the ones that are positively correlated with all the employee responses indicating that for more favorable employee responses, collecting and disseminating information about competitors and then taking coordinated actions based on these findings should be the priority action areas. It should also be noted that customer information acquisition, dissemination, and taking actions about them, that is customer

orientation, leads to more favorable employee responses and higher organizational commitment levels.

Employee responses are the second highly investigated consequence of market orientation in the literature (e.g. Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Kohli and Jaworski 1990; Ruekert 1992). Most of the studies investigating this relation found that market orientation positively affects employee responses (Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Ruekert 1992; Farrelly and Quester 2003; Helfert, Ritter and Walter 2002; Siguaw, Brown and Widing 1994; Jones, Busch and Dacin 2003; Selnes et.al. 1996). This research is in line with the findings of these studies.

6.1.3. Organizational Orientation and Customer Satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is the third dependent variable of this study and it is assessed by computing the managers' perceptions of customer satisfaction with the products and services and with the business unit in general into one scale. Table 6.3. gives the significantly correlated relations between organizational orientation and customer satisfaction.

Table 6.3. Relationships Between Dimensions of Organizational Orientation and Customer Satisfaction

Market Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (+)
Customer Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (+)

Market orientation again outperforms the other organizational orientations in terms of its positive impact on customer satisfaction. Among the dimensions of market orientation, customer orientation has a positive effect on customer satisfaction. The

end objective of market orientation is creating superior customer value. So, it can be concluded that firms that aspire to achieve higher levels of customer satisfaction should implement market orientation with special focus given to customer orientation.

The literature on the effect of market orientation on customer satisfaction is not so much extensive as the literature on the effect of market orientation on performance and employee responses. This somewhat limited research proposed positive linkages between market orientation and customer satisfaction (Jaworski and Kohli 1990; Balakrishnan 1996; Webb, Webster and Kreppa 2000; McNaughton, Osborne and Imrie 2002). This study contributes to the literature with its findings on the linkage between market orientation and customer satisfaction since this is somewhat a less investigated area in market orientation literature. Also most of the studies regarding the impact of market orientation on customer responses came from service sector. The sample of this research is a mixture of firms from not only services sector but also from manufacturing sector. The investigation of the relation between market orientation and customer satisfaction based on such a mixed sample is one of the contributions of this research.

6.1.4. Organizational Innovation and Performance Measures

Organizational innovation is studied in the management and marketing literature because it influences business performance (Deshpande, Farley and Webster 1993). Apart from the direct link between organizational innovation and business performance, innovation is usually taken as a contingency variable for the relationship between market orientation and business performance (Matear et.al.

2002.) The main theme in the study of Matear et.al. (2002) is that market orientation contribute to performance through a dual mechanism in that it contributes both directly and through innovation, with innovation moderating the contribution.

In this thesis, organizational innovation has been assessed as measured by Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) and Deshpande and Farley (1999) and as adapted from Capon, Farley and Hulbert (1988) and Capon, Farley, Hulbert and Lehmann (1992). Table 6.4. gives the significant relations between organizational innovation and performance measures.

Table 6.4. Relationships Between Organizational Innovation and Organizational Performance

Organizational Innovation and Overall Performance (+)
Organizational Innovation and Comparative Performance (+)
Organizational Innovation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Organizational Innovation and Total Perceived Performance (+)

The positive relations between organizational innovation and all performance measures indicate simply that innovative firms do perform better. Being first in marketing products and services in accordance with customers' needs and wants and being first in technology give the firms competitive advantage and help to obtain better performance results. This finding is in line with the study of Deshpande, Farley, and Webster (1993) who found a direct positive link between organizational innovation and business performance.

6.1.5. Organizational Learning and Performance Measures

Organizational learning is the development of new knowledge or insights that have the potential to influence behavior (Huber 1991). The scale to measure organizational learning is developed by the author based on the descriptions adapted from Slater and Narver (1995) and Hurley and Hult (1998). This scale tries to capture organizational learning in three dimensions of information acquisition, information dissemination and shared interpretation. These three dimensions are explained by Slater and Narver (1995). Since organizational learning scale is found to be reliable on the total level, the analyses were conducted again on the total level. The organizational learning scale developed and tested in this research is another contribution of this research.

The literature review reveals that there are studies investigating either the direct link between organizational innovation and business performance (Slater and Narver 1995; Hult, Ferrell and Hurley 2002) or the contingency effect of organizational learning on the relationship between market orientation and business performance (Slater and Narver 1995; Liu et.al. 2003). Table 6.5. gives the significant relations between organizational learning and performance measures.

Table 6.5. Relationships Between Organizational Learning and Organizational Performance

Organizational Learning and Overall Performance (+)
Organizational Learning and Comparative Performance (+)
Organizational Learning and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Organizational Learning and Total Perceived Performance (+)

The positive effect of organizational learning on all performance measures indicate that firms that have the capability to acquire, disseminate and interpret information about their environment including both their customers, competitors and about all the related parties and processes of concern can obtain better performance results. This finding parallels the findings obtained by Hult, Ferrell and Hurley (2002).

6.1.6. Market Related Factors and Performance Measures

Market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth are the investigated market related factors in this study. These factors are highly studied in the literature with respect to their moderating effects on the relationship between market orientation and business performance.

In this research, market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence is assessed by the measures of Jaworski and Kohli (1993) and market growth is assessed by the measure of Avlonitis and Gournaris (1999). Table 6.6. gives the significant correlations between market related factors and organizational performance dimensions.

Table 6.6. Relationships Between Market Related Factors and Organizational Performance

Market Growth and Overall Performance (+)
Market Growth and Comparative Performance (+)
Market Growth and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Market Growth and Total Perceived Performance (+)

No direct link is found between market turbulence, competitive intensity and technological turbulence and performance measures. Market growth is the only

market related factors that has a positive impact on the performance measures. It can be concluded that firms that operate in growing markets may achieve better performance results. Growing markets put pressure on the organizations to satisfy the preferences of the customers and to cope with the changes related to environmental and competition-related factors. Organizations that have the ability to take the necessary actions backed by this market pressure outperform their counterparts.

6.1.7. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator Between Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

Table 6.7. indicates whether organizational innovation has a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational orientation and performance measures.

Table 6.7. Moderating Effects of Organizational Innovation on Organizational Orientation and Performance Relationships

Product Orientation and Overall Performance
Market Orientation and Comparative Performance
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives

Product orientation requires innovative skills and methods for producing better and quality products. Organizational innovation in this regard acts as an important factor for establishing the linkage between implementing product orientation and obtaining better performance results.

Organizational innovation becomes an important factor in the relationship between implementing market orientation strategies based on the information acquired about customers and competitors and performance with respect to major competitors. Also

organizational innovation emerges as a contributing factor for the relationships between being competitor oriented and acting in a coordinated effort and performance with regard to meeting objectives. For firms having a market orientation, organizational innovation helps to create superior value for customers and to achieve competitive advantage and thereby performance gets better. The moderating effect of organizational innovation is limited in this scope, however the found moderating effects are in line with the study of Matear et.al. (2002). The relationships between organizational orientation dimensions and performance measures in the low and high organizational innovation groups are presented in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8. Relationships Between Organizational Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Organizational Innovation

Low Organizational Innovation	Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (+)
Low Organizational Innovation	Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Organizational Innovation	Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Organizational Innovation	Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Organizational Innovation	Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Organizational Innovation	Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Organizational Innovation	Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Organizational Innovation	Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Market Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Organizational Innovation	Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)

High Organizational Innovation	Customer Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
High Organizational Innovation	Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance(+)

According to these results, for high organizational innovation firms' dimensions of market orientation and performance measures are more related. In other words, innovative firms are more prone to implementing market orientation strategies, acquiring information about their customers and competitors and acting in a coordinated mode based on this information which result in achieving better performance results. This is in line with the findings of Hurley and Hult (1998) and Yalman (2003) who argue that models of market orientation should focus on innovation as the primary mechanism for responding to markets.

6.1.8. Organizational Learning as a Moderator Between Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

It is found that organizational learning does not moderate the relation between organizational orientation dimensions and performance measures. It can be concluded that organizational learning with its focus on information acquisition, dissemination and shared interpretation does not have significant moderating effect on the relationship between organizational orientation dimensions and performance

measures. This contradicts the findings of Slater and Narver (1995) who indicated that market orientation promotes organizational learning and the organization's ability to learn then enhances performance. In the Turkish setting, organizational learning has a positive impact on the performance and market orientation has a positive impact on performance but the relations between market orientation and performance is not contingent upon organizational learning.

6.1.9. Market-Related Factors as a Moderator Between Organizational Orientation and Organizational Performance

The results with respect to the moderating effects of market related factors are somewhat mixed in the literature. Authors like Jaworski and Kohli (1993); Narver and Slater (1990); Slater and Narver (1994a, 1994b, 2000); Subramanian and Gopalakrishna (2001) found that market related factors do not moderate the relation between market orientation and business performance. However, authors like Greenley (1995a, 1995b), Diamontopolous and Hart (1993); Sin et.al. (2003) found moderating effects of the environmental factors on the relationship between market orientation and performance.

Table 6.9. indicates whether market related factors have a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational orientation and performance measures.

Table 6.9. Moderating Effects of Market Related Factors on Organizational Orientation and Performance Relationships

Market Turbulence
Market Orientation and Overall Performance
Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance
Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance

Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance
Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Competitive Intensity
Production Orientation and Overall Performance
Production Orientation and Comparative Performance
Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Product Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Sales Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Market Growth
Production Orientation and Comparative Performance
Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance

First of all, it should be indicated that one of the market related factors, namely technological turbulence, does not moderate the relations between organizational orientation dimensions and performance measures. The linkages between organizational orientation dimensions and performance measures appear to be robust across contexts characterized by varying levels of technological turbulence as also found and indicated by Jaworski and Kohli (1993). Contrary to the findings of Jaworski and Kohli (1993), market turbulence is found to be a moderating factor for the relation between market orientation and overall performance. Also, market turbulence acts as a moderating variable for the relations between customer orientation and comparative performance and for the relations between competitor orientation and all performance measures. It can be concluded that in turbulent markets, firms should implement especially competitor orientation strategies in order to increase their performance levels.

Competitive intensity does not moderate the relations between market orientation and performance measures as in the study of Kohli and Jaworski (1993). Another contribution of this research is that not only market orientation but also production, product and sales orientations were investigated. It is found that competitive intensity

moderates the relations between production orientation and all performance measures, the relations between product and sales orientations and performance compared to objectives. It can be concluded that the level of competition is an important factor in the relationship between especially implementing production orientation strategies that focus on availability of products and inexpensive prices and achieving performance.

Finally, it is found that market growth moderates the relations between production orientation and comparative performance and total perceived performance. The rate of growth characterizing the market is an important factor in the relationship between implementing production orientation strategies that focus on availability of products and inexpensive prices and achieving performance.

The relationships between organizational orientation dimensions and performance measures in the low and high market turbulence, competitive intensity and market growth groups are stated in Table 6.10, Table 6.11, Table 6.12.

Table 6.10. Relationships Between Organizational Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Turbulence Groups

Low Market Turbulence	Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Low Market Turbulence	Market Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Market Turbulence	Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Customer Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)

Low Market Turbulence	Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Low Market Turbulence	Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Competitor Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Low Market Turbulence	Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance (+)
High Market Turbulence	Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Turbulence	Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Turbulence	Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
High Market Turbulence	Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
High Market Turbulence	Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance(+)

The results of Table 6.10 indicate that for firms in less turbulent markets, dimensions of market orientation and performance measures are more related. Although relations between market orientation and performance hold also in the high turbulent markets, on the average more dimensions of market orientation has a positive impact on performance in the less turbulent markets. The findings with respect to less turbulent markets runs contrary to the conceptualizations of Jaworski and Kohli (1993) who hypothesized that the greater the market turbulence, the stronger the relationship between a market orientation and business performance. In the low turbulent

markets, customer orientation and competitor orientation become the prevailing strategies of market orientation leading to higher levels of performance and in the high turbulent markets, interfunctional coordination, that is acting coordinatively based on the competitor and customer information, becomes the prevailing strategy of market orientation.

Table 6.11. Relationships Between Organizational Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Competitive Intensity Groups

Low Competitive Intensity	Sales Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Low Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Customer Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Low Competitive Intensity	Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives
Low Competitive Intensity	Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Sales Orientation and Overall Performance (+)
High Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)

High Competitive Intensity	Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance(+)

It seems that in the less competitive markets, customer orientation and interfunctional coordination becomes the prevailing strategies of market orientation for achieving higher levels of performance and in the high competitive markets customer and competitor orientation become the prevailing strategy of market orientation for achieving higher levels of performance. The relations between market orientation and performance measures found in the low competitive intensity markets runs contrary to the conceptualizations of Jaworski and Kohli (1993).

Table 6.12. Relationships Between Organizational Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Growth Groups

Low Market Growth	Production Orientation and Comparative Performance (-)
Low Market Growth	Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Low Market Growth	Production Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (-)
High Market Growth	Production Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
High Market Growth	Market Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Market Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)

High Market Growth	Market Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Growth	Market Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Customer Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Customer Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Customer Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Growth	Customer Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Competitor Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Competitor Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Growth	Competitor Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Interfunctional Coordination and Overall Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Interfunctional Coordination and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Interfunctional Coordination and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Growth	Interfunctional Coordination and Total Perceived Performance(+)

Markets where rate of growth is low showed more relations between production orientation and performance measures. Markets where rate of growth is high showed more relations between market orientation dimensions and performance measures. It can be concluded that in highly growing, dynamic markets, market orientation is the appropriate orientation to develop in order to obtain higher levels of performance. This finding parallels the results obtained by Avlonitis and Gounaris (1999).

6.1.10. Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

Strategic orientation refers to the usage of strategy by an organization to adapt and change aspects of the environment for a more favorable alignment (Manu and Sriram 1996). Strategic orientation in this research is assessed as proposed by Venkatraman

(1989) and measured by Morgan and Strong (1998). Aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness are the six dimensions of strategic orientation. Table 6.13. gives the tested relationships between strategic orientation dimensions and business performance which are found statistically significant.

Table 6.13. Relationships Between Dimensions of Strategic Orientation and Performance Measures

Aggressiveness and Comparative Performance (-)
Aggressiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Aggressiveness and Total Perceived Performance (-)
Analysis and Comparative Performance (+)
Analysis and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Analysis and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Defensiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Futurity and Comparative Performance (+)
Futurity and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Futurity and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Proactiveness and Overall Performance (+)
Proactiveness and Comparative Performance (+)
Proactiveness and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Proactiveness and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Riskiness and Comparative Performance (+)
Riskiness and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Riskiness and Total Perceived Performance (+)

Negative relations are found between aggressive orientation and performance measures. Firms implementing aggressiveness orientation rapidly deploy resources to improve market position. Constantly improving market share and competitive position requires high investment and this, especially, in the short-run may harm the performance measures of the organization.

Positive relations between analysis orientation and performance measures are found. It can be concluded that firms implementing analysis orientation represent an overall

problem-solving approach to strategic decision-making and reflect knowledge building capacity and enable processes for organizational learning and all of these traits lead to higher levels of performance. This finding is in line with the study of Morgan and Strong (2003) who found that firms emphasizing analysis orientation exhibit higher levels of business performance.

Defensiveness is the strategic orientation dimension that has the least number of relations with performance measures. Since defensive firms aim to protect their market position and emphasize cost reduction and efficiency gains, they excel in the performance compared to their stated objectives like customer satisfaction and retention. The characteristics of firms adopting defensiveness strategy, that is high degree of strategy specialization, focus on existing domain defense and expert knowledge leads to high levels of business performance. This finding is in line with the study of Venkatraman (1989) and Morgan and Strong (2003) who found that firms emphasizing defensiveness exhibit higher levels of business performance.

Firms that are positioning themselves in future environmental conditions, that is firms exhibiting a futurity orientation show higher levels of performance with respect to their competitors, higher levels of performance with respect to their stated objectives and higher levels of total perceived performance. Organizational preparedness maintains a role in not only reducing corporate anxiety about competitive futures but also providing a foothold to understanding the pattern, form and extent of potential change in competitive, industry, market and allied influences. In the face of significant environmental change, it has been purported that a long-term vision is a strategic imperative for securing a competitive edge in the

marketplace (Morgan and Strong 2003). This finding is in line with the study of Morgan and Strong (2003) who found that firms emphasizing futurity orientation exhibit higher levels of business performance.

Proactiveness is the strategic orientation dimension that has the highest number of positive relations with all the performance measures. The initiative adopted by firms to continuously search for burgeoning opportunities results in higher levels of performance. This finding is in line with the conceptualizations of Gatignon and Xuereb (1997) and Day and Wensley (1988). According to Gatignon and Xuereb (1997), proactiveness has been associated with competitive superiority due to the step ahead tactics pursued and market leadership characteristics exhibited by firms with this strategic behavior. Also, high performance returns are reported for such firms because of their responsiveness to market signals, access to scarce resources, customer loyalty gained and high commitment to innovative improvements in business (Day and Wensley 1988).

It is found that riskiness orientation has positive relations with comparative performance, performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. It can be concluded that firms implementing constructive risk stimulates entrepreneurship and encourages developing new consumer offerings in response to changing needs and this approach then leads to better performance measures. This finding is in line with the conceptualization of Baird and Thomas (1990), Clark and Montgomery (1996). Risk oriented firms are purported to combine the entrepreneurial skills of constructive risk taking with opportunistic venture seeking. In order to engage in such behavior, the firm must aspire to a mode of generative

learning and develop s sense of exploration within the organization. Only by engendering a flexible spirit of creativity and traditional rule breaking can riskiness provide the firm with potential improvements in business performance (Baird and Thomas 1990).

Morgan and Strong (2003) indicated that there are three notable limitations with respect to research on strategic orientation-performance relationship. First, the vast majority of the studies have adopted a classificatory approach. Second, performance has been considered purely in accounting terms. Third, most studies have tended to investigate firms in mature and stable industries. This study's contribution to the literature is that a comparative approach is adapted, performance is assessed by four scales and the sample utilized consisted of firms operating in highly growing markets. Nearly 85 % of the firms indicated that their markets are growing.

6.1.11. Strategic Orientation and Employee Responses

Table 6.14. presents the statistically significant relations found in this research between strategic orientation dimensions and employee responses.

Table 6.14. Relationships Between Dimensions of Strategic Orientation and Employee Responses

Aggressiveness Orientation and Employee Responses (-)
Aggressiveness Orientation and Organizational Commitment (-)
Aggressiveness Orientation and Esprit de Corps (-)
Analysis Orientation and Employee Responses (+)
Analysis Orientation and Esprit de Corps (+)
Defensiveness Orientation and Esprit de Corps (+)
Futurity Orientation and Employee Responses (+)
Futurity Orientation and Organizational Commitment (+)
Futurity Orientation and Esprit de Corps (+)
Proactiveness Orientation and Employee Responses (+)

Proactiveness Orientation and Organizational Commitment (+)
Proactiveness Orientation and Esprit de Corps (+)
Riskiness Orientation and Employee Responses (+)
Riskiness Orientation and Organizational Commitment (+)
Riskiness Orientation and Esprit de Corps (+)

Too much focus on improving market position found in the aggressiveness orientation may prevent firms from developing organizational commitment, team spirit and thereby favorable employee responses. So, it can be concluded that firms exhibiting aggressiveness strategy may have less favorable employee responses, lower levels of organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

Futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations have positive relations with employee responses, organizational commitment and esprit de corps. It can be concluded that firms that tend to be ready for future environmental situations, firms that proactively search for new opportunities and firms that can take risks to improve their positions all need a binding motivational force to obtain the desired objectives. This binding force results in favorable employee responses and higher levels of organizational commitment and esprit de corps.

It is also found that defensive firms and firms implementing analysis orientation have excelled in developing a team spirit whereas firms implementing analysis orientation also have favorable employee responses.

6.1.12. Strategic Orientation and Customer Satisfaction

Table 6.15. gives the significantly correlated relations between strategic orientation and customer satisfaction.

Table 6.15. Relationships Between Dimensions of Strategic Orientation and Customer Satisfaction

Defensiveness Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (+)
Futurity Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (+)
Proactiveness Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (+)
Riskiness Orientation and Customer Satisfaction (+)

Positive relations were found between defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations and customer satisfaction. It can be concluded that since defensive firms aim to protect their existing position, they have to emphasize customer retention and satisfaction in order not to lose share. This perspective, in turn, leads to higher levels of customer satisfaction. This finding also parallels the results that defensive firms excel in their performance measures with respect to stated objectives of customer retention and satisfaction. Firms that prepare themselves for future positions also have plans for the evolving marketplace and changing customer needs and such a viewpoint leads to higher levels of customer satisfaction. Proactive firms experiment with responses to changing marketplace conditions and they search for new opportunities. It can be concluded that this search for new opportunities and proactively responding to marketplace changes results in customer satisfaction. Another conclusion with respect to Table 6.15 is that firms adopting a riskiness orientation are more inclined to develop new consumer offerings in response to changing needs and this creates customer satisfaction. This finding also parallels the conceptualization of Kohli and Jaworski (1990).

6.1.13. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator Between Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

It is found that organizational innovation does not moderate the relation between strategic orientation dimensions and performance measures. It can be concluded that organizational innovation with its focus on being first to the market and having technological superiority does not have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between strategic orientation dimensions and performance measures. This contradicts the findings of Deshpande et.al. (1993) and Webster (1988) who indicated that orientations focusing on customer leads to successful innovations and higher organizational performance.

6.1.14. Organizational Learning as a Moderator Between Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

Table 6.16. indicates whether organizational learning has a moderating effect on the relationships between strategic orientation and performance measures.

Table 6.16. Moderating Effects of Organizational Learning on Strategic Orientation and Performance Relationships

Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance
Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance

It is found that organizational learning acts as a moderating factor on the relations between aggressiveness orientation and performance compared to objectives, between the proactiveness orientation and comparative and total perceived performance. Firms with a proactive orientation need to look for new market opportunities and this search creates a learning environment in the firm which results

in better performance levels. It can be concluded that organizational learning is an important factor in the relationship between implementing strategies that try to improve the market positions and that proactively search for new market opportunities and performance. The relationships between aggressiveness and proactiveness dimensions and performance measures in the low and high organizational learners groups are stated in Table 6.17.

Table 6.17. Relationships Between Strategic Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Organizational Learners

Low Organizational Learners	Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Organizational Learners	Aggressiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (-)
High Organizational Learners	Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(-)
High Organizational Learners	Aggressiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(-)
High Organizational Learners	Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Organizational Learners	Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Organizational Learners	Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Organizational Learners	Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)

According to these results, for high organizational learners firms, dimensions of strategic orientation and performance measures are more related. In other words, firms with high organizational learning capabilities are more prone to implementing aggressiveness and proactiveness strategic orientations; the first of which result in lower levels of performance and the second of which results in achieving better performance results.

6.1.15. Market-Related Factors as a Moderator Between Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance

Table 6.18. indicates whether market related factors have a moderating effect on the relationships between strategic orientation and performance measures.

Table 6.18. Moderating Effects of Market Related Factors on Strategic Orientation and Performance Relationships

Market Turbulence
Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance
Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance
Competitive Intensity
Aggressiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance
Analysis Orientation and Comparative Performance
Analysis Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Analysis Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance
Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance
Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Technological Turbulence
Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance
Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Market Growth
Defensiveness Orientation and Overall Performance
Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance
Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Futurity Orientation and Overall Performance
Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance
Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance
Riskiness Orientation and Overall Performance
Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance

First of all, it should be indicated that the moderating effects of market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth on the relations

between strategic orientation dimensions and performance runs contrary to the findings of Jaworski and Kohli (1993) especially on the dimensions concentrating on customer and competitors like defensiveness.

It can be concluded that market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth act as important factors in the relationship between implementing strategies about protecting the firm's market position and performance measures. Competitive intensity seems to be a moderating factor for all the six strategic orientation dimensions, therefore it can be concluded that levels of competition determines the relations between strategic orientation and performance.

Rate of market growth becomes an important factor for the relation between implementing strategies about positioning in future environmental situations and about strategies on taking constructive risk and performance measures. This finding is in line with the conceptualization of Avlonitis and Gournaris (1999).

The relationships between strategic orientation dimensions and performance measures in the low and high market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth groups are stated in Table 6.19, Table 6.20, Table 6.21, and Table 6.22.

Table 6.19. Relationships Between Strategic Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Turbulence Groups

Low Market Turbulence	Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Low Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance(+)

Low Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
Low Market Turbulence	Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
Low Market Turbulence	Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Turbulence	Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
High Market Turbulence	Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives
High Market Turbulence	Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)

The results of Table 6.19 indicate that proactiveness and riskiness have positive impact on performance measures in the low and high market turbulent environments. When market turbulence is high, that is when customer preferences change rapidly, being proactive for new customer opportunities and taking risks for developing new consumer offerings leads to higher levels of performance. Conversely, when market turbulence is low, being proactive and risk-taker can help firms to be one step ahead of the competition and thereby leads to better performance results.

Table 6.20. Relationships Between Strategic Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Competitive Intensity Groups

Low Competitive Intensity	Aggressiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (-)
Low Competitive Intensity	Aggressiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Low Competitive Intensity	Aggressiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (-)
Low Competitive Intensity	Analysis Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Analysis Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Analysis Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Proactiveness Orientation and Total

	Perceived Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Competitive Intensity	Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)

It seems that there are more significant relations between strategic orientation dimensions and performance measures in the low competitive markets. Due to lack of competitive intensity, every strategic orientation dimension except for aggressiveness orientation leads to better performance results. However, aggressiveness orientation leads to lower levels of performance in the low competitive environments. Since level of competition is not high, the aim to achieve better market positions in the lack of significant competitors may sometimes be a waste of resources and thereby this orientation may create lower levels of performance. When the level of competition is high, firms that are proactive in responding to both their competitors and customers and firms that take constructive risks to cope with changes may outperform their major competitors and this result in better performance results especially in better comparative performance levels.

Table 6.21. Relationships Between Strategic Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Technological Turbulence Groups

High Technological Turbulence	Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Technological Turbulence	Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
High Technological Turbulence	Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)

It can be concluded that in environments where technology is changing rapidly, firms that are implementing strategies to protect their market positions may obtain better

performance levels. Firms that work with technologies that are undergoing rapid change may be able to obtain a competitive advantage through technological innovation and thereby it may be enough to defend their current market position to obtain satisfying performance results. This conceptualization is in line with that of Jaworski and Kohli (1993).

Table 6.22. Relationships Between Strategic Orientation Dimensions and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Growth Groups

Low Market Growth	Defensiveness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Market Growth	Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Market Growth	Defensiveness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Market Growth	Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Market Growth	Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Market Growth	Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
Low Market Growth	Riskiness Orientation and Overall Performance(+)
Low Market Growth	Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Market Growth	Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
Low Market Growth	Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Defensiveness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Growth	Futurity Orientation and Overall Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Futurity Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Futurity Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Growth	Futurity Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Market Growth	Riskiness Orientation and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Riskiness Orientation and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Market Growth	Riskiness Orientation and Total Perceived Performance(+)

Markets where rate of growth is low showed more relations between defensiveness orientation and performance measures. In markets experiencing low rates of growth, implementing defensiveness strategy with the emphasis on the protection of the current market position may result in better performance measures. Futurity and riskiness orientations seem to have a positive impact on performance measures for both low and high growing markets. In somewhat stable markets, being prepared for future environmental positions and being a risk-taker for new opportunities may strengthen the position of the organizations and thereby leads to better performance results. In growing markets, these strategies may help the organizations to beat their competitors and again by strengthening the current position leads to better performance.

6.1.16. Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance

Organizational culture is defined by Deshpande and Webster (1989, p.4) as 'the pattern of shared values and beliefs that help members of an organization understand why things happen and thus teach them the behavioral norms in the organization.' Organizational culture was measured by the scales used by Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) and Deshpande and Farley (1999) which are adapted from Quinn (1988) and Cameron and Freeman (1991). There are four main types of organizational culture that are market, adhocracy, hierarchy and clan culture types. Table 6.23. gives the tested relationships between organizational culture types and business performance which are found statistically significant.

Table 6.23. Relationships Between Organizational Culture Types and Performance Measures

Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Adhocracy Culture and Overall Performance (+)
Adhocracy Culture and Comparative Performance (+)
Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (-)
Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance (-)

It is found that there is a positive relation between market culture and performance compared to objectives. A market culture emphasizes competitiveness, goal achievement planning, performance and efficiency. These goals are related to customer satisfaction and loyalty most of the time. It can be concluded that the emphasis on goal achievement which is a characteristics of a market culture leads higher levels of performance with regard to firm's stated objectives that are customer satisfaction, retention and product quality. This finding is in line with the study of Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) and Deshpande and Farley (1999).

Adhocracy culture shows the most number of relations among the four culture types with performance. It has a positive relation with all the performance measures. The adhocracy culture combines informal governance with an external orientation. This culture emphasizes entrepreneurship, creativity and adaptability. Finding new markets and new directions for growth are important here. It can be concluded that the external orientation and entrepreneurial orientation in adhocracy cultures help to achieve better performance results.

There is a negative correlation between hierarchy cultures and performance levels. It may be concluded that a hierarchical culture with its emphasis on predictability and smooth operations within a bureaucratic organization, contribute relatively unsatisfactorily to business performance. Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) found that business performance is ranked from highest to lowest according to type of organizational culture as follows: Best performances will be seen in market, adhocracy and clan cultures respectively and worst performance will be seen in hierarchical cultures. In this study, market culture type showed better performance with respect to stated objectives, but it does not relate positively to the other performance measures. This is somewhat in contradiction with the findings of Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993). With respect to the findings regarding adhocracy cultures and hierarchy cultures, parallelism is found with Deshpande, Farley and Webster's (1993) study. Deshpande and Farley (1999) found that adhocracy cultures are more important predictors of good performance for Indian firms and this exactly suits the situation in Turkey.

6.1.17. Organizational Culture Types and Employee Responses

Table 6.24. presents the statistically significant relations found in this research between organizational culture types and employee responses.

Table 6.24. Relationships Between Organizational Culture Types and Employee Responses

Adhocracy Culture and Employee Responses (+)
Adhocracy Culture and Organizational Commitment (+)
Adhocracy Culture and Esprit de Corps (+)
Hierarchy Culture and Employee Responses (-)
Hierarchy Culture and Organizational Commitment (-)
Hierarchy Culture and Esprit de Corps (-)

It is found that adhocracy cultures have positive relations and hierarchy cultures have negative relations with all employee responses. The focus on innovation, entrepreneurship and risk-taking seen in adhocracy cultures may require that all organization members should direct their focus on these key points and they should all work together as an organization toward the achievement of innovation or new opportunities. This orientation binds individuals in the organization toward the achievement of the stated objectives and thereby organizational commitment and esprit de corps is created in the organization. Taken together, more favorable employee responses are found in adhocracy cultures.

Hierarchy cultures are defined by their bureaucratic structures. They emphasize order and stability, and rules and procedures become important in these cultures. This inner orientation may lead to less favorable employee responses, lower levels of organizational commitment and esprit de corps. This finding also parallels the study of Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) who stated that hierarchy cultures are the worst type of culture in terms of performance and employee responses levels. The relations found between organizational culture types and employee responses resembles the findings of Sheridan (1992) who also found that variation in cultural values had a significant effect on employee retention rates.

6.1.18. Organizational Culture Types and Customer Satisfaction

Table 6.25. gives the significantly correlated relations between organizational culture types and customer satisfaction.

Table 6.25. Relationships Between Organizational Culture Types and Customer Satisfaction

Adhocracy Culture and Customer Satisfaction (+)
Hierarchy Culture and Customer Satisfaction (-)

Parallel to the findings related to business performance and employee responses, adhocracy culture is found to have a positive relation with customer satisfaction, whereas hierarchy culture is found to have a negative relation with customer satisfaction. Since adhocracy cultures emphasize innovation, entrepreneurship and risk-taking, firms with these cultures may be better in terms of responding to changing customer needs and therefore it can be concluded that adhocracy cultures lead to higher levels of customer satisfaction. The inner orientation and emphasis on order and stability found in hierarchical cultures may prevent these firms from meeting the changing needs of their markets. This, in turn, leads to lower levels of customer satisfaction.

6.1.19. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator Between Organizational Culture Types and Organizational Performance

Table 6.26. indicates whether organizational innovation has a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational culture types and performance measures.

Table 6.26. Moderating Effects of Organizational Innovation on Organizational Culture Types and Performance Relationships

Clan Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives

Clan cultures are internally oriented and they emphasize cohesiveness, participation and teamwork. It is also found that there are no significant correlations between clan

cultures and performance measures. Organizational innovation in this regard acts as an important factor for establishing the linkage between having a clan culture and obtaining better performance results with respect to established objectives. The moderating effect of organizational innovation is limited in this scope, however the found moderating effects are in line with the conceptualization of Barney (1986). The relationships between organizational culture types and performance measures in the low and high organizational innovation groups are stated in Table 6.27.

Table 6.27. Relationships Between Organizational Culture Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Organizational Innovation

Low Organizational Innovation	Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
High Organizational Innovation	Adhocracy Culture and Comparative Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
High Organizational Innovation	Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance(+)

According to these results, for high organizational innovation firms, adhocracy culture and dimensions of performance measures are more related. In other words, innovative firms are more prone to adopting adhocracy culture with its emphasis on entrepreneurship and creativity which result in achieving better performance results. This is in line with the findings of Hurley and Hult (1998) and Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993).

6.1.20. Organizational Learning as a Moderator Between Organizational Culture Types and Organizational Performance

Table 6.28. indicates whether organizational learning has a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational culture types and performance measures.

Table 6.28. Moderating Effects of Organizational Learning on Organizational Culture Types and Performance Relationships

Market Culture and Overall Performance
Market Culture and Comparative Performance
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance

It is found that organizational learning acts as a moderating factor on the relations between market culture and all performance measures. It can be concluded that organizational learning is an important factor in the relationship between adopting market cultures with their emphasis on competitiveness, efficiency and goal achievement and performance. The requirements of market culture create a learning orientation and this in turn affect performance positively. The relationships between organizational culture types and performance measures in the low and high organizational learners groups are stated in Table 6.29.

Table 6.29. Relationships Between Organizational Culture Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Organizational Learners

High Organizational Learners	Market Culture and Overall Performance(+)
High Organizational Learners	Market Culture and Comparative Performance (+)
High Organizational Learners	Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Organizational Learners	Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance(+)

High Organizational Learners	Adhocracy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives(+)
High Organizational Learners	Adhocracy Culture and Total Perceived Performance(+)
High Organizational Learners	Hierarchy Culture and Comparative Performance (-)
High Organizational Learners	Hierarchy Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives(-)
High Organizational Learners	Hierarchy Culture and Total Perceived Performance(-)

According to these results, for high organizational learner firms, organizational culture types and performance measures are more related. In other words, firms with high organizational learning capabilities are more prone to implementing market and adhocracy cultures. The common points of these two cultures are their outward orientations and this orientation requires high learning capabilities. Also, in the high organizational learner group, negative relations are found between hierarchy culture and performance measures resembling the results obtained in the total sample.

6.1.21. Market-Related Factors as a Moderator Between Organizational Culture Types and Organizational Performance

Table 6.30. indicates whether market related factors have a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational culture types and performance measures.

Table 6.30. Moderating Effects of Market Related Factors on Organizational Culture Types and Performance Relationships

Competitive Intensity
Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives
Market Growth
Market Culture and Overall Performance
Market Culture and Comparative Performance
Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance

First of all, it should be indicated that no moderating effects of market turbulence and technological turbulence on the relations between organizational culture types and performance is found. This finding parallels the conceptualization of Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) who argue that the relation between organizational culture types and performance holds regardless of environmental complexity. However, the moderating effects of competitive intensity and market growth contradict the views of Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993).

It can be concluded that competitive intensity is an important factor for the relation between adopting market cultures with their emphasis on competitiveness, efficiency and goal achievement and performance compared to stated objectives. Also the rate of market growth acts as an important factor for the relations between market cultures emphasizing market superiority and performance measures. The relationships between organizational culture types and performance measures in the low and high competitive intensity and market growth groups are stated in Table 6.31 and Table 6.32.

Table 6.31. Relationships Between Organizational Culture Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Competitive Intensity Groups

Low Competitive Intensity	Market Culture and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Low Competitive Intensity	Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (+)

It seems that there are more significant relations between market culture and performance measures in the low competitive markets. Market culture with its

emphasis on market superiority and competitiveness is a more important determinant of performance under low levels of competition. This finding contradicts the conceptualization of Jaworski and Kohli (1993) who expected that market orientation is a more important determinant of performance under conditions of high competitive intensity.

Table 6.32. Relationships Between Organizational Culture Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Growth Groups

High Market Growth	Market Culture and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Market Culture and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
High Market Growth	Market Culture and Total Perceived Performance (+)

Market culture is more related to performance dimensions in the high market growth group. Growing markets are more challenging than stable markets. They provide both risks and opportunities for the firm. Organizations who have a culture emphasizing market superiority and competitiveness may obtain better performance results especially in growing markets by outperforming their competitors.

6.1.22. Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

Organizational capabilities are 'complex bundles of skills and collective learning, exercised through organizational processes, that ensure superior coordination of functional activities' (Day, 1994, p.38). There are three main categories of organizational capabilities that are outside-in capabilities, inside-out capabilities and spanning capabilities. The scale to measure organizational capabilities is developed by the author with the descriptions adopted from Day (1994). Table 6.33. gives the

tested relationships between organizational capabilities and business performance which are found statistically significant.

Table 6.33. Relationships Between Organizational Capabilities and Performance Measures

Outside-in Capabilities and Overall Performance (+)
Outside-in Capabilities and Comparative Performance (+)
Outside-in Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Outside-in Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Inside-out Capabilities and Overall Performance (+)
Inside-out Capabilities and Comparative Performance (+)
Inside-out Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Inside-out Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (+)

It is found that there are significant positive relations between outside-in and inside-out capabilities and all performance measures. There are also significant positive relations between spanning capabilities and performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance. Outside-in capabilities enable the business to compete by anticipating market requirements ahead of competitors, and creating durable relations with customers, channel members and suppliers. So, it can be concluded that higher levels of such capabilities lead to higher levels of performance. Inside-out capabilities are activated by market requirements, competitive challenges and external opportunities and firms that excel at these capabilities achieve higher performance levels since they overcome the competitive challenges and get use of the external opportunities. Spanning capabilities are exercised through the sequences of activities that comprise the processes used to satisfy the anticipated needs of customers identified by the outside-in capabilities and meet the commitments that have been made to enhance relationships. So, it can be concluded that firms excelling

at spanning capabilities perform better both at the total level and with regard to the organization's stated objectives. The findings with regard to the positive relations between outside-in and spanning capabilities and performance measures resembles the findings of Vorhies, Harker and Rao (1999) who found that market-driven firms having higher levels of market research, product development, pricing, distribution, promotion and marketing management capabilities outperform the other firms in terms of various performance measures like growth and profitability.

6.1.23. Organizational Capabilities and Employee Responses

Table 6.34. presents the statistically significant relations found in this research between organizational capabilities and employee responses.

Table 6.34. Relationships Between Organizational Capabilities and Employee Responses

Outside-in Capabilities and Employee Responses (+)
Outside-in Capabilities and Organizational Commitment (+)
Outside-in Capabilities and Esprit de Corps (+)
Inside-out Capabilities and Employee Responses (+)
Inside-out Capabilities and Organizational Commitment (+)
Inside-out Capabilities and Esprit de Corps (+)
Spanning Capabilities and Employee Responses (+)
Spanning Capabilities and Organizational Commitment (+)
Spanning Capabilities and Esprit de Corps (+)

There are positive significant relations between all three types of organizational capabilities and all employee responses. It is concluded that as firms excel in the capabilities that enable them to compete by anticipating market requirements, to meet challenges and external opportunities, to satisfy needs of customers, their employees become attached to the organization, team spirit prevails and employee responses become more favorable.

6.1.24. Organizational Capabilities and Customer Satisfaction

Table 6.35. gives the significantly correlated relations between organizational capabilities and customer satisfaction.

Table 6.35. Relationships Between Organizational Capabilities and Customer Satisfaction

Inside-out Capabilities and Customer Satisfaction (+)

There is a significant correlation between inside-out capabilities and customer satisfaction. It can be concluded that when firms excel in capabilities that are activated by market requirements, competitive challenges and external opportunities, they achieve higher levels of customer satisfaction. The absence of a relation between outside-in and spanning capabilities and customer satisfaction in this research contradicts the findings of Vorhies, Harker and Rao (1999) who found that market-driven firms excelling in outside-in and spanning capabilities achieve higher levels of customer satisfaction. Environmental differences and organizational culture differences between the samples and settings may lie behind these different findings.

6.1.25. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator Between Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

It is found that organizational innovation does not moderate the relation between organizational capabilities and performance measures. Although there are significant and positive relations between outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities and performance measures, it is concluded that organizational innovation does not contribute to this linkage. This finding is in line with the findings of Grewal and

Tansuhaj (2001) who indicated that capabilities related with market orientation (mainly outside-in capabilities in this research) lead to better performance levels especially during economic crises times since an economic crises shifts competition away from innovation and toward other market factors and market-oriented capabilities comes in handy here.

6.1.26. Organizational Learning as a Moderator Between Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

It is found that like organizational innovation, organizational learning does not moderate the relation between organizational capabilities and performance measures. Although there are significant and positive relations between outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities and performance measures, it is concluded that organizational learning also does not contribute to this linkage. This finding contradicts the conceptualization made by Slater and Narver (1995). Slater and Narver (1995) asserted that an organization has a foundation for sustained competitive advantage when it possesses skills and resources that provide superior value to customers and organizational learning is valuable to firm in this context because it focuses on understanding and effectively satisfying their needs through new products.

6.1.27. Market-Related Factors as a Moderator Between Organizational Capabilities and Organizational Performance

Table 6.36. indicates whether market related factors have a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational capabilities and performance measures.

Table 6.36. Moderating Effects of Market Related Factors on Organizational Capabilities and Performance Relationships

Technological Turbulence
Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance
Market Growth
Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance
Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance

First of all, it should be indicated that no moderating effects of market turbulence and competitive intensity on the relations between organizational capabilities and performance is found. This finding, especially the absence of moderating effects of market turbulence and competitive intensity on the relations between outside-in capabilities and performance runs contrary to the conceptualizations made by Grewal and Tansuhaj (2001) who claimed the moderating effects of market turbulence and competitive intensity exists for the relationship between market orientation capabilities and performance. However, it should also be noted that the findings with respect to technological turbulence and market growth parallels Grewal and Tansuhaj's study (2001).

It can be concluded that technological turbulence is an important factor for the relation between excelling in spanning capabilities that are aimed at satisfying the anticipated needs of customers and performance. Therefore, technological turbulence contributes to the relation between spanning capabilities and performance. Also the rate of market growth acts as an important factor for the relations between spanning capabilities emphasizing customer satisfaction and service and performance measures. It is concluded that in growing markets where there is a battle between the firms to capture the satisfying market shares, the relation between excelling in

spanning capabilities that includes the processes used to satisfy the anticipated needs of customers identified by the outside-in capabilities and meet the commitments that have been made to enhance relationships and performance measures becomes important. The relationships between organizational capabilities and performance measures in the low and high technological turbulence and market growth groups are stated in Table 6.37 and Table 6.38.

Table 6.37. Relationships Between Organizational Capabilities and Performance Measures for Low and High Technological Turbulence Groups

Low Technological Turbulence	Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Low Technological Turbulence	Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (+)
High Technological Turbulence	Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)

In low technological turbulent markets, spanning capabilities have more relations with performance dimensions. It can be concluded that in low technologically turbulent environments, spanning capabilities that aim to satisfy the anticipated needs of customers become important and firms excelling at this capability obtain better performance results.

The relation between spanning capabilities and performance in high technologically turbulent markets resembles the conceptualization of Jawroski and Kohli (1993). According to Jaworski and Kohli (1993), the positive relation between firm performance and market orientation and thereby market orientation capabilities weaken as technological uncertainty increases. Outside-in capabilities are the representative of market orientation capabilities. When there is technological

turbulence in the market, firms reliance on outside-in capabilities lose importance, however it can be concluded that at these circumstances, spanning capabilities gain importance.

Table 6.38. Relationships Between Organizational Capabilities and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Growth Groups

High Market Growth	Spanning Capabilities and Comparative Performance (+)
High Market Growth	Spanning Capabilities and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
High Market Growth	Spanning Capabilities and Total Perceived Performance (+)

Spanning capabilities are more related to performance dimensions in the high market growth group. Growing markets, being more challenging than stable markets, provide both risks and opportunities for the firm. Organizations who excel in capabilities that satisfy the anticipated needs of customers identified by the outside-in capabilities and meet the commitments that have been made to enhance relationships may obtain better performance results especially in growing markets by outperforming their competitors.

6.1.28. Organizational Form and Organizational Performance

Organizational form is defined by Romanelli (1991, p.81-82) as ‘the characteristics of an organization that identify it as a distinct entity and at the same time classify it as a member of a group of similar organizations.’ Organizational form was measured by the scales developed by author with the adaptations made from Webster (1992) and Srivastava, Shervani and Fahey (1999). There are four main types of organizational forms that are hierarchical, transactional, relational and network

forms. Table 6.39. gives the tested relationships between organizational form types and business performance which are found statistically significant.

Table 6.39. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Performance Measures

Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (-)
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (-)
Relational Form and Comparative Performance (+)
Relational Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)
Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (+)
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (+)

There is a negative correlation between hierarchical form and performance. Hierarchical forms emphasize more administrative and bureaucratic control and they also emphasize less market control in the pursuit of economic efficiency and thereby because of their inward lookingness and lack of flexibility, these forms result in less satisfactory performance levels. On the contrary, relational form and network form are organizational forms that emphasize market control, multiple and long-term relations with various partners. These forms have flexibility in responding to market and customer requirements and can achieve better performance results. These findings parallel the conceptualizations made by Webster (1992) and Murray (2001).

6.1.29. Organizational Form Types and Employee Responses

Table 6.40. presents the statistically significant relations found in this research between organizational form types and employee responses.

Table 6.40. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Employee Responses

Hierarchical Form and Employee Responses (-)
Hierarchical Form and Organizational Commitment (-)
Transactional Form and Organizational Commitment (-)
Relational Form and Employee Responses (+)
Relational Form and Organizational Commitment (+)
Relational Form and Esprit de Corps (+)
Network Form and Employee Responses (+)
Network Form and Organizational Commitment (+)
Network Form and Esprit de Corps (+)

Negative relations between hierarchical and transactional form and performance is found together with positive relations between relational and network forms and performance. Hierarchical forms are defined by their bureaucratic structures. This bureaucratic structure and inner orientation found in hierarchical forms may lead to less favorable employee responses and lower levels of organizational commitment. Transactional forms represent the organizations that rely on one-time, arm's length relationships in their operations and this lack of continuity in relations may lower organizational commitment. Relational forms and network forms, on the other hand, emphasize durable, stronger partnerships and greater interdependence. This binding environment results in higher organizational commitment and esprit de corps and more favorable employee responses. These findings suit the conceptualizations made by Webster (1992).

6.1.30. Organizational Form Types and Customer Satisfaction

There are no significant relations found between organizational form types and customer satisfaction. None of the organizational forms (hierarchical, transactional, relational, network) by themselves have an effect on customer satisfaction. The absence of relation between relational and network forms and customer satisfaction

runs contrary to the conceptualizations of Webster 1992) who indicated that relational forms and especially networks respond quickly and flexibly to accelerating change in customer preferences and thereby they increase customer satisfaction. The environmental conditions and differences between the settings the researches are conducted may explain these contradictory findings. In this regard, future research can take organizational form as a moderating variable.

6.1.31. Organizational Innovation as a Moderator Between Organizational Form Types and Organizational Performance

Table 6.41. indicates whether organizational innovation has a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational form types and performance measures.

Table 6.41. Moderating Effects of Organizational Innovation on Organizational Form Types and Performance Relationships

Relational Form and Overall Performance

It is found that organizational innovation moderates the relation between relational form and overall performance. Relational forms are flexible organizational forms where the relations between customers and suppliers are in the form of partnerships instead of being arm's length relationships. These forms respond to the changing needs of customers more easily than the hierarchical and transactional forms. It can be concluded that organizational innovation acts as an important factor in the relation between having relational forms that emphasize long-term partnerships and overall performance. However, it should also be noted that the moderating effect of organizational innovation is limited. The relationships between organizational form

types and performance measures in the low and high organizational innovation groups are stated in Table 6.42

Table 6.42. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Organizational Innovation

High Organizational Innovation	Relational Form and Comparative Performance(+)
High Organizational Innovation	Relational Form and Total Perceived Performance (+)

According to these results, for high organizational innovation firms, relational form and dimensions of performance measures are more related. In other words, innovative firms are more prone to adopting relational form with its emphasis on long-term relationships with related partners which result in achieving better performance results. This is in line with the conceptualization of Webster (1992).

6.1.32. Organizational Learning as a Moderator Between Organizational Form Types and Organizational Performance

Table 6.43. indicates whether organizational learning has a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational form types and performance measures.

Table 6.43. Moderating Effects of Organizational Learning on Organizational Form Types and Performance Relationships

Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance
Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance

It is found that organizational learning acts as a moderating factor on the relations between hierarchical form and all performance measures. It can be concluded that organizational learning is an important factor in the relationship between adopting hierarchical forms with their emphasis on bureaucratic and administrative control and performance. The relationships between organizational form types and performance measures in the low and high organizational learners groups are stated in Table 6.44.

Table 6.44. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Organizational Learners

High Organizational Learners	Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
------------------------------	--

It is found that for the companies that have high organizational learning capabilities, adopting a hierarchical form results in lower levels of performance compared to objectives. The inflexible and inward-looking characteristics of hierarchical forms may hinder these firms from responding to customer needs and this may have a negative impact on the performance with regard to stated objectives like customer retention and satisfaction. This relation holds especially in the high organizational learner group.

6.1.33. Market-Related Factors as a Moderator Between Organizational Form Types and Organizational Performance

Table 6.45. indicates whether market related factors have a moderating effect on the relationships between organizational form types and performance measures.

Table 6.45. Moderating Effects of Market Related Factors on Organizational Form Types and Performance Relationships

Market Turbulence
Network Form and Comparative Performance
Network Form and Performance Compared to Objectives
Network Form and Total Perceived Performance
Competitive Intensity
Hierarchical Form Overall Performance
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance
Technological Turbulence
Hierarchical Form Overall Performance
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance
Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives
Market Growth
Hierarchical Form Overall Performance
Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance
Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance

It is found that market turbulence moderates the relation between network form and performance measures. Market turbulence -the rate of change in composition of customers and their preferences- is an important factor in the relationship between adopting a network form with its emphasis on flexibility and achieving performance. Competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth have moderating effects on the relation between hierarchical culture and performance measures. It can be concluded that competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth operate as important factors for the relationship between having a hierarchical form with emphasis on bureaucracy and stability and performance. The relationships between organizational form types and performance measures in the low and high market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth groups are stated in Table 6.46, Table 6.47, Table 6.48, and Table 6.49.

Table 6.46. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Turbulence Groups

Low Market Turbulence	Network Form and Comparative Performance (+)
Low Market Turbulence	Network Form and Total Perceived Performance (+)

It seems that there are more significant relations between network form and performance measures in the low market turbulence group. Network form with its emphasis on flexibility is a more important determinant of performance under low levels of market turbulence.

Table 6.47. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Competitive Intensity Groups

Low Competitive Intensity	Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
High Competitive Intensity	Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (-)
High Competitive Intensity	Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (-)
High Competitive Intensity	Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
High Competitive Intensity	Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (-)

Under conditions of high competition, firms require to be more flexible in order to respond rapidly to changing customer needs. However, hierarchical forms lack this flexibility which is an essential requirement for firms operating in highly competitive markets. Therefore, in high competition, adopting hierarchical forms may result in unsatisfactory performance results.

Table 6.48. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Technological Turbulence Groups

Low Technological Turbulence	Transactional Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
High Technological Turbulence	Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (-)
High Technological Turbulence	Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (-)
High Technological Turbulence	Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
High Technological Turbulence	Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (-)

The negative impact of having transactional forms on performance compared to objectives holds for the low technological turbulence group. On the other hand, hierarchical form is more related to performance dimensions in the high technological turbulence group. When there is rapid change of technology, having hierarchical forms with their inflexible structures affects performance measures negatively.

Table 6.49. Relationships Between Organizational Form Types and Performance Measures for Low and High Market Growth Groups

Low Market Growth	Hierarchical Form and Overall Performance (-)
Low Market Growth	Hierarchical Form and Comparative Performance (-)
Low Market Growth	Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)
Low Market Growth	Hierarchical Form and Total Perceived Performance (-)
High Market Growth	Hierarchical Form and Performance Compared to Objectives (-)

Hierarchical form is more related to performance dimensions in the low market growth group. Having hierarchical forms affect performance measures negatively

and this holds true especially in the low market growth group where there is a low rate of market growth. When the market is not growing, it means that firms can have difficulty in finding new customers. The only way is to gain customers from the competitors. This requires flexible systems so that companies can respond effectively to customer need and wants. A hierarchical form lacks these attributes and thereby results in lower levels of performance when operates in markets having low rates of growth.

6.1.34. Conclusions on Model Fit

The fit of the model is tested by multiple regression analyses between various components. The dependent variables tested are overall performance, comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, total perceived performance, employee responses, organizational commitment, esprit de corps, and customer satisfaction. The independent variables used are organizational orientation, strategic orientation, hierarchical form, transactional form, relational form, network form, organizational innovation, organizational learning, market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth.

With respect to the models tested with performance measures taken as the dependent variable, it can be stated that highest percentage of variance explained belongs to the models where performance compared to objectives and total perceived performance is taken as the dependent variables. With respect to the model with performance compared to objectives taken as the dependent variable, the best predictors of performance compared to objectives are strategic orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, competitive intensity, technological turbulence

and market growth. It can be concluded that, in conditions high strategic orientation, high organizational learning and innovation and high market growth, and in conditions of low competitive intensity and technological turbulence, performance compared to objectives increase. The relation between strategic orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, market growth and performance compared to objectives support the correlation results, there is no supporting finding on the negative relationship between competitive intensity, technological turbulence and performance compared to objectives. Since regression is multivariate, this analysis is better.

When the model with total perceived performance as the dependent variable is analyzed in terms of fit, it is seen that the best predictors of total perceived performance are organizational orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, technological turbulence, market growth. Under conditions of high organizational orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning and market growth and under conditions of low technological turbulence, total perceived performance increases. Except for the negative relation between technological turbulence and total perceived performance, all the relations in this model are also supported by the correlation results. Since organizational orientation is a predictor of total perceived performance, to understand which organizational orientation dimension contributes to total perceived performance more, each of the organizational orientation dimensions (production, product, sales and market orientations) are included in the model. This time, the best predictors of total perceived performance become market orientation, organizational innovation, organizational learning, technological turbulence and market growth. It can be

concluded that under conditions of high market orientation, organizational learning, organizational innovation, market growth and under conditions of low technological turbulence, total perceived performance increases. Again, except for the negative relation between technological turbulence and total perceived performance, all the relations in this model are also supported by the correlation results.

When employee responses are taken as the dependent variable, organizational learning, hierarchical form, network form, market turbulence are the best predictors of the dependent variable. It is concluded that under conditions of high organizational learning and low market turbulence and when network form is found to a greater extent and hierarchical form is found to a lesser extent, favorable employee responses are acquired.

Finally, with respect to the model with customer satisfaction as the dependent variable, the best predictors of customer satisfaction has become strategic orientation, organizational innovation and learning, hierarchical form, technological turbulence and competitive intensity. In order to understand which strategic orientation dimensions contribute most to customer satisfaction, aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations are included in the model. This time, the best predictors of customer satisfaction has been proactiveness orientation, organizational learning, competitive intensity and technological turbulence. It is concluded that under conditions of high proactiveness orientation and organizational learning and high technological turbulence and competitive intensity, customer satisfaction increases.

6.2. Implications

This study attempted to analyze various important organizational dimensions like organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities and organizational form and their impact on organizational performance, employee and customer responses. The impact of organizational learning, organizational innovation, and market-related factors (market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, market growth) on the relationship between organizational dimensions and organizational performance is also investigated. All the organizational dimensions are assessed from a marketing point of view in this research.

The findings of the study have important implications for managers and researchers. These implications are discussed with respect to the analyzed variables in the following sections.

6.2.1. Implications for Managers

Every organizational dimension, -organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities and organizational form - and that is the focus of this research affect three major outcomes: organizational performance, employee responses and customer satisfaction. Some of these relationships are moderated by organizational learning, organizational innovation and market-related factors.

Overall, it can be said that when managers want to improve their organization's total perceived performance, they should concentrate on organizational orientation,

organizational innovation, organizational learning, technological turbulence and market growth. Market orientation appears as the dominant form of organizational orientation. It outperforms the other organizational orientations of production, product and sales orientation. Managers should concentrate on customers, competitors and interfunctional coordination if they want to be more market oriented. Managers should know that under conditions of high market orientation, high organizational learning and innovation and when there is high market growth and low technological turbulence, they can achieve higher levels of total perceived performance.

When managers want to get more favorable employee responses, that is when they want to increase organizational commitment of their employees and achieve team spirit in the organization, they should focus on organizational learning, organizational form and market turbulence. If they try to compose network form of organization and stay away from hierarchical form when there is low market turbulence and if they try to improve organizational learning, their employees' responses will be more favorable.

Finally, managers who want to increase customer satisfaction in markets where competitive intensity and technological turbulence are high should apply proactiveness as the main strategic orientation of the organization and should improve organizational learning.

6.2.2.1. Organizational Orientation

Among the four organizational orientations investigated in this study, the one that has the highest positive impact on organizational performance, employee responses and customer satisfaction is market orientation. Therefore, managers should avoid implementing production, product and sales orientation as the prevailing form of organizational orientation and they should work hard to have a market oriented organization. Market orientation, in this sense, refers to the acquisition of information about the buyers and competitors in the target market and disseminating it throughout the business. Based on this customer and competitor information, the business then should show coordinated efforts with the involvement of all departments -not only the marketing department- to create superior value for the customers.

Organizational innovation becomes more important for firms adopting product and market orientation. Managers should be aware of the fact that organizational innovation acts as an important contributor for the relationship between product and market orientation and performance. If managers push their organizations toward being the first to meet and exceed their customers' needs and expectations with superior new products and services, together with implementing market orientation with emphasis on customers, competitors and interfunctional coordination, they can be more successful in terms of the organization's performance results.

Managers should also routinely and carefully analyze their environments. If production orientation is the leading organizational orientation, the level of competition and the rate of market growth should be taken into consideration. When

market orientation is the preferred organizational orientation, change in the preferences of the customers, that is market turbulence appears as the key environmental factor that is needed to be taken into consideration. When firms operate in turbulent markets, the preferences of their customers' change rapidly. Meeting these preferences requires the adoption of market orientation with specific emphasis given to customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination. Among the dimensions of market orientation, managers should show special interest to competitor orientation. By taking into consideration competitors' strategies and by acquiring information about them in turbulent markets, managers can obtain higher levels of performance.

6.2.2.2. Strategic Orientation

Six strategic orientations are investigated in this study for their effects on organizational performance, employee responses and customer satisfaction. Within these six strategic orientation dimensions, only aggressiveness orientation is found to be have a negative impact on organizational performance. In Turkish setting, managers should be cautious with implementing an aggressiveness orientation. Rapidly deploying resources to improve market position in the Turkish market may cause negative results. Proactiveness is the strategic orientation that has the highest positive impact on performance. This signals that managers should always adopt the initiative to continuously search for new opportunities around their organization's surroundings. The other strategic orientations namely, analysis, futurity , riskiness and defensives when implemented correctly can also positively affect performance. So, organizations, depending upon their own structures, can pursue one of or a combination of some of these strategies. This logic is also true when managers think

in terms of their employees. Pursuing an aggressiveness strategy can create unfavorable employee responses. This strategic orientation decreases organizational commitment and prevents the formation of a team spirit in the organization. However, proactiveness, futurity and riskiness orientations all positively affect employee responses. They increase organizational commitment and create esprit de corps. When it comes to the customers, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness orientations should be selected as the prevailing strategic orientation of the organization if customer satisfaction is wanted to be achieved. In a broader context, managers in the Turkish market should follow either one of or a combination of proactiveness, riskiness and futurity orientations and they should stay away from aggressiveness orientation.

Managers should also take organizational learning into consideration. If managers could adopt a learning orientation in the organization, the positive relation between proactiveness orientation and performance will hold more tightly.

When market related factors are analyzed, it is seen that market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth moderates the relations between strategic orientation dimensions and performance. This means that managers should analyze their environments carefully and should select their strategic orientations by taking the environmental conditions into consideration. The level of competition in the market is the major environmental variable that managers should always take into consideration. The rate of market growth is the second major market related factor. When managers adopt especially defensiveness and futurity

orientations, they should also be careful about the level of competition and rate of market growth.

6.2.2.3. Organizational Culture

Four main organizational culture types –market, adhocracy, clan and hierarchy – are investigated in this study. In the Turkish market, firms having an adhocracy culture have positive performance levels whereas firms having a hierarchy culture have negative performance results. Market culture, on the other hand, leads to better performance with respect to the stated objectives of the company.

In the hierarchy cultures, the organizations have an internal orientation and the managers of these organizations emphasize rules, procedures and stability. This inner orientation and focus on smooth operations prevent firms from evaluating new market opportunities. They become inflexible to responding to changing market situations and customer preferences and lose competitive advantage and end up with unsatisfactory performance results. Even if the dominant culture of the organization is hierarchy type, managers should create an environment where also an external orientation also exists. This external orientation balances the dominant internal focus of the hierarchy cultures and prevents firms from missing market opportunities. Market and adhocracy cultures have external orientation. Market cultures emphasize competitiveness and adhocracy cultures emphasize risk-taking and entrepreneurship. Success for organizations in Turkish market lies in the degree of implementing adhocracy or market cultures. Adhocracy cultures also affect employee responses favorably. Both organizational commitment and esprit de corps are increased by having an adhocracy culture in the organization. Hierarchy cultures with emphasis on

bureaucracy, order and rules decrease commitment to the organization, prevent formation of team spirit and thereby create unfavorable employee responses. The effects of adhocracy and hierarchy cultures on customer satisfaction resembles their effects on performance and employee responses. Organizations having hierarchy cultures are not externally oriented and they are inflexible to respond to their markets and customers, thereby they can not satisfy their customers. Organizations having adhocracy cultures emphasize innovation and creativity. These attributes lead to higher levels of customer satisfaction.

Organizational innovation only moderates the relation between clan cultures and performance compared to objectives. The effect of organizational innovation on the relation between organizational culture types and performance is therefore limited. Organizational learning has a moderating effect for the relation between market culture and performance. Organizations where learning is an emphasized trait of the firm are more prone to adopt a market orientation and achieve better performance results. The tendency to acquire, disseminate and give meaning to the information about customers, competitors and markets found in learning organizations fits well with the market orientation because market oriented organizations also collect information about their customers and competitors and act on this information coordinatively. Managers also analyze the level of competition and the rate of market growth in implementing market cultures since these market related factors affect the relation between market culture and performance. In the Turkish setting, companies operating in less competitive markets and companies operating in highly growing markets are more prone to gathering customer and competitor information and acting

upon this information in a coordinated fashion which results in achieving their performance targets.

6.2.2.4. Organizational Capabilities

For an organization, outside-in, inside-out and spanning capabilities are all important since all three affect performance positively. So firms should advance their market sensing, customer linking, channel bonding capabilities as well as their capabilities in financial management, logistics, manufacturing together with capabilities related mainly with customer service, pricing, purchasing and strategy development. The impact of spanning capabilities on performance is contingent upon the level of technological turbulence and the rate of market growth. In low technologically turbulent environments and in high growth markets, spanning capabilities with their focus on customer service becomes the key point and help organizations obtain better performance results. The importance given to these three core set of organizational capabilities will also affect employees positively by increasing their commitment and creating esprit de corps. When organizations advance their capabilities related with financial management, cost control, technology development, manufacturing and human resources management, this excel in these core areas will have a positive reflection on the level of customer satisfaction.

6.2.2.5. Organizational Form

Similar to the findings related with organizational culture, hierarchical form also negatively affects performance of the organization and employee responses. On the other hand relational and network form of organizations with durable, long-term and collaborative relations with multiple partners affect performance and employee

responses favorably. So, in the Turkish setting, if managers stay away from hierarchy forms and compose relational and network form of organizations, they achieve better performance, greater organizational commitment and esprit de corps. When organizations rest on long-term collaborative relations with suppliers, channel members and other related parties, they not only get better performance results but also higher customer satisfaction. Firms with high organizational innovation traits are more prone to adopt relational organizational forms which result in higher performance levels. Another interesting finding in the Turkish setting is that when firms have a learning orientation that is when they routinely acquire and disseminate information about their customers and competitors and when they at the same time have a hierarchical form preventing them from acting proactively responding to this information, they achieve worse performance results. Another set of contingency factors for the relation between hierarchical form and performance is the market related factors, namely competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth. When level of competition is high, technological turbulence is high and rate of market growth is low, having hierarchical forms leads to worse performance results. The relation between network form and performance is contingent upon level of market turbulence. When customers' preferences change slowly, having network type of organizational form causes an organization to achieve better performance.

6.2.2.6. Organizational Innovation, Organizational Learning, and Market-Related Factors

The moderating effects of organizational innovation, organizational learning and market-related factors (market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological

turbulence and market growth) for the relationships between organizational dimensions and organizational performance are discussed so far under each related heading. When the impact of organizational innovation and organizational learning and market-related factors on performance is investigated solely, it is seen that these relationships also have important implications for managers.

First of all, organizational innovation and organizational learning both have positive impact on organizational performance. Managers should be aware that when they create a learning orientation in the organization, they can obtain better performance results. Creation of a learning orientation requires information acquisition, information dissemination and shared interpretation. Information may be acquired from a wide variety of internal and external sources like from the experience of the employees, from common practices like networking, joint ventures, strategic alliances, and from trainings. Effective managers establish multiple internal and external sources of information about their customers, organizations and their environments. This acquired information should be disseminated throughout the organization since information becomes more valuable when it is evaluated in a broader context by the related parties (Slater and Narver 1995). Also, there must be a consensus on the meaning of the information and its implications for the business. Since learning organizations routinely collect, interpret, disseminate and use information about the products, markets, and customers, they can behave more proactively and flexibly upon the changing circumstances and this orientation presents them better performance results.

Organizational innovation also affects performance positively. Managers by using their resources and capabilities effectively, can respond to their customers' changing preferences with new products, services and offerings and with new technologies. By meeting customer needs and exceeding their expectations with value-added new services and products, these organizations achieve better performance results.

Among the market-related factors, only market growth affect performance solely. So, when managers of the firms in growing markets apply the appropriate strategies, they can advance their performance levels.

6.2.2. Implications for Researchers

The scales for market orientation as developed by Narver and Slater (1990), for strategic orientation developed by Venkatraman (1989), for organizational culture types as developed by and used by Quinn (1988), Cameron and Freeman (1991), Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993), for organizational capability as developed by the author with the inputs from Day (1994), for organizational innovation as developed by Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993), for organizational learning as developed by the author with the inputs from Slater and Narver (1995), for market turbulence, competitive intensity and technological turbulence as developed by Jaworski and Kohli, for organizational commitment and esprit de corps as developed by Jaworski and Kohli (1993) are found to be reliable as proven by the Cronbach's alpha values in the Turkish market. Performance is assessed multidimensionally namely by comparative performance, performance compared to objectives, and overall performance. All of these performance scales are proved to be reliable with their Cronbach's alpha values.

There are several areas in need for further research. First of all, performance is assessed with subjective measures. Further research should assess performance with more objective measures like profitability, sales volume, sales growth and market share and compare the results obtained from objective measures with the results obtained from subjective measures. Although the questionnaire included questions about objective levels of performance, for the purposes of this study and for the privacy concerns of the respondents, no descriptive findings related with objective measures of performance are reported and no analyses regarding objective measures of performance are conducted.

Second, this study is a cross-sectional one conducted at one specific period of time. However, most of the variables that are the focus of this study requires a longitudinal perspective. Organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities, organizational form, organizational learning and organizational innovation are all processes rather than being one time activities. Therefore assessing their long-term impact on performance, employee responses and customer satisfaction can give important highlights. Future research should conduct the same study with a longitudinal design in order to capture the long term effects of all of these variables.

Third, in order to strengthen the findings of this study, strategic orientation can be assessed with different scale. Miles and Snow's (1978) scale for strategic orientation can be utilized as an alternative. The findings obtained from the usage of this scale

should be compared with the findings of this study in order to assess the strength of the relationships in the Turkish setting.

Fourth, all of the relations analyzed in this study reflects the point of view of managers. That is, organizational performance, customer satisfaction, level of market orientation, type of strategic orientation, type of organizational culture and organizational form are all assessed as perceived by the managers. Since the perception of customers is more important than the perceptions of managers, these variables can also be analyzed by the inputs of customers. Seeing the similarities and/or differences between the managers and customers perceptions can present important implications for the organizations.

Finally, in order to generalize the findings of this study, further research can conduct cross-cultural and cross-country studies.

6.3. Suggestions for Future Research

Given the objectives of this study, the relations between each of the organizational dimensions of organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities, organizational form and the consequences created by these dimensions, that is organizational performance, employee responses, customer responses are investigated. Another set of analyses incorporated the relationship between organizational innovation, organizational learning, market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence, market growth and organizational performance. Still another set of analyses dealt whether relationships between organizational dimensions (organizational orientation, strategic orientation,

organizational culture, organizational capabilities and organizational form) and organizational performance are moderated by organizational innovation and organizational learning. The final set of analyses investigated whether the relationships between organizational dimensions (organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities and organizational form) and organizational performance are moderated by market related factors, namely by market turbulence, competitive intensity, technological turbulence and market growth.

The conceptual model presented in this research encompasses more than the above mentioned relationships. It is in the scope of future research to detect all of these relationships. First of all, the relationships among the independent variables of the study need to be investigated. Secondly, the relationships between the dependent variables of the study could be detected. Thirdly, the moderating effects of organizational learning, organizational knowledge and market related factors on the relations between organizational dimensions and employee and customer responses need to be assessed. Finally, the impact of moderating variables on the independent variables can be measured by future research.

The differences with respect to the independent, dependent and moderating variables between firms operating in different sectors, industries, or between firms of different sizes need to be captured by future research. Also some of the relationships like the relation between market orientation and customer satisfaction can be analyzed according to the sectors in order to find out which sectors witness more stronger relationships between the variables. Future research can assess the differences

regarding the independent variables and their effect on three of the dependent variables (organizational performance, employee responses and customer satisfaction) simultaneously by conducting multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).

Some qualitative research in the form in-depth interviews with the managers about the main constructs of the study, namely organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities, organizational form, organizational learning, organizational innovation, market related factors, organizational performance, employee responses and customer responses will be beneficiary for future research.

Organizational orientation, strategic orientation, organizational culture, organizational capabilities, organizational form, organizational learning, organizational innovation, market related factors, organizational performance, employee responses and customer responses is assessed by the perceptions of the managers. It will be in the interest of future research to study these constructs from the point of view of the supply chain.

Conducting the same study with a longitudinal design in order to understand the long-term impact of the constructs is another designated area for future research. Finally, assessing performance with objective measures and comparing the results obtained from the study where performance is assessed by objective measures with the study where performance is assessed by subjective measures will be useful for future research.

6.4. Concluding Remark

This study contributes to the literature in terms of its methodology, new moderating variables and the validation of the scales. The findings of this study that parallel the literature are the following: the positive relationships between market orientation and performance, employee responses, customer satisfaction, the positive relationship between organizational innovation and performance, the positive relationship between organizational learning and performance, the moderating effect of organizational innovation on the relationship between organizational orientation dimensions and performance, positive relations between analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness and riskiness strategic orientations and performance, the positive relationship between adhocracy culture and performance, the negative relationship between hierarchy culture and performance, the relations between organizational culture types and employee responses, the tendency of innovative firms to adopt adhocracy cultures, the absence of moderating effects of market and technological turbulence on the relationship between organizational culture types and performance, the relationships between organizational capabilities and performance, the negative relations between hierarchical form and performance, the positive relations between relational form and network form and performance together with employee responses.

The findings of this study that is unparallel to the existing literature are the following: The absence of the moderating effect of organizational learning on the relationship between organizational orientation and performance, the existence of moderating effects of market-related factors on the relationship between organizational orientation and performance (contrary to the findings of Kohli and

Jaworski (1993)), the absence of moderating effects of organizational innovation on the relationship between strategic orientation and performance, the existence of moderating effects of market related factors on the relationship between strategic orientation and performance (contrary to the findings of Kohli and Jaworski (1993)), the limited positive relation between market culture and performance with respect to objectives, the existence of the moderating effects of competitive intensity and market growth on the relationship between organizational culture types and performance (contrary to the findings of Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993)), the absence of a relationship between outside-in and spanning capabilities and customer satisfaction, the absence of the moderating effects of organizational learning on the relationship between organizational capabilities and performance, the absence of the moderating effects of market turbulence and competitive intensity on the relations between outside-in capabilities and performance, the absence of a relation between relational form and network form and customer satisfaction.

As a concluding remark, conceptualization of marketing in an organizational setting is open to new research areas the results of which provide important highlights for organizations, managers, and for researchers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaker, D.A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*. The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Achrol, R.S. (1991), 'Evolution of the Marketing Organization: New Forms for Turbulent Environments,' *Journal of Marketing*, 55 (October), 77-93. '
- Achrol, R.S. and P.Kotler (1999), 'Marketing in the Network Economy,' *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (Special Issue), 146-163.
- Aigen, M. and J. Hage (1968), 'Organizational Independence and Intraorganizational Structure,' *American Sociological Review*, 33, 912-930.
- Aiken, M., S.B.Bacharach and J.L. French (1980), 'Organizational Structure, Work Processes, and Proposal Making in Administrative Bureaucracies,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 631-652.
- Akimova, I. (2000), 'Development of Market Orientation and Competitiveness of Ukrainian Firms,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 34, 9-10, 1128-1148.
- Allaire, Y. and M.E. Firsirotu (1984), 'Theories of Organizational Culture,' *Organizational Studies*, 5, 3, 193-226.

- Allen, R.F. and F.J. Dyer (1980), 'A Tool for Tapping the Organizational Unconscious,' *Personnel Journal*, 59, 192-199.
- Anderson, P.F. (1982), 'Marketing, Strategic Planning and the Theory of the Firm,' *Journal of Marketing*, 46 (Spring), 15-26.
- Andrews, K.R. (1971), *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*. New York, NY: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Ansoff, H.I. and R.Brandenburg (1971), 'A Language for Organizational Design: Parts I and II,' *Management Science*, 350-393.
- Aragon-Correa, J. A. (1998), 'Strategic Proactivity and Firm Approach to the Natural Environment,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 5, 556-567.
- Argyris, C. (1977), 'Double-Loop Learning in Organizations,' *Harvard Business Review*, 55 (September-October), 115-125.
- Argyris, C. (1994), 'Good Communication That Blocks Learning,' *Harvard Business Review*, 72 (July-August), 77-86.
- Argyris, C. and D.A. Schön (1978), *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Atuahene-Gima, K. (1996), 'Market Orientation and Innovation,' *Journal of Business Research*, 35, 93-103.
- Atuahene-Gima, K. and A. Ko (2001), 'An Empirical Investigation of the Effect of Market Orientation and Entrepreneurship Orientation Alignment on Product Innovation,' *Organization Science*, 12, 1, 54-74.
- Au, A.K.M. and A.C.B. Tse (1995), 'The Effect of Marketing Orientation on Company Performance in the Service Sector: A Comparative Study of the Hotel Industry in Hong Kong and New Zealand,' *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 8, 77-87.
- Avlonitis, G.J. and S.P. Gounaris (1997), 'Marketing Orientation and Company Performance,' *Industrial Marketing Management*, 26, 385-402.
- Avlonitis, G.J. and S.P. Gounaris (1999), 'Marketing Orientation and its Determinants: An Empirical Analysis,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 33 (11/12), 1003-1037.
- Baden-Fuller, C. (1995), 'Strategic Innovation, Corporate Entrepreneurship and Matching Outside-in to Inside-out Approaches to Strategy Research,' *British Journal of Management*, 6 (December), S3-S16.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1975), 'Marketing as Exchange,' *Journal of Marketing*, 39 (October), 32-39.

Baird, L.S. and W.Thomas (1990), 'What is Risk Anyway? Using and Measuring risk in Strategic Management,' Bettis, R.A. and Thomas, H. (eds.), *Risk, Strategy and Management*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 21-52.

Balabanis, G.; R.E. Stables and H.C. Phillips (1997), 'Market Orientation in the top 200 British Charity Organizations and its Impact on Their Performance,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 31, 583-603.

Balakrishnan, S. (1996), 'Benefits of Customer and Competitive Orientations in Industrial Markets,' *Industrial Marketing Management*, 25, 257-269.

Baldrige, J.V. and R.A. Burnham (1975), 'Organizational Innovation: Individual, Organizational and Environmental Impacts,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 165-176.

Ballantyne, D. (2004), 'Action-Research Reviewed: A Market-Oriented Approach,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 38, 3-4, 321-337.

Barksdale, H.C. and B. Darden (1971), 'Marketers' Attitude Toward the Marketing Concept,' *Journal of Marketing*, 35 (October), 29-36.

Barney, J.B. (1986), 'Organizational Culture: Can It Be a Source of Sustained Competitive Advantage,' *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 3, 656-665.

- Barney, J. (1991), 'Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage,' *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-120.
- Beck, N. and A. Kieser (2003), 'The Complexity of Rule Systems, Experience and Organizational Learning,' *Organization Studies*, 24 (5), 793-814.
- Bedeian, A.G. (1986), 'Contemporary Challenges in the Study of Organizations,' *Journal of Management*, 12 (Winter), 185-201.
- Beer, M. and R.A. Eisenstat (2004), 'How to Have an Honest Conversation About Your Business Strategy,' *Harvard Business Review*, 82-89.
- Benedetto, C.A.D. and M.Song (2003), 'The Relationship Between Strategic Type and Firm Capabilities in Chinese Firms,' *International Marketing Review*, 20, 5, 514-534.
- Bennett, R. and R. Cooper (1981), 'Beyond the Marketing Concept,' *Business Horizons*, 22 (June), 76-83.
- Bertschek, I. and U. Kaiser (2004), 'Productivity Effects of Organizational Change: Microeconomic Evidence,' *Management Science*, 50, 3, 394-404.
- Bharadwaj, S.G., P.R.Varadarajan and J.Fahl (1993), 'Sustainable Competitive Advantage in Service Industries, A Conceptual Model and Research Propositions,' *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (October), 83-99.

Bigne, J.E., A. Blesa, I. Küster and L. Andreu (2004), 'Market Orientation: An Antecedent to the Industrial Manufacturer's Power,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 38, 1-2, 175-193.

Boer, M.D., F.A.J.V. Bosch and H.W.Volberda (1999), 'Managing Organizational Knowledge Integration in the Emerging Multimedia Complex,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 36, 3, 379-398.

Bonoma, T.V. (1984), 'Making Your Marketing Strategy Work,' *Harvard Business Review*, 62 (March-April), 69-72.

Bonoma, T. (1985), *The Marketing Edge: Making Strategies Work*. Free Press, New York, NY.

Bonoma, T. and B. Clark (1992), *Marketing Performance Assessment*. HBS Press, Boston, MA.

Booz, Allen and Hamilton (1982), *New Products for the 1980s*. New York, NY: Booz, Allen and Hamilton.

Boynton, A.C. and B. Victor (1991), 'Beyond Flexibility: Building and Managing the Dynamically Stable Organization,' *California Management Review* (Fall), 53-66.

Bozeman, B. and K. Coker (1992), 'Assessing the Effectiveness of Technology Transfer from US Government R&D Laboratories: The Impact of Market Orientation,' *Technovation*, 12, 239-255.

Brady, M.K. and C.J. Robertson (2001), 'Searching for a Consensus on the Antecedent role of Service Quality and Satisfaction: An Exploratory Cross-National Study,' *Journal of Business Research*, 51, 1, 53-60.

Brusoni, S. and A. Prencipe (2001), 'Managing Knowledge in Loosely Coupled Networks: Exploring the Links Between Product and Knowledge Dynamics,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 7, 1019-1035.

Burchill, G. and C.H. Fine (1997), 'Time Versus Market Orientation in Product Concept Development: Empirically-Based Theory Generation,' *Management Science*, 43, 4, 465-478.

Burns, T. and G.M. Stalker (1961), *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock Publishing.

Buzzell, R.D., B.T. Gale, and R.M. Sultan (1975), 'Market Share –A Key to Profitability,' *Harvard Business Review*, 53, 1, 97-106.

Cadogan, J.W., C.C. Cui, and E.K.Y. Li (2003), 'Export Market-Oriented Behavior and Export Performance: The Moderating Roles of Competitive Intensity and Technological Turbulence,' *International Marketing Review*, 20, 5, 493-514.

Cadogan, J.W. and A. Diamantopoulos (1995), 'Narver and Slater, Kohli and Jaworski and the Market Orientation Construct: Integration and Internationalization,' *Journal of Strategic Management*, 3, 41-60.

Cadogan, J.W., A. Diamantopoulos and J.A. Siguaw (1998), 'Export Market-Oriented Behaviors, Their Antecedents, Performance Consequences and the Moderating Effect of the Export Environment: Evidence from the UK and US,' in Anderson, P. (Ed), *Marketing Research and Practice, Track2 International Marketing, Proceedings of the 27th EMAC Conference*, Stockholm, 449-452.

Cadogan, J.W., S.Sundqvist, R.T. Salminen and K. Puumalainen (2002), 'Market-Oriented Behavior: Comparing Service With Product Exporters,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1076-1102.

Camelo-Ordaz, C., F. Martin-Alcazar and R. Valle-Cabrera (2003), 'Intangible Resources and Strategic Orientation of Companies: An Analysis in the Spanish Context,' *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 95-103.

Cameron, J.P. and S.J. Freeman (1991), 'Cultural Congruence, Strength and Type: Relationships to Effectiveness,' in *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, vol.5, R.W. Woodman and W.A. Passmore, eds. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Cameron, K.S. and R.E.Quinn (1999), *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Campbell, J.P. (1977), 'On the Nature of Organizational Effectiveness,' in *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, P.S. Goodman and J.M. Pennings, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Campbell, J.P. and S.J. Freeman (1991), 'Cultural Congruence, Strength and Type: Relationships to Effectiveness,' in *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol.5, R.W. Woodman and W.A. Passmore, eds. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Canning, G. (1989), 'Is Your Company Marketing Oriented?' *Journal of Business Strategy*, 8, 34-36.

Capon, N., J.U. Farley and S. Hoening (1990), 'Determinants of Financial Performance,' *Management Science*, 36, 1143-1159.

Capon, N., J.U. Farley and J.M. Hulbert (1988), *Corporate Strategic Planning*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Capon, N., J.U. Farley, J.M. Hulbert and D.R. Lehmann (1992), 'Profiles of Product Innovators Among Large U.S. Manufacturers,' *Management Science*, 38 (February), 157-169.

Carroll, G.R. and M.T. Hannan (2000), *The Demography of Corporations and Industries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cavusgil, S.T. and S.Zou (1994), 'Marketing Strategy-Performance Relationship: An Investigation of the Empirical Link in Export Market Ventures,' *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (January), 479-506.

Cervera, A., A. Molla and M. Sanchez (2001), 'Antecedents and Consequences of Market Orientation in Public Organizations,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 35, 11-12, 1259-1286.

Cespedes, F. (1990), 'The Need for Organizational Change,' in *Organizing to Become Market Driven*, Marketing Science Institute Conference Summary, 13-14 September, Boston, MA.

Chaffee, E. (1985), 'Three Models of Strategy,' *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 89-98.

Chakravarthy, B.S. (1986), 'Measuring Strategic Performance,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 437-458.

Chandler, A.D. (1962), *Strategy and Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chaston, I. B. Badger and E.Sadler-Smith (2000), 'Organizational Learning Style and Competences: A Comparative Investigation of Relationship and Transactionally Orientated Small UK Manufacturing Firms,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 34, 5-6, 625-640.

Chatman, J. (1989), 'Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person-Organization Fit,' *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 333-349.

Chatman, J.A. and K.A.Jehn (1994), 'Assessing the Relationship Between Industry Characteristics and Organizational Culture: How Different Can You Be?' *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 3, 522-553.

Churchill, G.A. and D. Iacobucci (2004), *Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations*. 9th ed. South-Western Educational Publishing.

Cicic, M., P.Patterson and A. Shoham (2002), 'Antecedents of International Performance: A Service Firms' Perspective,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1103-1118.

Clark, B.H. and D.B. Montgomery (1996), 'Competitive Reputations, Multimarket Competition and Entry Deterrence,' *Stanford University Graduate School of Business Research Paper Series*, Research Paper No. 1414, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Cohen, M.D. (1991), 'Individual Learning and Organizational Routine: Emerging Connections,' *Organization Science*, 2 (February), 135-139.

Conant, J.S., M.P.Mokwa and P.R.Varadarajan (1990), 'Strategic Types, Distinctive Marketing Competencies, and Organizational Performance,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 365-383.

- Conduit, J. and F.T. Mavondo (2001) 'How Critical is Internal Customer Orientation to Market Orientation,' *Journal of Business Research*, 51, 11-24.
- Cooke, R.A. and J.C. Lafferty (1989), *Organizational Culture Inventory*. Plymouth, MI: Humar Synergistics.
- Cooke, R. and D. Rousseau (1988), 'Behavioral Norms and Expectations: A Quantitative Approach to the Assessment of Organizational Culture,' *Group and Organizational Studies*, 13, 245-273.
- Corey, E.R. (1978), *Procurement Management: Strategy, Organization and Decision-Making*. Boston: CBI Publishing Co., Inc.
- Cronin, J.J. and T.J. Page (1988), 'An Examination of the Relative Impact of Growth Strategies on Profit Performance,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 22 (1), 57-68.
- Cyert, R.M. and J.G. March (1963), *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Daft, R.L. (1978), 'A dual-Core Model of Organizational Innovation,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 193-210.
- Daft, R.L. (1982), 'Bureaucratic versus Nonbureaucratic Structure and the Process of Innovation and Change,' in S.B. Bacharach (ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 1, 129-166. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Daft, R.L. and G.P. Huber (1987), 'How Organizations Learn: A Communications Framework,' in *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, N. DiTomaso and S. B. Bacharach, eds. Greenwich: CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Daft, R.L. and K.E. Weick (1984), 'Toward a Model of Organizations as Interpretation Systems,' *Academy of Management Review*, 9 (April), 284-295.

Damanpour, F. (1987), 'The Adoption of Technological, Administrative and Ancillary Innovations: Impact of Organizational Factors,' *Journal of Management*, 13, 675-688.

Damanpour, F. (1991), 'Organizational Innovation: A Meta-Analysis of Effects of Determinants and Moderators,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 3, 555-590.

Darroch, J. and R. McNaughton (2003), 'Beyond Market Orientation: Knowledge Management and the Innovativeness of New Zealand Firms,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 3-4, 572-593.

Davenport, T.H. (1993), *Process Innovation: Reengineering Work Through Information Technology*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Davis, S.M. (1984), *Managing Corporate Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.

- Day, G.S. (1990), *Market-Driven Strategy: Processes for Creating Value*. New York: The Free Press.
- Day, G.S. (1991), 'Learning About Markets,' *Marketing Science Institute Report Number 91-117*. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Day, G.S. (1993), *The Capabilities of Market-Driven Organizations*. Marketing Science Institute, Report No: 93-123.
- Day, G.S. (1994), 'The Capabilities of Market-Driven Organizations,' *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (October), 37-52.
- Day, G.S. (1997), 'Aligning the Organization to the Market,' in *Reflections on the Futures of Marketing*, Donald R. Lehmann and Katherine E. Jocz, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 67-96.
- Day, G.S. and D.B. Montgomery (1999), 'Charting New Directions for Marketing,' *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (Special Issue), 3-13.
- Day, G.S. and P. Nedungadi (1994), 'Managerial Representations of Competitive Advantage,' *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (April), 31-44.
- Day, G.S. and R. Wensley (1988), 'Assessing Advantage: A Framework for Diagnosing Competitive Superiority,' *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (April), 1-20.

Deal, T.E. and A.A.Kennedy, (1982), *Corporate Culture*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Deng, S. and J. Dart (1994), 'Measuring Market Orientation: A Multi-Factor, Multi-Item Approach,' *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10, 725-742.

Deng, S. and J. Dart (1999), 'The Market Orientation of Chinese Enterprises During a Time of Transition,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 33, 631-654.

Denison, D.R. (1984), 'Bringing Corporate Culture to the Bottom Line,' *Organization Dynamics*, 13, 2, 4-22.

Denison, D. (1990), *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. Wiley, New York.

Denison, D.R. (1996), 'What is the Difference Between Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate? A Native's Point of View on a Decade of Paradigm Wars,' *Academy Management Review*, 21, 3, 619-654.

Denison, D. (2000), *The Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Denison, D. and A.K. Mishra (1995), 'Toward a Theory of Organizational Culture and Effectiveness,' *Organization Science*, 6, 2, 204-223.

Denison, D. and A.K. Mishra (1998), 'Does Organizational Culture Have an Impact on Quality? A Study of Culture and Quality in 92 Manufacturing Organizations,' *Academy Management Conversion*, San Diego, CA (August).

Denison, D., J.Cho and J.L. Young (2002), 'Diagnosing Organizational Cultures: Validating a Model and Method,' Working Paper, *International Institute for Management Development*, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Denison, D.R., S. Haaland and P. Goelzer (2004), 'Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness: Is Asia Different From the Rest of the World,' *Organization Dynamics*, 33, 1, 98-109.

Dess, G. G. and P.S. Davis (1984), 'Porter's (1980) Generic Strategies as Determinants of Strategic Group Membership and Organizational Performance,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 467-488.

Deshpande, R. (1982), 'The Organizational Context of Market Research Use,' *Journal of Marketing*, 46 (Fall), 91-101.

Deshpande, R. and J.U. Farley (1998), 'Measuring Market Orientation: A Generalization and Synthesis,' *Journal of Market Focused Management*, 2,213-232.

Deshpande, R. and J.U. Farley (1999), 'Corporate Culture and Market Orientation: Comparing Indian and Japanese Firms,' *Journal of International Marketing*, 7 (4), 111-127.

Deshpande, R., J.U. Farley and F.E. Webster (1993), 'Corporate Culture, Customer Orientation and Innovativeness in Japanese Firms: A Quadrad Analysis,' *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (January), 23-37.

Deshpande, R. and A. Parasuraman (1986), 'Linking Corporate Culture to Strategic Planning,' *Business Horizons*, 29 (May-June), 28-37.

Deshpande, R. and F.E. Webster (1989), 'Organizational Culture and Marketing: Defining the Research Agenda,' *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (January), 3-15.

Deshpande, R. and G.R.Zaltman (1982), 'Factors Affecting the Use of Market Research Information: A Path Analysis,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19 (February), 14-31.

Deshpande, R. and G.R.Zaltman (1984), 'A Comparison of Factors Affecting Researcher and Manager Perceptions of Market Research Use,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21 (February), 32-38.

Deshpande, R. and G.R.Zaltman (1987), 'A Comparison of Factors of Affecting Use of Marketing Information in Consumer and Industrial Firms,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24 (February), 114-118.

Dess, G. G. and R.B. Robinson (1984), 'Measuring Organizational Performance in the Absence of Objective Measures: The Case of the Privately-Held Firms and Conglomerate Business Units,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 265-273.

Devlin, G. and M. Bleakley (1988), 'Strategic Alliances –Guidelines for Success,' *Long Range Planning*, 21 (5), 18-23.

Dewar, R.D., and J.E. Dutton (1986), 'The Adoption of Radical and Incremental Innovations: An Empirical Analysis,' *Management Science*, 32, 1422-1433.

Diamantopoulos, A. and S. Hart (1993), 'Linking Market Orientation and Company Performance: Preliminary Evidence on Kohli and Jaworski's Framework,' *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1, 93-121.

Dickinson, R.H., A. Herbst and A. O'Shaughnessy (1986), 'Marketing Concept and Customer Orientation,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 20, 18-23.

Dickson, P.R. (1992), 'Toward a General Theory of Competitive Rationality,' *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (January), 69-83.

Dickson, P.R. and J.J. Giglierano (1986), 'Missing the Boat and Sinking the Boat: A Conceptual Model of Entrepreneurial Risk,' *Journal of Marketing*, 50 (July), 58-70.

Dixon, R. (1990), 'Marketing as Production: The Development of a Concept,' *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18, 337-343.

Dixon, N.M. (1992), 'Organizational Learning: A Review the Literature with Implications for HRD Professionals,' *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 3 (Spring), 29-49.

Downs, G.W., and L.B. Mohr (1976), 'Conceptual Issues in the Study of Innovation,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 700-714.

Drazin, R. and C.B. Schoonhoven (1996), 'Community, Population and Organization Effects on Innovation: A Multilevel Perspective,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 5, 1065-1083.

Drennan, D. (1992), *Transforming Company Culture*. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill.

Drucker, P.(1954), *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.

Dwyer, S., O.C. Richard and K. Chadwick (2003), 'Gender Diversity in Management and Firm Performance: the Influence of Growth Orientation and Organizational Culture,' *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 1009-1019.

Elliot, G. (1987), 'The Marketing Concept: Necessary but Sufficient?' *European Journal of Marketing*, 21, 20-30.

Engel, J.F., D.T. Kollat and R.D.Blackwell (1968), *Consumer Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Enz, C. (1986), *Power and Shared Values in the Corporate Culture*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.

Enz, C. (1988), 'The Role of Value Congruity in Intraorganizational Power,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 284-304.

Esteban, A., A. Millan, A. Molina and D.Martin-Consuegra (2002), 'Market Orientation in Service: A Review and Analysis,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1003-1021.

Ettlie, J.E., W.P. Bridges and R.D. O'Keefe (1984), 'Organization Strategy and Structural Differences for Radical Versus Incremental Innovation,' *Management Science*, 30, 682-695.

Evered, R. (1983), 'So, What is Strategy?,' *Long Range Planning*, 16 (3), 57-72.

Farrelly, F. and P. Quester (2003), 'The Effects of Market Orientation on Trust and Commitment: The Case of the Sponsorship Business-to-Business Relationships,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 3-4, 530-553.

Feldman, J. (1986), 'On the Difficulty of Learning from Experience,' in *The Thinking Organization*, H.P.Simms, D.A.Gioia and Associates, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Felton, A.P. (1959), 'Making the Marketing Concept Work,' *Harvard Business Review*, 37, 4, 55-65.

Fennell, M.L. (1984), 'Synergy, Influence and Information in the Adoption of Administrative Innovation,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 113-129.

Fey, C.F. and D.R. Denison (2003), 'Organizational Culture and Effectiveness: Can American Theory Be Applied in Russia,' *Organization Science*, 14, 6, 686-706.

Fiol, C.M. and M.A. Lyles (1985), 'Organizational Learning,' *Academy of Management Review*, 10 (October), 803-813.

Fombrun, C.J. and A.Ginsberg (1990), 'Shifting Gears: Enabling Change in Corporate Aggressiveness,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 4, 297-308.

Franwick, G.L., J.G. Ward, M.D.Hutt, and P.H. Reingen (1994), 'Evolving Patterns of Organizational Beliefs in the Formation of Strategy,' *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (April), 96-110.

Fredrickson, J. (1984), 'The Comprehensiveness of Strategic Decision Process: Extension, Observations and Future Directions,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 445-466.

Frost, P.J., L.F. Moore, M.R. Louis , C. Lundberg, and J. Martin (1985), *Organizational Culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gagliardi, P. (2002), *Understanding Organizational Culture*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ganesan, S. (1994), 'Determinants of Long-Term Orientation in Buyer-Seller Relationships,' *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (April), 1-19.

Gatignon, H. and E.Anderson (1987), 'The Multinational Corporation's Degree of Control Over Foreign Subsidiaries: An Empirical Test of a Transaction Cost Explanation,' Working Paper No: 87-103, Marketing Science Institute.

Gatignon, H. and J.M. Xuereb (1997), 'Strategic Orientation of the Firm and New Product Performance,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (February), 77-90.

Gerwin, D. and J.S. Ferris (2004), 'Organizing New Product Development Projects in Strategic Alliances,' *Organization Science*, 15, 1, 22-37.

Ginsberg, A. and N. Venkatraman (1985), 'Contingency Perspectives of Organizational Strategy: A Critical Review of Empirical Research,' *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 421-434.

Glaser, R. (1983), *The Corporate Culture Survey*. Bryn Mawr, PA: Organizational Design and Development.

Glazer, R. (1991), 'Marketing in an Information-Intensive Environment: Strategic Implications of Knowledge As an Asset,' *Journal of Marketing*, 55 (October), 1-19.

Glazer, R. and A.M. Weiss (1993), 'Marketing in Turbulent Environments: Decision Processes and the Time-Sensitivity of Information,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (November), 509-521.

Golden, B.R. (1992), 'SBU Strategy and Performance: The Moderating Effects of the Corporate-SBU Relationship,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 145-158.

Golden, P.A., P.M. Doney, D.M. Johnson and J.R. Smith (1995a), 'The Dynamics of a Marketing Orientation in Transition Economies: A Study of Russian Firms,' *Journal of International Marketing*, 3, 29-49.

Golden, P.A., D.M. Johnson and J.R. Smith (1995b), 'Strategic Orientation and Marketing Strategies in Transition Economies: A Study of Russian Firms,' *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 3, 1-22.

Grant, R.M. (1991), 'The Resource-Based Theory of Competitive Advantage, Implications for Strategy Formulation,' *California Management Review*, Spring, 114-135.

Grant, R.M. (1996), 'Prospering in Dynamically Competitive Environments, Organizational Capability as Knowledge Integration,' *Organizational Science*, 7 (July-August), 375-387.

Grant, J.H. and W.R. King (1982), *The Logic of Strategic Planning*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Gray, B.J. and G.J. Hooley (2002), 'Market Orientation and Service Firm Performance --A Research Agenda,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 980-988.

Gray, B., S. Matear, C. Boshoff and P. Matheson (1998), 'Developing a Better Measure of Market Orientation,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 32, 884-903.

Greenley, G. E. (1995a), 'Forms of Market Orientation In UK Companies,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 32 (1), 47-66.

Greenley, G.E. (1995b), 'Market Orientation and Company Performance: Empirical Evidence from UK Companies,' *British Journal of Management*, 6, 1-13.

Grewal, R. and P. Tansuhaj (2001), 'Building Organizational Capabilities for Managing Economic Crisis: The Role of Market Orientation and Strategic Flexibility,' *Journal of Marketing*, 65 (April), 67-80.

Gummesson, E. (1991), 'Marketing-Oriented Revisited: The Crucial Role of the Part Time Marketer,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 5, 60-75.

Guo, C. (2002), 'Market Orientation and Business Performance: A Framework for Service Organizations,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1154-1163.

Haggett, P. (1975), *Geography: A Modern Synthesis*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Hall, R.H., J.E. Haas, and N.J. Johnson (1967), 'Organizational Size, Complexity and Formalization,' *American Sociological Review*, 32 (December), 903-911.

Hambrick, D.C. (1982), 'Environmental Scanning and Organizational Strategy,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 3, 2, 159-174.

Hambrick, D.C. (1983), 'Some Tests of the Effectiveness and Functional Attributes of Miles and Snow's Strategic Types,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (March), 5-25.

Hamel, G. and C.K. Prahalad (1991), 'Corporate Imagination and Expeditionary Marketing,' *Harvard Business Review*, 69 (July-August), 81-92.

- Hamel, G. and C.K. Prahalad (1994), *Competing for the Future*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Han, J.K., N.Kim and R.K.Srivastava (1998), 'Market Orientation and Organizational Performance: Is Innovation a Missing Link?' *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (October), 30-45.
- Handy, C. (1990), *The Age of Unreason*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Harris, L.C. (1998), 'Cultural Domination: The Key to a Market-Oriented Culture?' *European Journal of Marketing*, 32, 354-373.
- Harris, L.C. (2000), 'The Organizational Barriers to Developing Market Orientation,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 34, 5-6, 598-624.
- Harris, L.C. (2001), 'Market Orientation and Performance: Objective and Subjective Empirical Evidence from UK Companies,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 1, 17-43.
- Harris, L.C. and E. Ogbonna (1999), 'Developing a Market Oriented Culture: A Critical Evaluation,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 36 (March), 177-196.
- Harris, L.C. and E. Ogbonna (2000), 'The Responses of Front-Line Employees to Market-Oriented Culture Change,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 34, 318-340.

- Harris, L.C. and E. Ogbonna (2001a), 'Leadership Style and Market Orientation: An Empirical Study,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 35, 5-6, 318-340.
- Harris, L.C. and E. Ogbonna (2001b), 'Strategic Human Resource Management, Market Orientation, and Organizational Performance,' *Journal of Business Research*, 51, 157-166.
- Harrison, R. (1972), 'Understanding Your Organization's Character,' *Harvard Business Review*, 3, 119-128.
- Harrison, J. and G.Carroll (1991), 'Keeping the Faith: A Model of Cultural Transition in Formal Organizations,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36.
- Hart, S. and A. Diamantopoulos (1993), 'Linking Market Orientation and Company Performance: Preliminary Evidence on Kohli and Jaworski's Framework,' *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1, 93-121.
- Hatch, M.J. (1993), 'The Dynamics of Organizational Culture,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 657-693.
- Helfert, G., T.Ritter and A.Walter (2002), 'Redefining Market Orientation From a Relationship Perspective: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Results,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1119-1139.

Heskett, J.L., T.O. Jones, G.W.Loveman, W.E. Sasser and L. Schlesinger (1994), 'Putting the Service-Profit Chain to Work,' *Harvard Business Review*, 72, 2, 105-111.

Hirschman, E.C. (1983), 'Aesthetics, Ideologies and the Limits of the Marketing Concept,' *Journal of Marketing*, 47 (Summer), 45-55.

Hise, R.T. (1965), 'Have Manufacturing Firms Adopted the Marketing Concept,' *Journal of Marketing*, 29 (July), 9-12.

Hofer, C.W. and D.E. Schendel (1978), *Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts*. New York, NY: West Publishing.

Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly-Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hofstede, G. (1986), 'The Usefulness of the Organizational Culture Concept,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 23 (May), 253-258.

Hofstede, G. , B. Neuijen, D.D.Ohayv, G.Sanders (1990), 'Measuring Organizational Cultures: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study Across Twenty Cases,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286-316.

Holmqvist, M. (2003), 'A Dynamic Model of Intra and Interorganizational Learning,' *Organization Studies*, 24 (1), 95-123.

Holmqvist, M. (2004), 'Experiential Learning Process of Exploitation and Exploration Within and Between Organizations: An Empirical Study of Product Development,' *Organization Science*, 15, 1, 70-81.

Homburg, C. and C. Pflesser (2000), 'A Multiple-Layer Model of Market-Oriented Organizational Culture: Measurement Issues and Performance Outcomes,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37 (November), 449-462.

Hooley, G., J.E.Lynch and J.Shepherd (1990), 'The Marketing Concept: Putting the Theory into Practice,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 24, 9, 7-23.

Hooley, G., T.Cox, J. Fahy, D.Shipley, J.Beracs, K. Fonfara and B. Snoj (2000), 'Market Orientation in the Transition Economies of Central Europe: Tests of the Narver and Slater Market Orientation Scales,' *Journal of Business Research*, 50, 273-285.

Hooley, G., J.Fahy, G. Greenley, J.Beracs, K. Fonfara and B. Snoj (2003), 'Market Orientation in the Service Sector of the Transition Economies of Central Europe,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 1-2, 86-106.

Houghton, J.R. (1989), 'The Age of the Hierarchy is Over,' *The New York Times* (Sunday, September 24), Sec. 3, 3.

Houston,, F.S. (1986), 'The Marketing Concept: What It Is and What It Is Not,' *Journal of Marketing*, 50 (April), 81-87.

Hu, M.Y. (1986), 'An Experimental Study of Managers' and Researchers' Use of Consumer Market Research,' *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14 (Fall), 44-51.

Huber, G.P. (1991), 'Organizational Learning: The Contributing Processes and the Literatures,' *Organization Science*, 2 (February), 88-115.

Hult, G.T.M., O.C.Ferrell and R.F. Hurley (2002), 'Global Organizational Learning Effects on Cycle Time Performance,' *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 377-387.

Hurley, R.F. and G.T.M. Hult (1998), 'Innovation, Market Orientation, and Organizational Learning: An Integration and empirical Examination,' *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (July), 42-54.

Hurst, D., J.Rush and R.White (1984), 'Top Management Teams and Organizational Renewal,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 87-105.

Ingram, P. and T.Simons (2000), 'State Formation, Ideological Competition and the Ecology of Israeli Workers' Cooperatives 1920-1993,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 25-53.

Itami, H. (1987), *Mobilizing Invisible Assets*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jacques, E. (1952), *The Changing Culture of a Factory*. New York, USA.

- Jackson, B.B. (1985), 'Build Customer Relationships that Last,' *Harvard Business Review*, 63 (November-December), 120-128.
- James, C.R. (2003), 'Designing Learning Organizations,' *Organizational Dynamics*, 32, 1, 46-61.
- James, W.L. and K.J. Hatten (1994), 'Evaluating the Performance Effects of Miles and Snow's Strategic Archetypes in Banking, 1983 to 1987 Big or Small?' *Journal of Business Research*, 31, 145-154.
- Jaworski, B.J. and A.K. Kohli (1993), 'Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences,' *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (July), 53-70.
- Jaworski, B.J. and A.K. Kohli (1996), 'Market Orientation: Review, Refinement and Roadmap,' *Journal of Market Focused Management*, 1, 2, 119-135.
- Jelinek, M. (1979), *Institutionalizing Innovation: A Study of Organizational Learning Systems*. New York: Praeger Publishers
- Jelinek, M., L.Smircich, and P.Hirsch (1983), 'Introduction: A Code of Many Colors,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28 (September), 331-338.
- Jennings, P.D. and S.L. Seaman (1994), 'High and Low Levels of Organizational Adaptation: An Empirical Analysis of Strategy, Structure, and Performance,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 459-475.

Jennings, P.D. and P.A. Zandbergen (1995), 'Ecologically Sustainable Organizations: An Institutional Approach,' *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 4, 1015-1052.

Johnston, R. and P.R. Lawrence (1988), 'Beyond Vertical Integration –The Rise of the Value-Adding Partnership,' *Harvard Business Review*, 66 (July-August), 94-101.

Jones, E., P. Busch and P. Dacin (2003), 'Firm Market Orientation and Salesperson Customer Orientation: Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Influences on Customer Service and Retention in Business-to-Business Buyer-Seller Relationship,' *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 323-340.

Jung, C.G. (1923), *Psychological Types*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kaldor, A.G. (1971), 'Imbricative Marketing,' *Journal of Marketing*, 35 (April), 19-25.

Kallinikos, J. (2003), 'Work, Human Agency and Organizational Forms: An Anatomy of Fragmentation,' *Organization Studies*, 24 (4), 595-618.

Kanji, G.K. (2002), *100 Statistical Tests*, Sage Publication, p.35.

Kanter, R.M. (1989), *When Giants Learn to Dance*. New York: Touchstone.

Kaplan, R.S. and D.P.Norton (1992), 'The Balanced Scorecard –Measures That Drive Performance,' *Harvard Business Review*, 70, 71-79.

Kasper, H. (2002), 'Culture and Leadership in Market-Oriented Service Organizations,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1047-1057.

Keith, R.J. (1960), 'The Marketing Revolution,' *Journal of Marketing*, 24 (January), 35-38.

Kelley, S.W. (1992), 'Developing Customer Orientation Among Service Employees,' *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 20, 27-36.

Kennedy, K.N., J.R. Goolsby and E.J. Arnould (2003), 'Implementing a Customer Orientation: Extension of Theory and Application,' *Journal of Marketing*, 67, 4, 67-87.

Kerby, J.K. (1972), 'The Marketing Concept: Suitable Guide to Product Strategy,' *Business Quarterly*, 37 (Summer), 31-35.

Kilmann, R. and M.J. Saxton (1983), *The Kilmann-Saxton Culture-Gap Survey*. Pittsburgh: Organizational Design Consultants.

Kilmann, R., M.J.Saxton, and R. Serpa (1986), *Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kimberly, J.R. (1981), 'Managerial Innovation,' in P.C. Nystrom and W.H. Strabuck (eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Design*, 1, 84-104. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kimberly, J.R. and M. Evanisko (1981), 'Organizational Innovation: The Influence of Individual, Organizational and Contextual Factors on Hospital Adoption of Technological and Administrative Innovations,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 689-713.

King, S. (1985), 'Has Marketing Failed or Was It Never Really Tried?', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 1, 1-19.

Kohli, A.K. and B.J. Jaworski (1990), 'Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions and Managerial Implications,' *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (April), 1-18.

Kohli, A.K., B.J. Jaworski and A. Kumar (1993), 'MARKOR: A Measure of Market Orientation,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (November), 467-477.

Konopa, L.J. and P.J. Calabro (1971), 'Adoption of the Marketing Concept by Large Northeastern Ohio Manufacturers,' *Akron Business and Economic Review*, 2 (Spring), 9-13.

Kotler, P. (1980), *Principles of Marketing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Kotler, P. (1988), *Marketing Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kotler, P. (2002), *Marketing Management*. 11th ed. NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kotler, P. and G. Zaltman (1971), 'Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change,' *Journal of Marketing*, 35 (July), 3-12.
- Kotter, J.P. and J.L.Heskett (1992), *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Kroeber, A.L.and C. Kluckhohn (1952), 'Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions,' *Papers of the Peabody Museum*, 47 (1a).
- Kumar, K., R.Subramanian and C. Yauger (1998), 'Examining the Market Orientation-Performance Relationship: A Context Specific Study,' *Journal of Management*, 24, 201-233.
- Lafferty, B.A. and G.T. Hult (2001), 'A Synthesis of Contemporary Market Orientation Perspectives,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 35, 1-2, 92-109.
- Lamb, C. W. Jr., J.F.Hair and C. McDaniel (2000), *Marketing*, 5th ed. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Lawson, R.B. and C.L. Ventriss (1992), 'Organizational Change: The Role of Organizational Culture and Organizational Learning,' *The Psychological Record*, 42 (Summer), 205-219.

Lawton, L. and A. Parasuraman (1980), 'The Impact of the Marketing Concept on New Product Planning,' *Journal of Marketing*, 44 (Winter), 19-25.

Lear, R.W. (1963), 'No Easy Road to Market Orientation,' *Harvard Business Review*, 41 (September-October), 53-60.

Learned, E., C. Christensen, K. Andrews and W. Guth (1969), *Business Policy: Text and Cases*. Homewood IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. ,

Leavitt, H.J. (1964), 'Applied Organization Change in Industry: Structural, Technical, and Human Approaches,' in *New Perspectives in Organization Research*, W.W. Cooper, H.J. Leavitt, and M.W. Shelly, II, eds. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lee, S., J.F.Courtney, and R.M. O'Keefe (1992), 'A System for Organizational Learning Using Cognitive Maps,' *OMEGA International Journal of Management Science*, 20 (Spring), 23-36.

Levin, D.Z. (2000), 'Organizational Learning and the Transfer of Knowledge: An Investigation of Quality Improvement,' *Organization Science*, 11, 6, 630-647.

Levitt, T. (1960), 'Marketing Myopia,' *Harvard Business Review*, 38, 4, 24-47.

Levitt, T. (1969), *The Marketing Mode*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Levitt, T. (1983), 'The Globalization of Markets,' *Harvard Business Review*, 61 (May/June), 92-102.

Levitt, B. and J.G.March (1988), 'Organizational Learning,' *Annual Review of Sociology*, W. Richard Scott and Judith Blake, eds. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc., 319-340.

Li, T. and R.J. Calantone (1998), 'The Impact of Market Knowledge Competence on New Product Advantage: Conceptualization and Empirical Examination,' *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (October), 13-29.

Liao, H. and A. Chuang (2004), 'A Multilevel Investigation of Factors Influencing Employee Service Performance and Customer Outcomes,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 41-58.

Linden, W.J. (1987), 'Marketing Marketing: The Ryder System Story,' paper presented at Marketing Science Institute miniconference on *Developing a Marketing Orientation*, (April), Cambridge, MA.

Lings, I.N. (2004), 'Internal Market Orientation: Construct and Consequences,' *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 405-413.

Liu, H. (1995), 'Market Orientation and the Firm Size: An Empirical Examination in UK Firms,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 29, 57-71.

Liu, S.S., X. Luo and Y.Z. Shi (2003), 'Market-Oriented Organizations in an Emerging Economy: A Study of Missing Links,' *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 481-491.

Louis, M. (1983), Organizations as Culture-Bearing Milieux, in L.Pondy, P.Frost, G. Morgan and T. Dandridge eds., *Organizational Symbolism*, 186-218, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lundstrom, W.J. (1976), 'The Marketing Concept: The Ultimate in Bait and Switch,' *Marquette Business Review*, 20 (Fall), 214-230.

Lusch, R.F. and G.R. Laczniak (1987), 'The Evolving Marketing Concept, Competitive Intensity and Organizational Performance,' *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15 (Fall), 1-11.

Lusch, R.F., J.G. Udell and G.R. Laczniak (1976), 'The Practice of Business,' *Business Horizons*, 19 (December), 65-74.

Lynn, G., J. Morone, A. Paulson (1996), 'Marketing and Discontinuous Innovation: The Probe and Learn Process,' *California Management Review*, 38, 3, 8-37.

Mahajan, V.P. , R. Varadarajan, and R.A.Kerin (1987), 'Metamorphosis in Strategic Market Planning, in *Contemporary Views on Marketing Practice*, Gary L. Frazier and Jagdish N. Sheth, eds. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Mahoney, J.T. and J.R. Pandian (1992), 'The Resource-Based View Within the Conversation of Strategic Management,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 13 (June), 363-380.

Maltz, E. and A.K. Kohli (1996), 'Market Intelligence Dissemination Across Functional Boundaries,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33 (February), 47-61.

Manu, F.A. and V. Sriram (1996), 'Innovation, Marketing Strategy, Environment and Performance,' *Journal of Business Research*, 35, 79-91.

March, J.G. and Z. Shapira (1987), 'Managerial Perspective on risk and Risk Taking,' *Management Science*, 33, 11, 1404-1418.

Marino, K.E. (1982), 'Structural Correlations of Affirmative Action Compliance,' *Journal of Management*, 8, 75-93.

Martin, J. and D. Meyerson (1988), 'Organizational Culture and the Denial, Channeling and Acknowledgement of Ambiguity,' in Pondy,L.R., R.J. Boland and H. Thomas (Eds), *Managing Ambiguity and Change*, New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Martin, J. and C.Siehl (1983), 'Organizational Culture and Counterculture: An Uneasy Symbiosis,' *Organizational Dynamics*, 12,1, 52-64.

Matear, S., P.Osborne, T.Garrett and B.J.Gray (2002), 'How Does Market Orientation Contribute to Service Firms Performance? An Examination of Alternative Mechanisms,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1058-1075.

Matsuno, K. and J.T. Mentzer (2000), 'The Effects of Strategy Type on the Market Orientation – Performance Relationship,' *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (October), 1-16.

Matsuno, K. J.T. Mentzer and A. Özsomer (2002), 'The Effects of Entrepreneurial Proclivity and Market Orientation on Business Performance,' *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (July), 18-32.

McCarthy, E.J. and W.D. Perreault (1984), *Basic Marketing*. 8th ed., Homewood, IL: Irwin.

McDaniel, S. and J.W. Kolari (1987), 'Marketing Strategy Implications of the Miles and Snow Strategic Typology,' *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (October), 19-30.

McGee, L.W. and R.L. Spiro (1988), 'The Marketing Concept in Perspective,' *Business Horizons*, May-June, 40-45.

McKee, D.O., P.R. Varadarajan and W. M. Pride (1989), 'Strategic Adaptability and Firm Performance: A Market Contingent Perspective,' *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (July), 21-35.

McKelvey, B. (1975), 'Guidelines for the Empirical Classification of Organizations,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 509-525.

McKendrick, D.G. and G.R. Carroll (2001), 'On the Genesis of Organizational Forms: Evidence from the Market for Disk Arrays,' *Organization Science*, 12, 6, 661-682.

McKitterick, J.B. (1957), 'What Is The Marketing Management Concept?' in *The Frontiers of Marketing Thought and Science*, F. M. Bass, ed. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 71-92.

McNamara, C.P. (1972), 'The Present Status of the Marketing Concept,' *Journal of Marketing*, 36 (January), 50-57.

McNaughton, R.B., P. Osborne and B.C. Imrie (2002), 'Market-Oriented Value Creation in Service Firms,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 990-1002.

Menon, A. and P.R. Varadarajan (1992), 'A Model of Marketing Knowledge Use Within Firms,' *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (October), 53-71.

Meyer, A.D. and J.B. Goes (1988), 'Organizational Assimilation of Innovations: A Multilevel Contextual Analysis,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 897-923.

Miles, R.E. and K.S.Cameron (1982), *Coffin Nails and Corporate Strategies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Miles, R.E. and C.C. Snow (1978), *Organizational Strategy and Process Structure*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Miles, R. and C.Snow (1984), 'Fit, Failure and the Hall of Fame,' *California Management Review*, 26 (Spring), 10-28.

Miles, R. and C.Snow (1986), 'Network Organizations: New Concepts for New Forms,' *California Management Review*, 28 (Spring), 62-73.

Miller, D. (1983), 'The Correlates of Entrepreneurship in Three Types of Firms,' *Management Science*, 29 (7), 770-791.

Miller, D. (1987), 'Strategy Making and Structure: Analysis and Implications for Performance,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 1, 7-32.

Miller, D. (1989), 'Matching Strategies and Strategy-Making: Process, Content and Performance,' *Human Relations*, 42,3, 241-260.

Miller, D. and P.H. Friesen (1978), 'Archetypes of Strategy Formulation,' *Management Science*, 24, 921-933.

Miller, D. and P.H. Friesen (1982), 'Innovation in Conservative and Entrepreneurial Firms: Two Models of Strategic Momentum,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 3, 1-25.

Mintzberg, H. (1994), *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. New York: The Free Press.

Mitroff, I.I. (1983), *Stakeholders of the Organizational Mind*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Moller, K. and M. Antilla (1987), 'Marketing Capability- A Key Success Factor in Small Business,' *Journal of Marketing Management*, 3, 2, 185-203.

Moore, G.A. (1995), *Inside the Tornado*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Moorman, C. (1995), 'Organizational Market Information Processes: Cultural Antecedents and New Product Outcomes,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32 (August), 318-335.

Moorman, C. (1998), 'Market Level Effects of Information: Competitive Responses and Consumer Dynamics,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35(February), 82-98.

Moorman, C. and R.J. Slotegraaf (1999), 'The Contingency Value of Complementary Capabilities in Product Development,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (May), 239-257.

Moorman, C., G.Zaltman and R.Deshpande (1992), 'Relationships Between Providers and Users of Market Research: The Dynamics of Trust Within and Between Organizations,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (August), 314-328.

Morgan, R. E. and C.A. Strong (1998), 'Market Orientation and Dimensions of Strategic Orientation,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 32 (11/12), 1051-1073.

Morgan, R. E. and C.A. Strong (2003), 'Business Performance and Dimensions of Strategic Orientation,' *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 163-176.

Murray, J.Y. (2001), 'Strategic Alliance-Based Global Sourcing Strategy for Competitive Advantage: A Conceptual Framework and Research Propositions,' *Journal of International Marketing*, 9, 4, 30-58.

Myers, J.G., W.G.Massy and S.A. Greyser (1980), *Marketing Research and Knowledge Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Narver, J.C. and S.F. Slater (1990), 'The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability,' *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (October), 20-35.

Narver, J.C. and S.F. Slater (1991), 'Becoming More Market Oriented: An Exploratory Study of the Programmatic and Market-Back Approaches,' working paper, University of Washington.

Narver, J.C. and S.F. Slater (1998), 'Additional Thoughts on the Measurement of Market Orientation: A Comment on Deshpande and Farley,' *Journal of Market Focused Management*, 2, 233-236.

Narver, J.C., S.F. Slater and B.Tietje (1998), 'Creating a Market-Oriented,' *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 2, 3, 241-256.

Naude, P., J.Desai and J. Murphy (2003), 'Identifying the Determinants of Internal Marketing Orientation,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 9, 1205-1220.

Ngai, J.C.H. and P.Ellis (1998), 'Market Orientation and Business Performance: Some Evidence from Hong Kong,' *International Marketing Review*, 15, 119-139.

Nielsen, J.F., V. Host, J.E. Jaensson, S. Kock and F. Selnes (2003), 'Market Orientation in Nordic Banks: Does Nationality Matter?' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 11-12, 1818-1841.

Nonaka, I. and H.Takeuchi (1995), *The Knowledge-Creating Company*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Nord, W.R. and S. Tucker (1987), *Implementing Routine and Radical Innovation*.

Lexington: MA: Lexington Books.

Ohmae, K. (1989), 'The Global Logic of Strategic Alliances,' *Harvard Business Review*, 67 (March-April), 143-154.

Oliver, R.L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective of the Consumer*.

McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Olson, D. (1987), 'When Consumer Firms Develop a Marketing Orientation,' paper presented at Marketing Science Institute Miniconference on **Developing a Marketing Orientation**, (April), Cambridge, MA.

O'Reilly, C.A. (1989), 'Corporations' Culture, and Commitment: Motivation and

- Social Control in Organizations,' *California Management Review*, 31, 4, 9-25.

O'Reilly, C.A., J.Chatman and D.F.Caldwell (1991), 'People and Organizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 3, 487-516.

Osborn, R.N. and J.Hagedoorn (1997), 'The Institutionalization and Evolutionary Dynamics of Interorganizational Alliances and Networks,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 2, 261-278.

- Osterloh, M. and B.S. Frey (2000), 'Motivation, Knowledge Transfer and Organizational Forms,' *Organization Science*, 11, 5, 538-550.
- Otley, D. and A.Fakiolas (2000), 'Reliance on Accounting Performance Measures: Dead End or New Beginning,' *Accounting, Organization, Society*, 25, 497-510.
- Ottesen, G.G. and K. Gronhaug (2002), 'Managers' Understanding of Theoretical Concepts: The Case of Market Orientation,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 11-12, 1209-1224.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1980), 'Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clans,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25 (March), 129-141.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1981), *Theory Z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Ouchi, W.G. and A. Van de Ven (1980), 'Antitrust and Organization Theory,' in *Antitrust Law and Economics*, O.E. Williamson, ed. Houston, TX: Dame Publications, Inc.
- Ouchi, W.G. and A.L.Wilkins (1985), 'Organizational Culture,' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 457-483.
- Owen-Smith, J.M. and W.W. Powell (2004), 'Knowledge Networks,' *Organization Science*, 15, 1, 5-21.

Parasuraman, A. and R.Deshpande, (1984), 'The Cultural Context of Marketing Management,' in *AMA Educators' Proceedings*, Series 50, Russell W. Belk et.al., eds. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 176-179.

Parker, B. and M.M.Helms (1992), 'Generic Strategies and Firm Performance in a Declining Industry,' *Management Industry Review*, 32, 23-39.

Parnell, J.A. (1997), 'New Evidence in the Generic Strategy and Business Performance Debate: A Research Note,' *British Journal of Management*, 8, 175-181.

Parsons, T. (1951), *The Social System*. New York: Free Press.

Parsons, T. (1956), 'Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the study of Organizations,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1 (March), 63-85.

Pascale, R.T. and A.Athos (1981), *The Art of Japanese Management*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Pelham, A.M. and D.T. Wilson (1996), 'A Longitudinal Study of the Impact of Market Structure, Firm Structure, Strategy, and Market Orientation Culture on Dimensions of Small Firm Performance,' *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24, 1, 27-43.

- Pennings, J.M., H.Barkema and S. Douma (1994), 'Organizational Learning and Diversification,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 3, 608-640.
- Penrose, E.T. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- 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.
- Peters, T. and R.Waterman (1982), *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper&Row Publishers, Inc.
- Pettigrew, A.M. (1979), 'On Studying Organizational Cultures,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24 (December), 570-581.
- Pettigew, A. M. (1985), 'Examining Changes in the Long Term Context of Culture and Politics,' in Pennings, J.M. (Ed.), *Organizational Strategy and Change*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 269-318.
- Piercy, N. (1989), 'Marketing Concepts and Actions: Implementing Market-Led Strategic Change,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 24, 24-42.
- Piercy, N. (1997), *Market-Led Strategic Change*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.

- Piercy, N.F. and D.W. Cravens (1995), 'The Network Paradigm and the Marketing Organization,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 29, 3, 7-34.
- Piercy, N.F., L.C. Harris and N. Lane (2002), 'Market Orientation and Retail Operatives' Expectations,' *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 261-273.
- Piercy, N.F. and N.A. Morgan (1994), 'The Marketing Planning Process: Behavioral Problems Compared to Analytical Techniques in Explaining Marketing Plan Credibility,' *Journal of Business Research*, 29, 167-178.
- Pitt, L., A. Caruana and P.R. Berthon (1996), 'Market Orientation and Business Performance: Some European Evidence,' *International Marketing Review*, 13, 5-18.
- Polos, L., M.T.Hannan, G. Peli, and G.R. Carroll (1998), 'Form and Identity: On the Structure of Organizational Forms,' Presented at the 14th *Colloquium of European Group on Organizational Studies*, Maastricht, Netherlands.
- Polos, L., M.T.Hannan, G. Peli, and G.R. Carroll (1999), **Identities, Form and Populations**. Unpublished manuscript. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Polos, L., M.T.Hannan, G. Peli, and G.R. Carroll (2002), 'Foundations of a Theory of Social Forms,' *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11,2.
- Pondy, L., P.T.Frost, G.Morgan and T.Dandridge (1985), *Organizational Symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Porter, M.E. (1980), *Competitive Strategy*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Porter, M.E. (1985), *Competitive Advantage*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Porter, M.E. (1991), 'Towards a Dynamic Theory of Strategy,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 12 (Winter), 95-117.

Powell, W.W. (1990), 'Neither Market nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization,' *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 295-336.

Powpaka, S. (1998), 'Factors Affecting the Adoption of Market Orientation: The Case of Thailand,' *Journal of International Marketing*, 6, 33-55.

Prahalad, C.K. and G. Hamel (1990), 'The Core Competence of the Corporation,' *Harvard Business Review*, 68, (May-June), 79-91.

Pugh, D.S. and D.J.Hickson (1976), *Organization Structure in its Context: The Aston Programme 1*. Farnborough, Hants: Saxon House/Lexington.

Pulendran, S., R. Speed and R.E. Widing II (2003), 'Marketing Planning, Market Orientation and Business Performance,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 3-4, 476-497.

Putnam, L.L. (2002), *Organizational Culture: Mapping the Terrain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Quinn, R.E. (1988), *Beyond Rational Management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Quinn, R.E.(1992), *Intelligent Enterprise*. New York: The Free Press.

Quinn, R.E. and M.R.McGrath (1985), 'Transformation of Organizational Cultures: A Competing Values Perspective,' in *Organizational Culture*, P.Frost et.al., eds. Beverly-Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Quinn, R.E. and J. Rohrbaugh (1983), 'A Spatial Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Toward a Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis,' *Management Science*, 29 (3), 363-377.

Raju, P.S., S.C. Lonial and Y.P. Gupta (1995), 'Market Orientation and Performance in the Hospital Industry,' *Journal of Health Care Marketing*, 15, 34-41.

Ramaswamy K., A.S. Thomas, and R.J. Litschert (1994), 'Organizational Performance in a Regulated Environment: The Role of Strategic Orientation,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 63-74.

Reger, R.K., I.M. Duhaime, and J.L. Stimpert (1992), 'Deregulation, Strategic Choice, Risk, and Financial Performance,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 189-204.

Ritter, T. and H.G. Gemünden (2003), 'Network Competence: Its Impact on Innovation Success and its Antecedents,' *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 745-755.

Ritti, R.R. and G.R. Funkhouser (1982), *The Ropes to Skip and the Ropes to Know*. Colombus, OH: John Wiley and Sons.

Roberts, E.B. (1990), 'Evolving Toward Product and Market Orientation: The Early Years of Technology-Based Firms,' *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 7, 274-287.

Robinson, R.B. and J.A. Pearce (1988), 'Planned Patterns of Strategic Behavior and Their Relationship to Business-Unit Performance,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 43-60.

Rogers, E.M. (1962), *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Rogers, P.R. and C.E. Bamford (2002), 'Information Planning Process and Strategic Orientation: The Importance of Fit in High-Performing Organizations,' *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 205-215.

Rokeach, M. (1973), *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.

Romanelli, E. (1991), 'The Evolution of New Organizational Forms,' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 79-103.

- Rose, G.M. and A. Shoham (2002), 'Export Performance and Market Orientation: Establishing an Empirical Link,' *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 217-225.
- Rousseau, D.M. (1990), 'Quantitative Assessment of Organizational Culture: The Case for Multiple Measures,' in B.Schneider (ed.), *Organizational Climate and Culture*, 153-192, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ruekert, R.W. (1992), 'Developing a Market Orientation: An Organizational Strategy Perspective,' *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 9, 225-245.
- Ruekert, R.W. and O.C.Walker (1987), 'Marketing's Interaction with Other Functional Units: A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Evidence,' *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (January), 1-19.
- Ruekert, R.W., O.C. Walker and K.J. Roering (1985), 'The Organization of Marketing Activities: A Contingency Theory of Structure and Performance,' *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (Winter), 13-25.
- Rumelt, R.P. (1974), *Strategy, Structure and Economic Performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rumelt, R.P., D.Schendel and D.Teece (1991), 'Strategic Management and Economics,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 12 (Winter), 5-30.

- Sackman, S.A. (1991), *Cultural Knowledge in Organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sashkin, M. and R. Fulmer (1985), *Measuring Organizational Excellence Culture with a Validated Questionnaire*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego.
- Sathe, V. (1983), 'Some Action Implications of Corporate Culture: A Manager's Guide to Action,' *Organizational Dynamics*, 12 (Autumn), 4-23.
- Schein, E. (1985), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. (1990), 'Organizational Culture,' *American Psychologist*, 45 (February), 109-119.
- Schein, E. (1991), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schiffman, L.G and L.L. Kanuk (2000), *Consumer Behavior*. 7th ed., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Schneider, B. (1987), 'The People Make the Place,' *Personal Psychology*, 40, 437-453.

Schneider, B. (1988), 'Notes on Climate and Culture,' in Lovelock, C., *Managing Services*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schul, P.L., P.S. Davis and M.D. Hartline (1995), 'Strategic Adaptation to Extended Rivalry: Effects on Organizational Performance,' *Journal of Business Research*, 33, 129-142.

Schwartz, H. and S.Davis (1981), 'Matching Corporate Culture and Business Strategy,' *Organizational Dynamics*, 10 (Summer), 30-48.

Selnes, F., B.J. Jaworski and A.K. Kohli (1996), 'Market Orientation in United States and Scandinavian Companies: A Cross-Cultural View,' *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 12, 139-157.

Selnes, F., B.J. Jaworski and A.K. Kohli (1997), 'Market Orientation in United States and Scandinavian Companies: A Cross-Cultural Study,' *Marketing Science Institute Working Paper No 97-107*, Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.

Selznick, P. (1957), *Leadership in Administration*. New York: Harper& Row.

Senge, P.M. (1990), *The Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

Shanklin, W.L. and J.K. Ryans (1984), *Marketing High Technology*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Shapiro, B.P. (1988), 'What the Hell Is Market Oriented?' *Harvard Business Review*, 65 (November-December), 119-125.
- Sharp, B. (1991), 'Marketing Orientation: More Than Just Customer Focus,' *International Marketing Review*, 8, 20-25.
- Sheridan, J.E. (1992), 'Organizational Culture and Employee Retention,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 5, 1036-1056.
- Shortell, S.M. and E.J. Zajac (1990), 'Perceptual and Archival Measures of Miles and Snow's Strategic Types: A Comprehensive Assessment of Reliability and Validity,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 4, 817-832.
- Siguaw, J.A., G. Brown and R.E. Widing (1994), 'The Influence of Market Orientation of the Firm on Sales Force Behavior and Attitudes,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31 (February), 106-116.
- Siguaw, J.A. and A. Diamantopoulos (1995), 'The Influence of Market Orientation of the Firm on Sales Force Behavior and Attitudes,' *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31 (February), 106-116.
- Simon, H.A. (1969), *Sciences of the Artificial*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Simon, H.A. (1991), 'Bounded Rationality and Organizational Learning,' *Organization Science*, 2 (February), 125-134.

Sin, L.Y.M., A.C.B. Tse, O.H.M. Yau, R. Chow and J.S.Y. Lee (2003), 'Market Orientation and Business Performance: A Comparative Study of Firms in Mainland China and Hong Kong,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 5-6, 910-936.

Sinkula, J.M. (1990), 'Perceived Characteristics, Organizational Factors and the Utilization of External Market Research Suppliers,' *Journal of Business Research*, 16 (August), 1-17.

Sinkula, J.M. (1994), 'Market Information Processing and Organizational Learning,' *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (January), 35-45.

Sinkula, J.M. and R.D.Hampton (1988), 'Centralization and Information Acquisition by In-House Market Research Departments,' *Journal of Business Research*, 16 (June), 337-349.

Slater, S.F. and J.C. Narver (1992), 'Superior Customer Value and Business Performance: The Strong Evidence for a Market-Driven Culture,' *Marketing Science Institute Report Number 92-125*, Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge, MA.

Slater, S.F. and J.C. Narver (1993), 'Product-market Strategy and Performance: An Analysis of the Miles and Snow Strategy Types,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 27, 10, 33-51.

Slater, S.F. and J.C. Narver (1994a), 'Does Competitive-Environment Moderate the Market Orientation-Performance Relationship?' *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (January), 46-55.

Slater, S.F. and J.C. Narver (1994b), 'Market Orientation, Customer Value and Superior Performance,' *Business Horizons*, March-April, 22-28.

Slater, S.F. and J.C. Narver (1995), 'Market Orientation and the Learning Organization,' *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (July), 63-74.

Slater, S.F. and J.C. Narver (2000), 'The Positive Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability: A Balanced Replication,' *Journal of Business Research*, 48, 69-73.

Slocum, J.W. (1971), 'A Comparative Study of American and Mexican Operatives,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 14, 1, 89-97.

Smircich, L. (1983), 'Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28 (September), 339-358.

Snow, C.C. and L.G. Hrebiniak (1980), 'Strategy, Distinctive Competence, and Organizational Performance,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25 (June), 317-336.

Speed, R. (1993), 'Maximizing the Potential of Strategic Typologies for Marketing Strategy Research,' *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1, 171-188.

- Spekman, R.E. (1988), 'Strategic Supplier Selection: Understanding Long-Term Buyer Relationships,' *Business Horizons*, 31 (July-August), 75-81.
- Srivastava, R.K., T.A. Shervani and L. Fahey (1998), 'Market-Based Assets and Shareholder Value: A Framework for Analysis,' *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 2-18.
- Srivastava, R.K., T.A. Shervani and L. Fahey (1999), 'Marketing, Business Processes, and Shareholder Value: An Organizationally Embedded View of Marketing Activities and the Discipline of Marketing,' *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (Special Issue), 168-179.
- Stampfl, R. W. (1978), 'Structural Constraints, Consumerism and the Marketing Concept,' *MSU Business Topics*, 26 (Spring), 5-16.
- Subramanian, R. and P. Gopalakrishna (2001), 'The Market Orientation-Performance Relationship in the Context of a Developing Economy: An Empirical Analysis,' *Journal of Business Research*, 53, 1-13.
- Sudman, S. (1976), *Applied Sampling*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Swidler, A. (1986), 'Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies,' *American Sociological Review*, 51, 273-286.
- Tagiuri, R. and G.H.Litwin (1968), *Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tan, J.J. and R.J. Litschert (1994), 'Environment-Strategy Relationship and its Performance Implications: An Empirical Study of the Chinese Electronics Industry,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 1-20.

Tauber, E.M. (1974), 'How Marketing Discourages Major Innovation,' *Business Horizons*, 17 (June), 22-26.

Terborg, J. (1981), 'Interactional Psychology and Research on Human Behavior in Organizations,' *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 569-576.

Thomas, A. and K. Ramaswamy (1996), 'Matching Managers to Strategy: Further Tests of the Miles and Snow Typology,' *British Journal of Management*, 7, 247-261.

Thomas, J.B., S.W. Sussman and J.C. Henderson (2001), 'Understanding Strategic Learning: Linking Organizational Learning, Knowledge Management and Sensemaking,' *Organization Science*, 12, 3, 331-345.

Thompson, J.D. (1967), *Organization in Action*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Thorelli, H. (1986), 'Networks: Between Markets and Hierarchies,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 37-51.

Tiryakian, E.A. (1968), 'Typologies,' in Sills, D.L. (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 16, New York, NY: MacMillan/Free Press.

- Tregear, A. (2003), 'Market Orientation and the Craftsperson,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 11-12, 1621-1635.
- Trice, H. and J.Beyer (1984), 'Studying Organizational Cultures Through Rites and Ceremonials,' *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 653-669.
- Trout, J. and A. Ries (1985), *Marketing Warfare*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Tse, A.C.B., L.Y.M. Sin, O.H.M. Yau, J.S.Y. Lee and R. Chow (2003), 'Market Orientation and Business Performance in a Chinese Business Environment,' *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 227-239.
- Tsoukas, H. and E.Vladimirou (2001), 'What is Organizational Knowledge?,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 7, 973-993.
- Tuominen, M., K. Moller, and A.Rajala (1997), 'Marketing Capability: A Nexus of Learning-Based Resources and a Prerequisite for Market Orientation,' *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the European Marketing Academy*, May, 1220-1240.
- Turner, G.B. and B. Spencer (1997), 'Understanding the Marketing Concept as Organizational Culture,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 31, 110-121.
- Van Maanen, J. (1979), 'The Fact of Fiction in Organizational Ethnography,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 539-550.

Varadarajan, P.R., S.Jayachandran and J.C. White (2001), 'Strategic Interdependence in Organizations: Deconglomeration and Marketing Strategy,' *Journal of Marketing*, 65 (January), 15-28.

Van de Ven, A. (1976), 'On the Nature, Formation, and Maintenance of Relations Among Organizations,' *Academy of Management Review*, 1 (October), 24-36.

Van de Ven, A. (1986), 'Central Problems in the Management Of Innovation,' *Management Science*, 32, 590-607.

Van de Ven, A.H. and E.M. Rogers (1988), 'Innovations and Organizations – Critical Perspectives,' *Communication Research*, 15, 632-651.

Vazquez R., L.I. Alvarez and M.L. Santos (2002), 'Market Orientation and Social Services in Private Non-Profit Organizations,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 9-10, 1022-1046.

Veloutsou, C., M. Saren and N. Tzokas (2002), 'Relationship Marketing, What If,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 36, 4, 433-449.

Venkatraman, N. (1989), 'Strategic Orientation of Business Enterprises: The Construct, Dimensionality and Measurement,' *Management Science*, 35 (8), 942-962.

Venkatraman, N. and V. Ramanujam (1986), 'Measurement of Business Performance in Strategy Research: A Comparison Approach,' *Academy of Management Review*, 11 (4), 801-814.

Verhage, B.J. and E. Waarts (1988), 'Marketing Planning for Improved Performance: A Competitive Analysis,' *International Marketing Review*, 15 (2), 20-30.

Viebranz, A.C. (1967), 'Marketing's Role in Company Growth,' *MSU Business Topics*, 15 (Autumn), 45-49.

Vorhies, D.W.; M. Harker and C.P. Rao (1999), 'The Capabilities and Performance Advantages of Market-Driven Firms,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 33, 1171-1202.

Voss, G.B. and Z.G. Voss (2000), 'Strategic Orientation and Firm Performance in an Artistic environment,' *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (January), 67-83.

Walker, O.C. and R.W. Ruekert (1987), 'Marketing's Role in the Implementation of Business Strategies: A Critical Review and Conceptual Framework,' *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (July), 15-33.

Walsh, J.P. and G.R. Ungson (1991), 'Organizational Memory,' *Academy of Management Review*, 16 (January), 57-91.

Washington, M. and M.J. Ventresca (2004), 'How Organizations Change: The Role of Institutional Support Mechanisms in the Incorporation of Higher Education Visibility Strategies,' *Organization Science*, 15, 1, 82-97.

Webb, D., C. Webster and A Krepapa (2000), 'An Exploration of the Meaning and Outcomes of a Customer-Defined Market Orientation,' *Journal of Business Research*, 48, 101-112.

Webster, C. (1990), 'Toward the Measurement of the Marketing Culture of a Service Firm,' *Journal of Business Research*, 21, 345-362.

Webster, C. (1991), 'A Note on Cultural Consistency Within the Service Firm: The Effects of Employee Position on Attitudes Toward Marketing Culture,' *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19, 341-346.

Webster, C. (1992), 'What Kind of Marketing Culture Exists in Your Service Firm? An Audit,' *Journal of Services Marketing*, 6, 54-67.

Webster, C. (1993), 'Refinement of the Marketing Culture Scale and the Relationship Between Marketing Culture and Profitability of a Service Firm,' *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 111-131.

Webster, F.E. (1981), 'Top Management's Concerns About Marketing: Issues for the 1980s,' *Journal of Marketing*, 45 (Summer), 9-16.

- Webster, F.E. (1984), *Industrial Marketing Strategy*, 2nd.ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Webster, F.E. (1988), 'The Rediscovery of the Marketing Concept,' *Business Horizons*, 31, (May-June), 29-39.
- Webster, F.E. (1992), 'The Changing Role of Marketing in the Corporation,' *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (October), 1-17.
- Webster, F.E. (1994a), 'Defining the New Marketing Concept,' *Marketing Management*, 2, 23-31.
- Webster, F.E. (1994b), *Market Driven Management*. Wiley, London.
- Webster, F.E. and R. Deshpande (1990), 'Analyzing Corporate Cultures in Approaching the Global Marketplace,' Report No: 90-111: Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute (June).
- Weick, K.E. (1979), *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Weick, K.E. (1985), 'The Significance of Corporate Culture,' in *Organizational Culture*, P.J. Frost et.al., eds. Beverly-Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 381-389.

Weiner, Y. (1988), 'Forms of Value Systems: A Focus on Organizational Effectiveness and Cultural Change and Maintenance,' *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 534-545.

Weitz, B., H.Sujan and M. Sujan, (1986), 'Knowledge, Motivation, and Adaptive Behavior: A Framework for Improving Selling Effectiveness,' *Journal of Marketing*, 50 (October), 174-191.

Wernerfeld, B. (1984), 'A Resource-Based View of the Firm,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 5 (March), 171-180.

Whittington, R. and R. Whipp (1992), 'Professional Ideology and Marketing Implementation,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 26, 52-62.

Wilkins, A.L. and W.G. Ouchi (1983), 'Efficient Cultures: Exploring the Relationship Between Culture and Organizational Performance,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 468-481.

Williams, A.P.O. (2001), 'A Belief-Focused Process Model of Organizational Learning,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 1, 67-85.

Williamson, O.E. (1975), *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York: The Free Press.

Willmott, H. (1993), 'Strength is Ignorance: Slavery is Freedom: Managing Culture in Modern Organizations,' *Journal of Management Studies*, 30, 515-551.

Wilson, A.M. (2001), 'Understanding Organizational Culture and the Implications for Corporate Marketing,' *European Journal of Marketing*, 35, 3-4, 353-367.

Wissema, J.G., H.W. Van der Pol and H.M. Messer (1980), 'Strategic Management Archetypes,' *Strategic Management Journal*, 1, 37-47.

Wong, V. and J. Saunders (1993), 'Business Orientations and Corporate Success,' *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 48 (Spring), 46-53.

Wood, V.R. and S. Bhuian and P. Kiecker (2000), 'Market Orientation and Organizational Performance in Not-for-Profit Hospitals,' *Journal of Business Research*, 48, 213-226.

Woodman, R.W. and W.A. Passmore (1991), *Research in Organizational Change and Development*. Vol 5, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Woodruff, R.B. (1997), 'Customer Value, the Next Source for Competitive Advantage,' *Journal of The Academy of Marketing Science*, 25 (Spring), 139-153.

Wright, P., M.Kroll, B.Pray and A. Lado (1995), 'Strategic Orientations, Competitive Advantage, and Business Performance,' *Journal of Business Research*, 33, 143-151.

Yalman, N.H. (2003), 'Moderators of the Relationship Between Market Orientation and Business Performance: Findings From Turkey,' *PhD. Dissertation*, Istanbul: Bogazici University

Yau, O.H.M., P.R. McFetridge, R.P.M. Chow, J.S.Y. Lee, L.Y.M. Sin and A.C.B. Tse (2000), 'Is Relationship Marketing for Everyone?' *European Journal of Marketing*, 34, 9-10, 1111-1127.

Zaltman, G. (1965), *Marketing: Contributions from the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Harcourt, Brace&World, Inc.

Zaltman, G., R.Duncan and J.Holbek (1973), *Innovations and Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Zeithaml, C.P. and V.A. Zeithaml (1984), 'Environmental Management: Revising the Marketing Perspective,' *Journal of Marketing*, 48 (Spring), 46-53.

Zey-Ferrell, M. (1981), 'Criticisms of the Dominant Perspective on Organization,' *Sociological Quarterly*, 22 (Spring), 181-205.

Zmud, R.W. (1982), 'Diffusion of Modern Software Practices: Influence of Centralization and Formalization,' *Management Science*, 28, 1421-1431.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH

This questionnaire is a part of the Ph.D Thesis conducted at Bogazici University. The aim of the questionnaire is to formulate an integrated framework for marketing in an organizational setting for Turkey. Strategic business unit is the main focus of this study. The author thanks for your valuable contribution and cooperation.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your strategic business unit.

1. We believe that consumers will prefer products/services that are widely available and inexpensive. Our managers concentrate on achieving high production efficiency, low costs, and mass distribution. Our managers assume that consumers are primarily interested in product/service availability and low prices.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither Disagree Nor Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

2. We believe that consumers will favor products/services that offer the most quality, performance and innovative features. Our managers focus on designing, developing and engineering the functionally best possible product or delivering superior services and improving them over time. Our managers assume that buyers admire well-made products or well-delivered services and can appraise quality and performance. Customers are seen solely as a means to sell, deliver, and service the product or service. Supply chain is designed and managed to obtain and use the functionally best raw materials and supplies. Our business unit gives little importance to customer inputs and/or competitors' offerings when designing the products or services. Instead, we are mainly driven by the inputs of the manufacturing/operations departments.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither Disagree Nor Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

3. We believe that consumers and businesses, if left alone, will ordinarily not buy enough of the business unit's products and services. The business unit must, therefore, undertake an aggressive selling and promotion effort. We assume that consumers typically show buying inertia or resistance and must be coaxed into buying. We intend to sell what we make rather than make what the market wants.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither Disagree Nor Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your strategic business unit.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. Business objectives are driven by customer needs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. We monitor/assess commitment in serving customer needs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Competitive advantage is based on understanding customer needs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Strategies are driven by goal of increasing customer value.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. We frequently measure customer satisfaction.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. We pay close attention to after sales service.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. We share information about competitors.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. We response rapidly to competitor actions.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. Management regularly discusses competitor strengths/weaknesses.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. We target customers for competitive advantage opportunities.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. We share information across departments.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
15. There is sharing of customer information among functions.					
16. We understand how employees can create customer value.					
17. There is functional integration in strategy.					
18. We share resources among business units.					
19. We often sacrifice profitability to gain market share.					
20. We often cut prices to increase market share.					
21. We often set prices below competition.					
22. We often seek market share position at the expense of cash flow and profitability.					
23. We emphasize effective coordination among different functional areas.					
24. Our information systems provide support for decision making.					
25. When confronted with a major decision, we usually try to develop through analysis.					
26. We use several planning techniques.					
27. We use the outputs of management information and control systems.					
28. We commonly use manpower planning and performance appraisal of senior managers.					
29. We occasionally conduct significant modifications to manufacturing technology.					
30. We often use cost control systems for monitoring performance.					
31. We often use production management techniques.					
32. We often emphasize product quality through the use of quality circles.					
33. We emphasize basic research to provide us with future competitive edge.					
34. Forecasting key indicators of operations is common.					
35. Formal tracking of significant general trends is common.					
36. We often conduct 'what if' analyses of critical issues.					
37. We are constantly seeking new opportunities related to present operations.					
38. We are usually the first ones to introduce new brands or products/services on the market.					
39. We are constantly on the look for businesses that can be acquired.					
40. Operations in later stages of the life cycle are strategically eliminated.					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
41. We seem to adopt a rather conservative view when making major decisions.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
42. New projects are approved on a 'stage by stage' basis rather than with blanket approval.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
43. We have a tendency to support projects where the expected returns are certain.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
44. Our operations have generally followed the 'tried and true' paths.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please distribute 100 points among the choices for each of the questions presented below.

45.	_____	(A) My business unit is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.	_____	(B) My business unit is a very dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.
	points for A		points for B	
	_____	(C) My business unit is a very formalized and structural place. Established procedures generally govern what people do.	_____	(D) My business unit is very production oriented . A major concern is getting the job done, without much personal involvement.
	points for C		points for D	
46.	_____	(A) The head of my organization is generally considered to be a mentor, sage, or a father or mother figure .	_____	(B) The head of my organization is generally considered to be an entrepreneur, an innovator, or a risk taker .
	points for A		points for B	
	_____	(C) The head of my organization is generally considered to be a coordinator, an organizer, or an administrator .	_____	(D) The head of my organization is generally considered to be a producer, a technician, or a hard-driver .
	points for C		points for D	
47.	_____	(A) The glue that holds my business unit together is loyalty and tradition . Commitment to this firm runs high.	_____	(B) The glue that holds my business unit together is a commitment to innovation and development . There is an emphasis on being first.
	points for A		points for B	
	_____	(C) The glue that holds my business unit together is formal rules and policies . Maintaining a smooth-running institution is important here.	_____	(D) The glue that holds my business unit together is the emphasis on tasks and goal accomplishment . A production orientation is commonly shared.
	points for C		points for D	
48.	_____	(A) My business unit emphasizes human resources . High cohesion and morale in the firm are important.	_____	(B) My business unit emphasizes growth and acquiring new resources . Readiness to meet new challenges is important.
	points for A		points for B	
	_____	(C) My business unit emphasizes permanence and stability . Efficient, smooth operations are important.	_____	(D) My business unit emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Measurable goals are important.
	points for C		points for D	

Please indicate how important the following capabilities are for your strategic business unit.

	Not Important At All	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Unimportant Nor Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
49. The capability of learning about customers, competitors, and channel members in order to continuously sense and act on events and trends in present and prospective markets.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
50. The capability of creating and managing close and long-lasting customer relationships.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
51. The capability of creating and managing close, collaborative relationships with channel members based on a high level of coordination, participation in joint programs and close communication links.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
52. The capability of detecting technological changes in the environment and taking the necessary actions to cope with these changes.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
53. Financial Management Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
54. Cost Control Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
55. Technology Development Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
56. Logistics Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
57. Manufacturing or Operational Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
58. Human Resources Management Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
59. The Capability for Preserving and Improving Environment Health and Safety	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
60. Customer Order Fulfillment Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
61. Pricing Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
62. Purchasing Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
63. Customer Service Delivery Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
64. New Product/Service Development Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
65. Strategy Development Capability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

66. Our organizational chart has a pyramid shape with increasingly fewer and more highly paid people from the bottom to the top. There are clear distinctions between line and staff responsibilities in our business unit which is also characterized by functional specialization.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither Disagree Nor Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

67. There is a set of independent, discrete contracts with external suppliers and disconnected arrangements with internal units for supply chain management process.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither Disagree Nor Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

68. Our business unit gives very much importance to developing, fostering and leveraging relationships with individuals and sets of customers and there is a set of ongoing, tightly bonded relationships internal and external to the business unit in terms of product/service.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither Disagree Nor Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

69. Our business unit develops and manages a network of relationships with entities like rivals, channels, end-users and market professionals to identify, reach, and satisfy customers. It also leads and participates in multiple networks to spawn, nurture and integrate the development of products/services that otherwise would be impossible.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither Disagree Nor Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Please indicate how often your strategic business unit engages in the following.

	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
70. First to market new products and services	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
71. Later entrant in established but still growing markets.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
72. Entrant in mature, stable markets.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
73. At the cutting edge of technological innovation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
74. Our strategic business unit does not give emphasis to acquiring information from internally-focused experience.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
75. Our strategic business unit gives emphasis to acquiring information from externally-focused experience by using small-scale market experiments, large-scale demonstration projects, etc.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
76. Our strategic business unit gives emphasis to acquiring information from the experience of others through common practices like benchmarking, forming joint ventures, networking, making strategic alliances, working with lead customers, etc.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
77. Our strategic business unit provides opportunities for individual development other than formal training like work assignments and job rotation.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
78. Our strategic business unit does not encourage its members to attend formal developmental activities like training, professional seminars, symposia.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
79. Important knowledge in our strategic business unit is recorded in information systems, operating procedures, mission statements, strategic business unit stories etc. so that people can have access to this strategic business unit memory.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
80. In our strategic business unit, information is accessible in a broader context by all strategic business unit players who might use or be affected by it.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
81. Our strategic business unit does not put emphasis on multifunctional activities and discussions.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
82. Our strategic business unit puts emphasis on information exchange among departments.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
83. Our strategic business unit puts emphasis on the removal of functional barriers that impede the flow of information among departments.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
84. Our strategic business unit continually attempts to reach a consensus on the meaning of information and its implications for business.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
85. In our strategic business unit, the ramifications of alternative action plans are carefully considered through effective conflict resolution processes.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
86. In our strategic business unit, conflict resolution is enhanced by the development of group norms that encourage open sharing of information.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
87. In our strategic business unit, conflict resolution is not enhanced by the development of group norms that remove constraints on information and communication flows.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
88. In our kind of business, customers' product/service preferences change quite a bit over time.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
89. Our customers tend to look for new products/services all the time.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
90. We are witnessing demand for our products and services from customers who never bought them before.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
91. New customers tend to have product/service related needs that are different from those of our existing customers.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
92. We cater to many of the same customers that we used to in the past.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
93. Competition in our industry is cutthroat.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
94. There are many promotion wars in our industry.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
95. Anything that one competitor can offer, others can match readily.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
96. Price competition is a hallmark of our industry.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
97. One hears of a new competitive move almost every day.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
98. Our competitors are relatively weak.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
99. The technology in our industry is changing rapidly.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
100. Technological changes provide big opportunities in our industry.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
101. A large number of new product/service ideas have been made possible through technological breakthroughs in our industry.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
102. Technological developments in our industry are rather minor.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Please indicate what you think about the satisfaction level of your customers.

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Please indicate the overall performance of your business unit:

	Poor	Bad	Neither Bad Nor Good	Good	Excellent
119. Overall performance of the business unit last year is:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
120. Overall performance relative to major competitors last year is:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please indicate the specific comparative performance of your business unit:

	Much worse than competition	Worse than competition	Same as competition	Better than competition	Much better than competition
121. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, our business unit's market share	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
122. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, our business unit's market share growth	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
123. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, our business unit's sales growth in %	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
124. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, number of successful products/services introduced by our business unit	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
125. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, percentage of sales generated by new product/services in our business unit	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
126. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, our business unit's profitability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
127. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, our business unit's total sales revenue in TL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
128. When compared with the major competitors over the past year, our business unit's sales volume in units	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please indicate how your strategic business unit is performing relative to your strategic business unit's stated objectives about the below criteria:

	Poor	Bad	Neither Bad Nor Good	Good	Excellent
129. Customer satisfaction	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
130. Customer retention	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
131. Product/service quality	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please answer the following questions regarding your business unit.

132. What was the total sales revenue of your business unit last year? (TL)	_____
133. What was sales revenue (TL) growth of your business unit compared to year before? (%)	_____
134. What was the total profit of your business unit last year? (TL)	_____
135. What was the profit growth of your business unit compared to previous year? (%)	_____
136. What was the market share of your business unit in its principal served market last year? (%)	_____
137. What was the market share growth of your business unit in its principal served market last year? (%)	_____
138. What was the total sales volume of your business unit in its principal served market last year? (units)	_____
139. What was the unit sales growth of your business unit last year? (%)	_____

140. What was the number of successful new products/services introduced by your business unit last year? _____
141. What was the percentage of sales generated by your new products/services last year? (%) _____

Please answer the following questions regarding your business unit.

142. Which sector does this business unit operate?

- a. Manufacturing
- b. Service
- c. Other. Please specify: _____

143. Which market does this business unit serve mostly?

- a. Consumer market
- b. Industrial market
- c. Service market
- d. Other. Please specify: _____

144. What is the operation area of this business unit?

- a. Food & Drinks
- b. Household Goods
- c. Financial Services
- d. Health
- d. Other. Please specify: _____

145. Please specify the products/brands of this business unit?

146. Please indicate the number of full-time employees working in this company?

- a. <100
- b. 100-250
- c. 251-500
- d. 501-750
- e. >750

147. Please indicate the number of full-time employees working in this business unit: _____

148. What is your title in this business unit: _____

149. How is your distribution of capital in this business unit? Please indicate the percentage of local and foreign capital:

- a. Local: _____% b. Foreign: _____%

150. Which methods does your strategic business unit use for collecting information about your customers? (Please mark all that are applicable)

- a. Market research (in-house and research firms)
- b. Call center
- c. Database marketing
- d. CRM application packages
- e. Sales force interpersonal relationships
- e. Other. Please specify: _____

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE IN TURKISH

Bu anket Boğaziçi Üniversitesinde yapılmakta olan doktora tezinin bir parçasıdır. Anketin amacı Türkiye’de kurumsal ortamlarda pazarlamanın bütünsel çerçevesini oluşturabilmektir. Aşağıdaki tüm sorular yönetim birimi ile ilgilidir. Bu ankete gösterdiğiniz ilgi ve değerli katkılarınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

Lütfen stratejik yönetim biriminiz ile ilgili aşağıdaki ifadelerle katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtiniz. Katılıp katılmama derecenizi en iyi gösteren kutucuğu/çizgiyi işaretleyiniz.

1. Tüketicilerin her yerde bulunabilen ve pahalı olmayan ürün/hizmetleri tercih ettiklerine inanıyoruz. Yöneticilerimiz yaygın dağıtım, düşük maliyet ve yüksek üretim verimliliği elde etmeye konsantre olmuşlardır. Yöneticilerimiz tüketicilerin öncelikle ürün/hizmet bulunurluğuna ve düşük fiyatlara önem verdiklerine inanırlar.

☐ Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum ☐ Katılmıyorum ☐ Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum ☐ Katılıyorum ☐ Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

2. Tüketicilerin en iyi kalite, performans ve yenilikçi özellikleri sunan ürün/hizmetleri tercih ettiklerine inanıyoruz. Yöneticilerimiz fonksiyonel olarak en iyi ürünü tasarlamaya ya da üstün hizmet sunmaya ve zamanla bunları geliştirmeye odaklanmıştır. Yöneticilerimiz tüketicilerin iyi tasarlanmış ürün ve hizmetleri, kalite ve performansı takdir edeceklerine inanır. Tüketiciler ürün ve hizmetlerin satılmasında ya da sunulmasında bir araç olarak görülürler. Tedarikçi zinciri fonksiyonel olarak en iyi ham madde ve yedek parçaları elde edebilmek için oluşturulmuştur. Yönetim birimimiz ürün ve hizmetleri tasarlarken tüketicilerin isteklerine ya da rakiplerin sunduğu ürün ve hizmetlere çok az önem verir. Aksine, yönetim birimimiz genelde üretim / operasyon bölümlerinin bildirimlerine göre hareket eder.

☐ Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum ☐ Katılmıyorum ☐ Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum ☐ Katılıyorum ☐ Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

3. Tüketicilerin ve kurumların eğer yalnız bırakılırlarsa yeteri kadar ürün ve hizmet almayacaklarına inanıyoruz. Bu yüzden yönetim birimleri agresif satış ve promosyon yöntemleri izlemek zorundadırlar. Tüketicilerin tipik olarak satın almaya karşı bir resistans göstereceklerine ve bu yüzden de satın almaya zorlanmalarının gerektiğine inanıyoruz. Piyasanın istediğini yapmaktan çok yaptıklarımızı satmayı amaçlıyoruz.

☐ Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum ☐ Katılmıyorum ☐ Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum ☐ Katılıyorum ☐ Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

Lütfen stratejik yönetim biriminiz ile ilgili aşağıdaki ifadelerle katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtiniz. Katılıp katılmama derecenizi en iyi gösteren kutucuğu/çizgiyi işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
4. İş amaçlarımıza tüketici ihtiyaçları yön verir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Tüketici ihtiyaçlarına cevap verme taahhütümüz vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Rekabet üstünlüğü müşteri ihtiyaçlarını anlamaya bağlıdır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Stratejiler müşteriye sunulan değerin artırılması amacına yöneliktir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Sık sık müşteri memnuniyetini ölçeriz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Satış sonrası hizmete çok önem veririz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Rakipler hakkında bilgileri paylaşıyoruz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Rakiplerin aksiyonlarına hızla cevap veririz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. Yönetim düzenli olarak rakiplerin güçlü/zayıf yönlerini gözden geçirir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
13. Rekabet üstünlüğü fırsatları için müşteri hedefleriz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. Departmanlar arasında bilgi paylaşımı vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. Müşteri bilgileri fonksiyonlar arasında paylaşılır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. Çalışanların müşteriye nasıl değer yaratabildiklerine bakarız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. Stratejide fonksiyonel bütünlük mevcuttur.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. Yönetim birimleri arasında kaynak paylaşımı vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
19. Genelde pazar payı elde etmek için karlılığı feda ederiz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. Genelde pazar payımızı artırmak için fiyat düşürürüz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
21. Genelde rekabetin altında fiyat belirleriz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
22. Genelde nakit akışı ve karlılıktan vazgeçerek pazar payında iyi bir yer elde etmeye çalışırız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
23. Farklı fonksiyonel bölümler arasında etkin koordinasyonu vurgularız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
24. Bilgi sistemlerimiz karar vermek için destek sağlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
25. Önemli bir kararla karşı karşıya kalındığında genelde bu kararı analizler sonucunda oluşturmaya çalışırız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
26. Çeşitli planlama teknikleri kullanırız .	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
27. Yönetim bilgi ve kontrol sistemlerinin çıktılarını kullanırız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
28. Yöneticilerin işgücü planlamaları ve performans değerlendirmeleri yapılır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
29. Üretim teknolojisinde bazen belirgin değişiklikler yaparız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
30. Performansı izlemek için sık sık maliyet kontrol sistemleri kullanırız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
31. Sık sık üretim yönetimi teknikleri kullanırız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
32. Kaliteye verdiğimiz önem şirketteki kalite gruplarından anlaşılabilir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
33. Rekabet üstünlüğü sağlamak için araştırmaların gerekliliğini vurgularız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
34. Süreçlerin ana göstergelerini tahmin etmek yaygın olarak kullanılır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
35. Belirgin genel trendlerin formal olarak izlenmesi yaygın bir yöntemdir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
36. Sık sık önemli konular hakkında 'eğerolursa ne olur' analizlerini gerçekleştiririz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
37. Düzenli olarak mevcut süreçlerle ilgili yeni fırsatlar ararız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
38. Piyasaya yeni ürün/hizmet sunmada genelde birinciyiz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
39. Düzenli olarak yeni iş alanlarının alınması arayışındayız.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
40. Yaşam döngüsünün ileriki bölümlerindeki operasyonlar stratejik olarak elimine edilmiştir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
41. Önemli kararlar alırken konservatif bir bakış açımız vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
42. Yeni projeler tümünden onaylanmaktansa bölüm bölüm onaylanır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
43. Beklenen geri dönüşlerin kesin olduğu projeleri destekleme eğilimimiz vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
44. Operasyonlarımız genelde denenmiş ve doğrulanmış metodları izler.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen aşağıdaki her soru için 100 puanı seçenekler arasında dağıtınız.

45.	(A) Yönetim birimimiz oldukça kişisel bir ortamdan oluşmaktadır. Genişletilmiş bir aile ortamı vardır. İnsanlar kendileri ile ilgili çok şey paylaşırlar.	(B) Yönetim birimimiz oldukça dinamik ve girişimci bir ortamdan oluşmaktadır. Çalışanlar kafalarını uzatıp risk almak isteyen kişilerdir.
A için puanlar	_____	B için puanlar
	(C) Yönetim birimimiz oldukça formal ve yapısal bir ortamdır. Yerleşmiş prosedürler genelde kişilerin ne yapacaklarını belirler.	(D) Yönetim birimimiz üretime yönelik bir ortamdır. En önemli konu kişiselliği çok vurgulamadan işi bitirmektir.
C için puanlar	_____	D için puanlar
46.	(A) Üst düzey yöneticilerimiz genelde mentor gibi davranan bilge kişilerdir. Baba ya da anne figürü gibi hareket ederler.	(B) Üst düzey yöneticilerimiz genelde girişimci, yenilikçi ya da risk alan kişilerdir.
A için puanlar	_____	B için puanlar
	(C) Üst düzey yöneticilerimiz genelde koordinatör, organizatör ya da idareci kişilerdir.	(D) Üst düzey yöneticilerimiz genelde üretici ve teknik kişilerdir.
C için puanlar	_____	D için puanlar
47.	(A) Sadakat ve gelenek yönetim birimimizi birarada tutan en önemli unsurlardır. Kuruma bağlılık çok önemlidir.	(B) Yeniliğe ve gelişime olan bağlılık yönetim birimimizi birarada tutan en önemli unsurdur. Birinci olmaya önem verilir.
A için puanlar	_____	B için puanlar
	(C) Formal kurallar ve politikalar yönetim birimimizi birarada tutan en önemli unsurlardır. Düzenli işleyen bir kurum yapısını korumak önemlidir.	(D) Görev ve hedeflerin başarılmasına verilen önem yönetim birimimizi birarada tutan en önemli unsurlardır. Üretime verilen önem paylaşılan önemli bir değerdir.
C için puanlar	_____	D için puanlar
48.	(A) Yönetim birimimiz insan kaynaklarına önem verir. Yüksek bağlılık ve moral önemlidir.	(B) Yönetim birimimiz büyümeyi ve yeni kaynaklar elde etmeyi vurgular. Yenilikleri karşılamaya hazır olmak önemlidir.
A için puanlar	_____	B için puanlar
	(C) Yönetim birimimiz süreklilik ve dengeyi vurgular. Etkin ve düzgün işleyen süreçler önemlidir.	(D) Yönetim birimimiz rekabetçi aksiyonları ve elde edilmiş başarıları vurgular. Ölçülebilen hedefler önemlidir.
C için puanlar	_____	D için puanlar

Lütfen yönetim biriminiz için aşağıdaki yeteneklerin önem derecesini belirtiniz.

	Hiç Önemli Değil	Önemli Değil	Ne Önemli Ne Önemli	Önemli	Çok Önemli
49. Mevcut ve yeni pazarlardaki olay ve trendleri hissetmek ve buna göre davranmak için müşteriler, rakipler ve tedarikçiler hakkında bilgi toplama yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
50. Uzun süreli yakın müşteri ilişkileri kurma ve yönetme yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
51. Tedarikçiler ile koordinasyon, ortak programlara katılma ve sürekli iletişimde bulunmaya dayanan yakın ve işbirlikçi ilişkiler kurma ve yönetme yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
52. Çevredeki teknolojik değişiklikleri izleme ve bunlara göre gerekli aksiyonları alma yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
53. Finansal Yönetim Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
54. Maliyet Kontrol Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
55. Teknoloji Geliştirme Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
56. Lojistik Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
57. Üretim ya da Operasyonel Yetenek	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
58. İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
59. Çevre Sağlığı ve Güvenliğini Koruma ve Geliştirme Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
60. Müşteri İsteklerini Yerine Getirme Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
61. Fiyatlama Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
62. Satın Alma Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
63. Müşteri Hizmeti Sunma Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
64. Yeni Ürün/Hizmet Geliştirme Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
65. Strateji Geliştirme Yeteneği	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelerle katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtiniz. Katılıp katılmama derecenizi en iyi gösteren çizgiyi işaretleyiniz.

66. Organizasyon şeklimiz; yukarıya doğru gittikçe daha az sayıda olan ve daha çok maaş alan kişilerden oluşan piramit şeklindedir. Yönetim birimimizde yöneticilerin ve diğer çalışanların sorumlulukları arasında kesin çizgiler yani fonksiyonel uzmanlaşma vardır.

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

67. Tedarikçi zinciri yönetimi sürecinde dış tedarikçilerle ve iç birimlerle birbirinden bağımsız farklı anlaşmalar ve düzenlemeler vardır.

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

68. Yönetim birimimiz bireysel ve gruplar halinde müşterilerle ilişkileri geliştirmeye ve güçlendirmeye çok önem verir. Ürün/hizmetlerle ilgili yönetim birimi içi ve dışında sürekli ve güçlü ilişkiler vardır.

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

69. Yönetim birimimiz müşteri tanımlama, müşteriye ulaşma ve onları tatmin etme konularında rakipler, tedarikçiler, son kullanıcılar ve profesyonellerle iletişim ağı kurar ve yönetir. Yönetim birimimiz aksi takdirde geliştirilmesi imkansız olan ürün/hizmetleri oluşturmak, büyütmek, birleştirmek için çeşitli networklere katılır ya da liderlik eder.

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen yönetim biriminizin aşağıdaki durumlarda bulunma sıklığını belirtiniz.

	Hiçbir Zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Sık Sık	Her Zaman
70. Yeni ürün/hizmetleri pazarlamada birinci	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
71. Yerleşmiş ama halen büyümekte olan pazarlara geç giren	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
72. Olgun ve istikrarlı pazarlara giren	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
73. Teknolojik yeniliklerin tam ortasında olan	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelere katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtiniz. Katılıp katılmama derecenizi en iyi gösteren çizgiyi işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
74. Yönetim birimimiz kurum içi deneyimlerden elde edilen bilgiye önem vermez.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
75. Yönetim birimimiz küçük ölçekli piyasa deneyleri, büyük ölçekli gösterim projeleri kullanarak elde edilen kurum dışı deneyimlerden gelen bilgiye önem verir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
76. Yönetim birimimiz benchmark yaparak, stratejik ortaklıklar, networkler, birleşik girişimlerde bulunarak, önemli müşterilerle beraber çalışarak başkalarının deneyimlerinden elde edilen bilgiye önem verir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
77. Yönetim birimimiz formal eğitimlerden çok kişilere değişik görevler vererek ve rotasyon yaparak kişisel gelişime yönelik fırsatlar sunar.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
78. Yönetim birimimiz çalışanlarını eğitim, seminer ve sempozyumlar gibi formal gelişim aktivitelerine katılma konusunda teşvik etmez.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
79. Çalışanların kolayca öğrenebilmeleri ve alışmaları için önemli bilgiler kurum misyonuna, bilgi sistemlerine, prosedürlere, organizasyon öykülerine entegre edilmiştir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
80. Yönetim birimimizde bilgiyi kullanacak ya da bu bilgiden etkilenebilecek herkesin bu bilgiye erişimi vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
81. Yönetim birimimiz birden fazla bölümün katılması gereken aktivite ve görüşmeleri teşvik etmez.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
82. Yönetim birimimiz bölümler arası bilgi paylaşımına önem verir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
83. Yönetim birimimiz bölümler arası bilgi akışını engelleyecek fonksiyonel bariyerlerin kaldırılmasına önem verir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
84. Yönetim birimimiz düzenli olarak bilginin ne anlama geldiği ve iş için göstergelerinin ne olduğu konusunda fikir birliğine varmaya çalışır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
85. Yönetim birimimizde etkin sorun çözümleme süreçlerinde alternatif aksiyon planlarının etkileri dikkatle incelenir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
86. Yönetim birimimizde sorun çözümleme açık bilgi paylaşımını destekleyen grup normlarının oluşturulmasıyla teşvik edilir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
87. Yönetim birimimizde sorun çözümlemeye yönelik olarak iletişim ve bilgi akışındaki engelleri kaldırmaya yönelik grup normlarının geliştirilmesi teşvik edilmez.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
88. İş kolumuzda müşterilerin ürün/hizmet tercihleri zamanla az değişmektedir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
89. Müşterilerimiz her zaman yeni ürün ve hizmet arama eğilimindedirler.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
90. Ürün/hizmetlerimizi daha önce hiç almanmış ya da kullanmamış olan müşterilerden de ürün/hizmetlerimize yönelik talep gelmektedir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
91. Yeni müşterilerimizin ürün ve hizmetlerimize yönelik ihtiyaçları mevcut müşterilerimizden farklı olmaktadır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
92. Geçmişten alışık olduğumuz aynı müşterilerimize hizmet vermekteyiz.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
93. Sektörümüzde kızgın bir rekabet vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
94. Sektörümüzde promosyon savaşları fazladır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
95. Rakiplerin sunduğu herhangi bir ürün ya da hizmet kolayca başkaları tarafından taklit edilebilir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
96. Fiyat rekabeti sektörümüzün belirleyici bir unsurdur.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
97. Hemen hemen her gün yeni bir rakip hareketi gözlemlenir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
98. Genelde güçlü rakiplerimiz vardır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
99. Sektörümüzde teknoloji hızla değişir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
100. Sektörümüzde teknolojik değişiklikler büyük fırsatlar yaratır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
101. Yeni ürün/hizmet fikirlerinin pek çoğu sektörümüzdeki teknolojik gelişimlerle hayata geçmiştir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
102. Sektörümüzdeki teknolojik gelişmeler genelde küçük çaplıdır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

103. Lütfen geçmiş yıla bakarak kurumunuzun faaliyet gösterdiği pazarın gelir bakımından nasıl bir gelişme gösterdiğini belirtiniz .

Hızla Azalan	Azalan	Ne Azalan Ne Çoğalan	Çoğalan	Hızla Çoğalan
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelere katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtiniz. Katılıp katılmama derecenizi en iyi gösteren çizgiyi işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
104. Çalışanlar kendi geleceklerinin yönetim biriminin geleceğine yakından bağlı olduğunu hissederler.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
105. Çalışanlar yönetim birimlerinin iyiliği için fedakarlıkta bulunmaktan mutluluk duyarlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
106. Yönetim birimi ve çalışanlar arasındaki bağ zayıftır.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
107. Genelde çalışanlar bu yönetim birimi için çalışmaktan gurur duyarlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
108. Çalışanlar genelde yönetim biriminin menfaati için kendi işlerinin dışına çıkarlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
109. Çalışanların yönetim birimine bağlılıkları ya çok azdır ya da yoktur.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
110. Çalışanların yönetim birimine olan düşkünlüğü açıkça görülmektedir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
111. Bu yönetim biriminde çalışanlar birbirlerinin ihtiyaç ve problemleriyle içtenlikle ilgilenirler.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
112. Bu yönetim biriminde takım ruhu her mevkide mevcuttur.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
113. Bu yönetim biriminde çalışmak büyük bir ailenin parçası olmak gibidir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
114. Bu yönetim biriminde çalışanlar birbirlerine duygusal olarak bağlıdırlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
115. Bu yönetim biriminde takım ruhu eksiktir.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
116. Bu yönetim biriminde çalışanlar kendilerini etrafında bulunanları tolere etmek zorunda olan bağımsız bireyler olarak görürler.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen müşterilerinizin memnuniyet dereceleri hakkındaki görüşlerinizi belirtiniz.

117. Müşterileriniz yönetim biriminizin ürün/hizmetlerinden ne kadar memnunlar?

Hiç Memnun Değil Tamamiyle Memnun

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100



118. Müşterileriniz genelde yönetim biriminizden ne kadar memnunar?

Hiç Memnun Değil Tamamiyle Memnun

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100



Lütfen yönetim biriminizin genel performansını belirtiniz:

	Çok Kötü	Kötü	Ne Kötü Ne İyi	İyi	Çok İyi
119. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin genel performansı:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
120. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin en büyük rakiplerine göre genel performansı	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen yönetim biriminizin rekabete göre performansı ile ilgili aşağıdaki sorulara cevap veriniz:

	Rekabete Göre Çok Kötü	Rekabete Göre Kötü	Rekabetle Aynı	Rekabete Göre İyi	Rekabete Göre Çok İyi
121. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin pazar payı:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
122. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin pazar payı büyümesi:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
123. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin satışlarındaki yüzdesel büyüme:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
124. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin piyasaya sunduğu başarılı ürün/hizmet sayısı:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
125. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin yeni ürün/hizmetlerle yarattığı satış yüzdesi:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
126. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin karlılığı:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
127. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin TL olarak toplam cirosu:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
128. Geçen sene içinde büyük rakiplerinize karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin adetsel satış hacmi:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen yönetim biriminizin hedeflerine göre aşağıdaki kriterlerde performansının nasıl olduğunu belirtiniz.

	Çok Kötü	Kötü	Ne Kötü Ne İyi	İyi	Çok İyi
129. Müşteri memnuniyeti	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
130. Müşterilerin elde tutulması	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
131. Ürün/Hizmet kalitesi	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Lütfen yönetim biriminiz ile ilgili aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız.

132. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin toplam cirosu? (TL)	_____
133. Bir önceki sene ile karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin cirosundaki (TL) artış (%)	_____
134. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin toplam karı? (TL)	_____
135. Bir önceki sene ile karşılaştırıldığında yönetim biriminizin toplam karındaki artış (%)	_____
136. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin hizmet verdiği ana pazardaki pazar payı ne idi? (%)	_____
137. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin hizmet verdiği ana pazardaki pazar payı büyümesi ne idi? (%)	_____
138. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin hizmet verdiği ana pazardaki adetsel olarak toplam satış hacmi (adet)	_____
139. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin adetsel satışlarındaki büyüme yüzdesi ne idi? (%)	_____
140. Geçen sene yönetim biriminiz tarafından piyasaya sunulan başarılı yeni ürün/hizmet sayısı?	_____
141. Geçen sene yönetim biriminizin yeni ürün/hizmetlerle yarattığı satış yüzdesi (%)	_____

Lütfen yönetim biriminiz ile ilgili aşağıdaki soruları yanıtlayınız.

142. Yönetim biriminiz hangi sektörde faaliyet gösteriyor?

- a. Üretim
- b. Hizmet
- c. Diğer. Lütfen belirtiniz: _____

143. Yönetim biriminiz hangi piyasaya yönelik çalışıyor?

- a. Tüketici ürünleri pazarı
- b. Endüstriyel pazar
- c. Hizmet
- d. Diğer. Lütfen belirtiniz: _____

144. Yönetim biriminizin faaliyet alanı nedir?

- a. Gıda ve içecek
- b. Ev bakım ürünleri
- c. Finansal Hizmetler
- d. Sağlık
- e. Diğer. Lütfen belirtiniz: _____

145. Lütfen yönetim biriminizin ürünlerini/markalarını belirtiniz.

146. Firmanızda sürekli çalışan eleman sayısı nedir?

- a. <100
- b. 100-250
- c. 251-500
- d. 501-750
- e. >750

147. Yönetim biriminizde sürekli çalışan eleman sayısını lütfen belirtiniz _____

148. Yönetim biriminizde göreviniz nedir? _____

149. Yönetim biriminizin sermaye dağılımı nasıldır? Lütfen yabancı ve yerli sermaye oranlarını belirtiniz:

- a. Yerli: _____%
- b. Yabancı: _____%

150. Yönetim biriminiz müşterilerinizle ilgili bilgi toplamak için hangi metodları kullanıyor? (Birden çok şıkki işaretleyebilirsiniz)

- a. Pazar araştırması (firma içinde ayrı bir departman tarafından ya da dışarıdan profesyonel bir firma tarafından)
- b. Call Center
- c. Veritabanlı pazarlama
- d. CRM (müşteri ilişkileri yönetimi ile ilgili yazılım paketleri ile)
- e. Satış personelinin kişisel ilişkileri
- f. Diğer. Lütfen belirtiniz: _____

APPENDIX 3

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION LIST

VARIABLE	OPERATIONAL DEFINITION	SOURCE
Production Orientation	Q1	Adapted by the author by the studies of Kotler (2002); Srivastava, Shervani & Fahey (1999); Author
Product Orientation	Q2	Adapted by the author by the studies of Kotler (2002); Srivastava, Shervani & Fahey (1999); Author
Sales Orientation	Q3	Adapted by the author by the studies of Kotler (2002); Srivastava, Shervani & Fahey (1999); Author
Market Orientation	Q4-Q18	Narver& Slater (1990)
-Customer Orientation	Q4-Q9	Narver & Slater (1990)
-Competitor Orientation	Q10-Q13	Narver & Slater (1990)
-Interfunctional Coordination	Q14-Q18	Narver & Slater (1990)
Strategic Orientation	Q19-Q44	Venkatraman(1989); Morgan&Strong (1998)
-Aggressiveness	Q19-Q22	Venkatraman(1989); Morgan&Strong (1998)
-Analysis	Q23-Q28	Venkatraman(1989); Morgan&Strong (1998)
-Defensiveness	Q29-Q32	Venkatraman(1989); Morgan&Strong (1998)
-Futurity	Q33-Q36	Venkatraman(1989); Morgan&Strong (1998)
-Proactiveness	Q37-Q40	Venkatraman(1989); Morgan&Strong (1998)
-Riskiness	Q41-Q44	Venkatraman(1989); Morgan&Strong (1998)
Organizational Culture	Q45-Q48	Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993); Deshpande and Farley (1999); Quinn (1988); Cameron&Freeman (1991)
Organizational Capability	Q49-Q65	Day (1994), Author
-Outside-In Capabilities	Q49-Q52	Day (1994), Author
-Inside-Out Capabilities	Q53-Q59	Day (1994), Author
-Spanning Capabilities	Q60-Q65	Day (1994), Author
Organizational Form	Q66-Q69	Webster 1992; Srivastava,Shervani and Fahey (1999); Author
-Hierarchical Form	Q66	Webster 1992; Srivastava,Shervani and Fahey (1999); Author
-Transactional Form	Q67	Webster 1992; Srivastava,Shervani and Fahey (1999); Author
-Relational Form	Q68	Webster 1992; Srivastava,Shervani and Fahey (1999); Author
-Network Form	Q69	Webster 1992; Srivastava,Shervani and Fahey (1999); Author
Organizational Innovativeness	Q70-Q73	Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993); Deshpande and Farley (1999); Capon, Farley & Hulbert (1998); Capon, Farley, Hulbert&Lehmann (1992)
Organizational Learning	Q74-Q87	Author, Slater & Narver 1995; Hurley & Hult (1998)
-Information Acquisition	Q74-Q79	Author, Slater & Narver 1995;Hurley & Hult (1998)
-Information Dissemination	Q80-Q83	Author, Slater & Narver 1995;Hurley & Hult (1998)
-Shared Interpretation	Q84-Q87	Author, Slater & Narver 1995;Hurley & Hult (1998)

VARIABLE DEFINITION	OPERATIONAL	SOURCE
Market Turbulence	Q88-Q92	Jaworski & Kohli (1993)
Competitive Intensity	Q93-Q98	Jaworski & Kohli (1993)
Technological Turbulence	Q99-Q102	Jaworski & Kohli (1993)
Market Growth	Q103	Avlonitis & Gournaris (1999)
Employee Responses	Q104-Q116	Jaworski & Kohli (1993)
-Organizational Commitment	Q104-Q110	Jaworski & Kohli (1993)
-Esprit de Corps	Q111-Q116	Jaworski & Kohli (1993)
Customer Satisfaction	Q117-Q118	Author
Organizational Performance	Q119-Q141	Jaworski & Kohli (1993); Author; Harker & Rao (1999); Matzuno & Mentzer (2000); Yalman (2003); Deshpande, Farley & Webster (1993); Deshpande & Farley (1999); Ruekert (1992); Narver & Slater (1990); Slater & Narver (1994); Greenley (1995a, 1995b); Hart & Diamantopoulos (1993); Cavusgil and Zou (1994)
-Overall Subjective Performance	Q119-Q120	Jaworski & Kohli (1993)
-Subjective Comparative Performance	Q121-Q128	Author; Vorhies, Harker & Rao (1999); Matzuno & Mentzer (2000); Yalman (2003)
-Subjective Performance Compared to Objectives	Q129-Q131	Cavusgil and Zou (1994)
-Objective Performance	Q132-Q141	Author; Deshpande, Farley & Webster (1993); Deshpande & Farley (1999); Ruekert (1992); Jaworski & Kohli (1993); Narver & Slater (1990); Slater & Narver (1994); Greenley (1995a, 1995b); Hart & Diamantopoulos (1993), Yalman (2003)
Sector	Q142	Author
Served Market	Q143	Yalman (2003)
Operation Area	Q144	Yalman (2003)
Product/Brand Specification	Q145	Yalman (2003)
# of Full-Time Employees of the Company	Q146	Yalman (2003)
# of Full-Time Employees of the Strategic Business Unit	Q147	Yalman (2003)
Title of the Respondent	Q148	Yalman (2003)
Distribution of Capital	Q149	Yalman (2003)
Information Collection Method	Q150	Yalman (2003)

APPENDIX 4

LIST of FIRMS

COMPANIES	NUMBER of RESPONDENTS
Arçelik	3
Tansaş	2
Gima	3
Nestle	5
Eczacıbaşı Yapı	7
Henkel	7
Novartis	6
Vepa Sport-Nike	3
Marshall	3
Evyap	7
Siemens Business	3
Bosch	4
SAP	5
Glaxo Welcome	6
Beko	6
Coca Cola	3
Pınar	8
Alarko	5
Vestel	8
Mercedes	2
Marsa	7
Anadolu Efes	6
Fujitsu Siemens	2
Eczacıbaşı İlaç	6
Roche	7
Brisa	2
Pfizer	3
DYO	3
Alcatel	4
İpek Kâğıt	4
P&G	8
Shell	2
Finansbank	2
TOTAL	152