

DOMINANT TYPOLOGIES OF STRATEGIC ORIENTATION IN THE NIGERIAN TELECOMMUNICATION SECTOR: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

¹Olusanmi DipoOlatunbosun; ² Waribugo Sylva

¹University of Port Harcourt Business School, Nigeria

²Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, P. O. Box 419, Choba, Nigeria

Abstract: This study investigated the dominant typologies of strategic orientation of telecommunication firms in Nigeria. The study identified technology orientation and market orientation as the two principal strands of strategic orientation. A cross-sectional survey design was adopted, while primary data were collected via the administration of a structured questionnaire. Copies of the questionnaire were administered to 123 top-level employees of the firms. However, 98 copies were correctly filled and used for analyses. The study examined the levels of manifestation of these variables, alongside their indicators, using their means. The results indicated that, although both variables manifest moderately, the telecommunication firms are more market oriented than they are technologically oriented. The study suggested that future studies should adopt longitudinal design and conduct a comparison on the extent of implementation of these strategic orientations among the companies.

Keywords: strategic orientation, technology orientation, market orientation, telecommunication firms

I. Introduction

The concept of strategic orientation (Venkatraman, 1989) continues to gain traction in scholarly literature and has been widely praised as a vehicle of innovation (Tho, 2019) competitive advantage (Chevrollier, Zhang, Leeuwen&Nijhof, 2020) and organisational performance (Gatignon&Xuereb, 1997). Also, numerous research works attest that an organisation's strategic orientation is an intangible asset (Barney, 1991) which serves as an instrument for sustainability performance that differentiates it from other organisations, thereby leading to increase in profits (Hsu, Tan and Mohamad, 2016). However, there are no commonly agreed typologies of strategic orientation as various scholars have suggested various strands such as market orientation, technological orientation, competitor orientation, customer orientation, cost orientation, innovation orientation, inter-functional orientation, learning orientation, interactional orientation, product orientation, and entrepreneurial orientation and employee orientation (Covin&Slevin 1989; Narver&Slater 1990; Gatignon&Xuereb 1997; Grawe, Chen & Daugherty, 2009; Ferraresi, Quandt, dos Santos & Frega, 2012; Hakala, 2010; Liu & Fu, 2011; Laukkanen, Nagy, Hirvonen, Reijonen&Pasanen, 2013; Tutara, Nart&Bingöl, 2015; Masa'deh, Al-Henzab, Tarhini&Obeidat, 2018). Besides this, there is mixed conceptualization and equivocality in literature concerning the meaning of strategic orientation.

Moreover, the choice of dimensions of strategic orientation adopted by scholars depends on the organisations or sectors being investigated. Specifically, while several studies have used various dimensions of strategic orientation in diverse sectors such as banks (e.g. Otache, 2019; Mazzarolo, Mainardes&Montemor, 2021), pharmaceutical industry in (Masa'deh et al., 2018), SMEs (Al-Ansaari, Bederr& Chen, 2015; Yadav, Tripathi&Goel, 2019), medium and large-sized organisations (Ibarra-Cisneros, Demuner-Flores & Hernández-Perlines, 2021), few empirical studies are available on the dominant typologies of strategic orientation in the telecommunication sector of developing countries.

That being said, recognizing the sectorial problems and stiff competition - and coupled with the emergence of Internet of Things (IoT), Augment Reality, 5G connectivity and web 4.0 - it appears there is need for Nigerian telecommunication firms to deploy strategic orientations. Based on the above, this study investigates levels of manifestation of two the facets of strategic orientation in the Nigerian telecommunication sector, namely: market orientation and technological orientation. The rest of the paper is presented in the following sequence: 1). A literature review on the concept of strategic orientation 2). The methodology - that reveals the steps for collecting and analysing data. 3) Results - which involves analysis of the means and standard deviations of the chosen strands of strategic orientation - in order to ascertain their levels of manifestation in the industry. 4). Conclusions.

II. Literature Review

2.1: Theoretical Framework

The Core Competence-Based View

The core competence-based view was introduced by Hamel and Prahalad (1994). Core competencies – also known as core distinct competencies, distinctive capabilities, dynamic capabilities and distinctive competencies (Enginoglu&Arikan, 2016; Özbag, 2013), define the shape of a company's operations, including how effectively its strategic objectives are achieved.

Core competencies are the integrated collection of capabilities (organizational routines and problem-solving skills) that distinguish the firm in the marketplace. A firm's core competencies are the source of its collective learning and sustainable competitive advantage (Al-Ansari, Altalib, &Sardoh, 2013). Moreover, corecompetences enable a firm to obtain strategic fit with its changing environments in order to create opportunities and capture values for long-term profitability (Eisenhardt, & Martin, 2000; Faiz, 2014). Core competencies could be in the form of intangible and intangible assets such as bundles of technical and functional skills, knowledge, abilities, experience of the employees, rare resources, technologies and expertise (Enginoglu&Arikan, 2016).

2.1.2: Strategic Orientation

Although companies in the same industry contend with the same sets of environmental challenges, their response patterns will not be the same. (O'Regan&Ghobadian, 2005) argue that the variability in response patterns among firms in the same industry is due to the differentstrategic orientations adopted by the firms (O'Regan&Ghobadian, 2005).According to Ramachandran, Lengnick-Hall and Badrinarayanan (2019), strategic orientation is the set of a company's "deeply rooted philosophies about how business needs to be conducted, and offer guiding principles for firms to aspire and achieve superior performance" (p. 1139). It is the cluster of "principles that direct and influence the activities of a firm and generate the behaviors intended to ensure its viability and performance" (Hakala, 2011, p. 199).Moreover,Gatingnon and Xuereb (1997) submit that strategic orientation is the set of "strategic directions implemented by a firm to create the proper behaviors for the continuous superior performance of the business" (p. 78).

Depending on how a company chooses to employ its available resources strategically, strategic orientation stimulates profitability, competitive advantage, and ultimately firm survival (Hong &Yoo, 2013; Chin-Chun &Zailani, 2016).The strategic orientation of a company is also important for managing new product knowledge since it influences how knowledge is shaped, learned, relocated, and joined as a reserve base for developing and releasing new goods (Nasir, Al-Mamun, & Breen, 2017).Gatignon and Xuereb, (1997) submit that strategic orientations lead to "better products that will perform better, and the firm will be able to market innovations better, thereby achieving a superior level of performance" (p.88).

2.1.3: Dimensions of Strategic Orientation

There are several typologies of strategic orientation that have been explored in literature. Earlier studies used aggressiveness, analysis, defensiveness, futurity, proactiveness, and riskiness as facets of strategic orientation (Venkatraman, 1989). However, recent literature is awash with other sets of strategic orientation dimensions such as technological orientation, market orientation, competitor orientation, inter-functional orientation, customer orientation, learning orientation, product orientation, and entrepreneurial orientation (Voss & Voss, 2000; Li, 2005; Grinstein, 2008; Hakala, 2010; Liu & Fu, 2011; Laukkanen, Nagy, Hirvonen, Reijonen&Pasanen, 2013; Tutara, Nart&Bingöl, 2015; Al-Ansaari, Bederr& Chen, 2015; Masa'deh, Al-Henzab, Tarhini&Obeidat, 2018). Paladino (2007) and Hakala (2010) identified market orientation and technological orientation as the dominant typologies of strategic orientation. This study adopts these typologies of strategic orientation in the Nigerian telecommunication industry.

Market Orientation

Market orientation is a firm's "ability to generate organization-wide market knowledge regarding current and future customer needs, to disseminate this intelligence across all organizational departments and to respond to the market by means of products and services developed based on market knowledge to meet customer needs" (Aydin, 2020). It is the extent to which the firm's strategies and operations are ready to respond to market demands and any changes in the market (Zayed&Alawad, 2017). A market orientated firm easily discovers and understands the needs of not only existing customers, but also potential ones (Na, Kang &Jeong, 2019).For Kumar, Subramania and Yauger (1998), market orientation is the "generation and dissemination of market intelligence that is composed of information about the external environment confronting an organization, sharing of this information among all functions in an organization and rapid managerial action in response to this information" (pp. 203-204). Such organization responds to the market demand more than competitors and predicts market changes well to create a sustainable competitive advantage and superior profits (Buli, 2017). They also have more reliable and

comprehensive information about the strengths and weaknesses of competitors, thereby enabling them to make smart decisions (Narver & Slater, 1990).

Felisia, Sidharta, and Yosia, (2020) suggest that firms with high market orientation are likely to have good customer relations and create superior customer value. Some of the empirical studies on market orientation reported that it is capable of contributing to desirable organisational outcomes such as knowledge creation, innovation success (Acosta, Crespo, & Agudo, 2018), financial performance (Na, Kang, & Jeong, 2019) and marketing performance (Felisia, Sidharta, & Yosia, 2020). Moreover, market orientation also amplifies product/service quality, customer loyalty, satisfaction (Obeidat, Tarhini, Masa'deh & Aqqad, 2017), organizational commitment, employee team spirit, customer satisfaction, job satisfaction, new product success (Atuahene-Gima, 1996), return on assets (Narver & Slater, 1990). It also reduces role conflict (Kirca, Jayachandran & Bearden, 2005).

Technology Orientation

Technology orientation is company's proclivity to acquire new technologies for the manufacturing of products or delivery of services (Hurley & Hult, 1998). It is the harnessing of a strong technologic infrastructure that is ultimately deployed to develop new products or render superior services (Tutar, Nart, & Bingöl, 2015). A firm with technological orientation deploys technological knowledge to predict and respond customers' needs (Mehmood & Zafar, 2019). Moreover, technologically oriented companies use technology to coordinate their structures, processes systems and resources to in order to compete favourably among rivals (Yadav, Parihar, Jat, Singh, Kumar, Pooniya, Parihar, Saveipune, Parmar, & Jat, 2016). Such firms pay much attention to research and development in order to obtain new technologies and improve existing ones (Al-Ansari, Altalib, & Sardoh, 2013). The idea of technology orientation is based on the logic that consumers show preference for technologically improved products and services (Ali, Leifu, & Rehman, 2016).

Technology orientation facilitates the acquisition and utilisation of marketing information, leading to product/process innovation, (Hurley & Hult, 1998; Saqib, Baluch, & Udin, 2017; Zeebaree & Siron, 2017), business growth (Lei, Wu & Fu, 2019), competitive advantage (Zhao, 2012; Nduati & Kavale, 2015) and better firm performance (Mehmood, & Zafar, 2019).

III. Methodology

3.1: Research Design, Population and Sampling

We adopted the quasi-experimental research design (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The population of this study is all the major telecommunication companies in Rivers State. The four dominant telecommunication companies are MTN, AIRTEL, GLOBACOM and 9MOBILE (Proshare Nigeria, 2020). These companies have one hundred and thirty one (123) representatives, comprising administrative managers, operations managers, project managers, marketing managers, accountants, network engineers, heads of IT customer experience and data analysts. People in these roles were chosen because they are knowledgeable about the dynamic processes that affect the research variables (Huber & Power, 1985). Because the number of registered paint enterprises is manageable, we studied the entire population. Thus, we administered 123 copies of the questionnaire to collect primary quantitative data.

3.2: Instrument Design and Measurement

Sections A and B make up the questionnaire. Six items in Section A refer to the respondents' demographic (personal) information (e.g. name of organization, gender, age, marital status), while section B comprises 5 indicators on technology orientation, and 6 items on market orientation.

We relied on previously validated scales. Technological Orientation comprises five observables obtained from Al-Ansaari, Bederr and Chen (2015), and Masa'deh, Al-Henzab, Tarhini and Obeidat (2018). Sample item is: "Our firm purchases and uses technologies to position itself ahead of competitors". Market Orientation was constructed with six items adopted from Al-Ansaari, Bederr and Chen (2015), and Masa'deh, Al-Henzab, Tarhini and Obeidat (2018). An example of the statement items is: "Our firm encourages internal sharing of market information to understand consumer/competitor behaviors". All of the study's observable indicators were anchored on a five-point Likert scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 5 indicating strong agreement.

3.3: Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

We gave the instrument to two academic experts in strategy and six managers of the telecommunication firms in Rivers state to face-validate it. The components and overall design of the instrument were deemed suitable, straightforward, easy, and meaningful by these experts (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008; Sreejesh, Mohapatra & Anusree, 2014). We guaranteed content validity by doing a thorough review of the literature on the research constructs and extracting enough items to test them. We went a step farther and contacted five corporate strategy specialists. These experts believed that the questionnaire items adequately expressed and covered all of the

constructs' domains (Bollen, 1989; Wynd, Schmidt, & Schaefer, 2003). The convergent validity of the constructs was also tested using a 50 percent Average Variance Extracted (AVE) benchmark (Fornell&Lacker, 1981). According to Leedy and Ormrod (2010, p.116), reliability is “the consistency with which a measurement instrument yields a certain, consistent result when the entity being measured hasn’t changed”. This study uses the Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) measure of internal consistency, which is the most widely used and best (Warrens, 2015). The study used an Alpha value ((α)) of 0.7 as the acceptable minimum reliabilityvalue (Nunnally& Bernstein, 1994).

3.4: Methods of Data Analysis

We used the following quantitative technique after retrieving and entering the data: First, we computed the data on the demographic features of the respondents using IBM@SPSS version 22.0.Secondly, we conducted a univariate analysis using percentages, means and standard deviations as yardsticks. The output on the means concerning the variables was utilized for the interpretation of the extent to which these variables manifest in the companies.Thirdly, we assessed the reliability and convergent validity of the constructs using Cronbach’s alpha and Average Variance Extracted criteria, respectively (Cronbach, 1951; Fornell&Lacker, 1981).

IV. Results

4.1 Fieldwork, Data Cleaning and Demographic Report

A total of 123 target respondents were given the questionnaire by hand. After four weeks (April 2nd to April 30th, 2021), a total of 98 copies of the questionnaire had been retrieved, giving a response rate of 79.7%. We were able to reach this high response rate by following up with phone calls, sending multiple emails, and cultivating a friendly relationship with the respondents (Yu, Alper, Nguyen, Brackbill, Turner, Walker, Maslow & Zweig, 2017).There was no data that was missing. As a result, all of the responses were entered into IBM@SPSS version 22.0 for analysis. Table 4.1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents.

Table 4.1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Characteristic		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	75	76.5	76.5	76.5
	Female	23	23.5	23.5	100.0
	Total	98	100.0	100.0	
Age	20-35	29	29.6	29.6	29.6
	36-50	57	58.2	58.2	87.8
	51-above	12	12.2	12.2	100.0
	Total	98	100.0	100.0	
Marital Status	Single	24	24.5	24.5	24.5
	Married	55	56.1	56.1	80.6
	Separated	11	11.2	11.2	91.8
	Divorced	8	8.2	8.2	100
	Total	98	100.0	100.0	
Educational Qualification	WAEC-OND	19	19.4	19.4	19.4
	HND/Bachelor	69	70.4	70.4	89.8
	Masters above	10	10.2	10.2	100
	Total	98	100.0	100.0	
Position in the Organisation	Managers	17	17.3	17.3	17.3
	Unit Heads	28	28.6	28.6	45.9
	Network Engineers	42	42.9	42.9	88.8
	Data Analysts	11	11.2	11.2	100
	Total	98	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data (SPSS Output) 2021

Table 4.1 indicates that out of the 98 respondents, 75 (76.5%) were males, whereas 23 (23.5%) of the respondents were females. Hence, the number of males is more than thrice that of females in the telecommunication firms in Rivers State.Makama (2013) submits that most organisations pay lip service to the equal opportunity policy and relegate the female gender because “there is the commonality of general belief system that the best place for women is in the ‘kitchen” (p. 115).

Also, 29 (29.6%) respondents are within the age bracket of 20-35 years, whereas 57 (58.2%) are within 36-50 years, and 12 (12.2%) are above 51 years in age. Hence, majority of the respondents are within the age bracket of 36-50 years. The telecommunication sector is one where industry relevant experience is highly connected to career growth. Hence, most of the employees in the sector must have spent a long time to obtain various cognate degrees, search for job and grow in the job.

Moreover, 55 (56.1%) are married, 24 respondents (24.5%) are single, 11 respondents (11.2%) are separated, while 8 respondents (8.2%) are divorced. Thus, majority of the respondents are married. This is not surprising as Nigerians generally view marriage as a normative developmental achievement. On the other hand, anyone who is of age and is still single is seen as less responsible. Moreover, society perceives divorced and separated people as less mature, and less capable of adjusting to changing situations and pressures than married people (Morris, DePaulo, Hertel, & Taylor, 2008). Thus, most people quickly get married as soon as they have the capacity to cater for their marital and family needs.

Table 4.1 also reveals that 69 (70.4%) respondents have earned Higher National Diploma and bachelor degree, while 10 respondents (10.2%) have master degree and above. Those with West African School Certificate and Ordinary National Diploma (WASC-OND) are 19, representing 19.4 % of the entire respondents. Thus, a great number of managers in the sector are well educated. Thus, they should have good understanding of organisational processes and the variables under investigation.

Lastly, the highest number for responding positions is 42 for network engineers (representing 42.9%); this is followed by 28 unit heads (representing 28.6% of the total number of respondents); and 17 (17.3%) were managers. The category that recorded the least number is that of data analysts, which had 11 (representing 11.2%). This is not a surprise as much of the work in the telecommunication firms is related to operations and engineering tasks.

4.2 Univariate Analysis

The averages, standard deviations, and kurtosis of the two latent constructs were calculated using the data. Low, moderate, high, and very high were assigned to mean values (M) ranging from 1.0 to 2.4.0, 2.5 to 3.4, 3.5 to 4.4, and 4.5 and above, respectively (Asawo, 2009). The mean values indicate the degree to which the variables are manifested in the communications companies. Furthermore, if the skewness and kurtosis values of the variables and their items are divided by the appropriate Standard Errors (S.E), and the outputs fall between -2 and +2, the distribution of data concerning the variables and their items will be deemed normal (George & Mallery, 2010; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). Outputs for univariate analysis, including test for normality are shown in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics on the variables

Latent Variable	Indicator	N	Mean		Skewness (S_K)		Kurtosis (K_U)	
			Stat.	Stat.	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error
TOR (AVE= 0.54 $\alpha = 0.78$)	TOR ₁	98	2.54	0.92	1.61	0.84	1.91	1.08
	TOR ₂	98	2.41	1.08	-0.80	0.44	0.83	1.21
	TOR ₃	98	3.08	0.71	1.91	1.06	2.28	1.85
	TOR ₄	98	2.59	0.40	2.07	1.08	1.66	1.56
	TOR ₅	98	2.43	1.13	-1.71	0.91	1.46	0.75
MOR (AVE= 0.61 $\alpha = 0.72$)	MOR ₁	98	2.38	1.09	-0.48	0.27	1.99	1.08
	MOR ₂	98	2.41	0.17	-1.49	0.77	0.73	0.41
	MOR ₃	98	2.56	0.82	1.95	1.54	0.75	0.57
	MOR ₄	98	3.69	1.90	1.41	1.05	1.01	0.55
	MOR ₅	98	3.25	1.92	-1.77	0.91	0.67	0.48
	MOR ₆	98	2.88	0.87	0.46	1.03	2.05	1.18

Note: TOR = Technological Orientation; MOR = Market Orientation; AVE= Average Variance Extracted

Source: IBM@SPSS version 22.0 Output, 2021

Table 4.2 shows that no indicator in the overall model has problem of skewness, with the skewness ranging from MOR₅ ($S_K = -1.77$, Std. Error = 0.91) to MOR₃ ($S_K = 1.95$, Std. Error = 1.54). Furthermore, table 4.2 shows that no item has problem of kurtosis, with kurtosis ranging from MOR₅ ($K_U = 0.67$, Std. Error = 0.48) to TOR₃ ($K_U = 2.28$, Std. Error = 1.85). The instrument recorded satisfactory level of reliability, with alpha values of $\alpha = 0.78$ for technology orientation and $\alpha = 0.72$ for market orientation. Moreover, the instrument does not have convergent validity problem since AVEs of the constructs are greater than 50%.

Furthermore on univariate analysis, Table 4.2 shows that **technological orientation** manifested low on TOR₂ ($M = 2.41, SD = 1.08$) and TOR₅ ($M = 2.43, SD = 1.13$), while TOR₁ ($M = 2.54, SD = 0.92$), TOR₃ ($M = 3.08, SD = 0.71$) and TOR₄ ($M = 2.59, SD = 0.40$) manifested moderately in the telecommunication companies. In addition, for **market orientation**, MOR₁ ($M = 2.38, SD = 1.09$) and MOR₂ ($M = 2.41, SD = 0.17$) manifested low in the telecommunication firms; while MOR₃ ($M = 2.56, SD = 0.82$), MOR₅ ($M = 2.25, SD = 1.92$), and MOR₆ ($M = 2.88, SD = 0.87$) manifested moderately. However, MOR₄ ($M = 3.69, SD = 1.90$) recorded a high mean score in the telecommunication companies. Hence, the indicator that manifested least in the telecommunication companies is MOR₁ ($M = 2.38, SD = 1.09$), while MOR₄ ($M = 3.69, SD = 1.90$) recorded the highest mean score.

Table 4.3 shows the cumulative descriptive statistics on the study variables.

Table 4.3: Cumulative descriptive statistics on the study variables

Latent Variable	N	Mean		Standard Deviation		Skewness (S_K)		Kurtosis (K_U)	
		Stat.	Stat.	Stat.	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	
TOR	98	2.61	0.83	1.70	0.96	1.38	1.11		
MOR	98	2.86	1.41	-1.09	0.90	1.27	0.85		

Source: IBM@SPSS version 22.0 Output, 2021

Table 4.3 suggests that the telecommunication companies have moderate mean scores on technological orientation ($M = 2.61, SD = 0.83$), market orientation ($M = 2.86, SD = 1.41$). Hence, although both constructs have moderate mean scores, the level of manifestation of market orientation is higher than that of technological orientation.

V. Conclusion

This study investigated the dominant typologies of strategic orientation of telecommunication firms in Nigeria. The study identified technological orientation and market orientation as the two principal strands of strategic orientation. The study examined the levels of manifestation of these variables, alongside their indicators, using their means.

Using self-reported measures from respondents' perception, the study found that there is a low manifestation of the ability of the companies to purchase and use technologies to position themselves ahead of competitors or allocate resources for investments in latest technologies. The study also found that there is a moderate level to which the companies formulate policies to adopt up-to-date technologies, be the first to try out new methods and technologies, and improve internal processes such as speed, reliability and information management.

Furthermore, respondents generally agreed that they barely have proactive dialogues and mutual relationships with customers and are below average in quality customer service culture. Most of the respondents are of the opinion that their companies moderately implement immediate responses when our customers are targeted by other firms, encourage internal sharing of market information to understand consumer/competitor behaviours and pay close attention to after sale service. However, the study found that there is a high extent to which the telecommunication firms frequently take advantage of targeted opportunities to benefit from competitors' weaknesses. When the items of each construct were aggregated, it was found that the telecommunication firms are more market oriented than they are technologically oriented.

The study is not without limitations. It is a cross-sectional study and does not capture the nature of the variables over a long time span. Future studies should adopt longitudinal design. The study did not compare the level of implementation of strategic orientation among the four companies. Future studies should conduct a comparison using ANOVA.

References

- [1]. Acosta, A. S., Crespo, A. H., & Agudo, J. C. (2018). Effect of market orientation, network capability and entrepreneurial orientation on international performance of small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *International Business Review*, 30, 1–13.
- [2]. Al-Ansaari, Y., Bederr, H., & Chen, C. (2015). Strategic orientation and business performance: an empirical study in the UAE context. *Management Decision*, 53(10), 2287-2302.
- [3]. Al-Ansari, Y., Altalib, M., & Sardoh, M. (2013). Technology orientation, innovation and business performance: A study of Dubai SMEs. *The International Technology Management Review*, 3(1), 1-11.

- [4]. Ali, D., Leifu, G., & Rehman, R. U. (2016). The impact of technology orientation and customer orientation on firm performance: Evidence from Chinese firms. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 9(1), 1-11.
- [5]. Asawo, S.P. (2009) Spiritual leadership and workers' commitment in the Nigerian Manufacturing Industry (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation) Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt.
- [6]. Atuahene-Gima, K. (1996). Market orientation and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 35(2), 93-103.
- [7]. Aydin, H. (2020). Market orientation and product innovation: The mediating role of technological capability. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, (ahead-of-print), DOI:10.1108/EJIM-10-2019-0274.
- [8]. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-120. doi.org/10.1016/S0742-3322(00)17018-4
- [9]. Bollen, K. A. (1989). *Structural equations with latent variables*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [10]. Buli, B. M. (2017). Entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation and performance of SMEs in the manufacturing industry: Evidence from Ethiopian enterprises. *Management Research Review*, 40(3), 292-309.
- [11]. Chevrollier, N., Zhang, Z., Leeuwen, T. V., & Nijhof, A. (2020). The predictive value of strategic orientation for ESG performance over time. *Corporate Governance International Journal of Business in Society*, 20(1), 123-142.
- [12]. Chin-Chun, & Zailani, H. M. (2016). Strategic orientations, sustainable supply chain initiatives, and reverse logistics: empirical evidence from an emerging market. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 1-44.
- [13]. Covin, J. G., & Dennis P. S. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 75-87.
- [14]. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- [15]. Eisenhardt, K.M., & Martin, J.A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 10-11.
- [16]. Enginoglu, D., & Arikan, C.L. (2016). A literature review on core competencies. *International Journal of Management*, 7(3), 120-127.
- [17]. Faiz, M. A. (2014). Organization's core competencies; A key for successful & happy organization. *International Journal of Accounting and Business Management*, 2(1), 69-79.
- [18]. Felisia, C., Sidharta, H., & Yosia, I. B. (2020). The effect of entrepreneurship orientation and market orientation on marketing performance of furniture home industry in Sawahan district. *Review of Management and Entrepreneurship*, 04(02), 95-112.
- [19]. Ferraresi, A.A., Quandt, C.O., dos Santos, C.A., & Frega, J.R. (2012). Knowledge management and strategic orientation: leveraging innovativeness and performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(5), 688-701.
- [20]. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- [21]. Gatignon, H., & Xuereb, J-M. (1997). Strategic orientation of the firm and new product performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(1), 77-90.
- [22]. George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*, 17.0 update (10a Ed.) Boston, Pearson.
- [23]. Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2014). *Essentials of Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, (8th Ed.). United States of America, Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- [24]. Grawe, S. J., Chen, H., & Daugherty, P. J. (2009). The relationship between strategic orientation, service innovation, and performance. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 39(4), 282-300. doi:10.1108/09600030910962249
- [25]. Grinstein, A., (2008). The relationships between market orientation and alternative strategic orientations. A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42, (1/2), 115-134.
- [26]. Hakala, H. (2010). *Configuring out strategic orientation*. Master of Business Administration Thesis, set 95 Management and Organization, Universitas Wasaensis.
- [27]. Hakala, H. (2011). Strategic orientations in management literature: Three approaches to understanding the interaction between market, technology, entrepreneurial and learning orientations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(2), 199-217. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00292.

- [28]. Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C.K. (1994). *Competing for the future*. Boston/Mass.: HBS Press.
- [29]. Hong, J., & Yoo, S. (2013). Paths to success: How do market orientation and entrepreneurship orientation produce new product success. *Journal of product innovation management*, 44-55.
- [30]. Hsu, C. C., Tan, K. C., & Mohamad, S. H. (2016). Strategic orientations, sustainable supply chain initiatives, and reverse logistics empirical evidence from an emerging market. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 36(1), 86-110.
- [31]. Huber, G. P., & Power, D. J. (1985). Retrospective reports of strategic level managers: Guidelines for increasing their accuracy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6, 171-185.
- [32]. Hurley, R. F., & Hult, T. M. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: An integration and empirical examination. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3), 42-54. doi.org/10.2307/1251742.
- [33]. Ibarra-Cisneros, M., Demuner-Flores, M. R., & Hernández-Perlines, F. (2021). Strategic orientations, firm performance, and the moderating effect of absorptive capacity. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, DOI: 10.1108/JSMA-05-2020-0121.
- [34]. Kimberlin, C. L., & Winterstein, A. G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacists*, 65(1), 2276-2284.
- [35]. Kirca, A. H., Jayachandran, S., & Bearden, W. O. (2005). Market orientation: A meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and impact on performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(2), 24-41.
- [36]. Kumar, K., Subramanian, R., & Yauger, C. (1998). Examining the market orientation-performance relationship: A context-specific study. *Journal of Management*, 24(2), 201-233.
- [37]. Laukkanen, T., Nagy, G., Hirvonen, S., Reijonen, H., & Pasanen, M. (2013). The effect of strategic orientations on business performance in SMEs A multigroup analysis comparing Hungary and Finland. *International Marketing Review*, 30(6), 510-535.
- [38]. Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design*. (9th Ed.). Prentice Hall.
- [39]. Lei, L., & Wu, X., & Fu, Y. (2019). Effects of sustainability and technology orientations on firm growth: Evidence from Chinese manufacturing. *Sustainability*, 11(16), DOI:10.3390/su11164406.
- [40]. Li, J. J. (2005). The formation of managerial networks of foreign firms in China: The effects of strategic orientations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22(1), 423-443.
- [41]. Liu, B., & Fu, Z. (2011). Relationship between strategic orientation and organizational performance in born global: A critical review. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(3), 109-111.
- [42]. Makama, G. A. (2013). Patriarchy and gender inequality in Nigeria: The way forward. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(17), 115-144.
- [43]. Masa'deh, R., Al-Henzab, J., Tarhini, A., & Obeidat, B. (2018). The associations among market orientation, technology orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and organizational performance. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 25(8), 3117-3142.
- [44]. Mazzarolo, A., Mainardes, E.W., & Montemor, D. S. (2021). Effects of internal marketing on strategic orientations in the banking sector. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*. (ahead-of-print). DOI:10.1108/IJBM-08-2020-0437.
- [45]. Mehmood, K. K., & Zafar, H. (2019). Effect of strategic orientation on competitive advantage: Mediating role of innovation. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(3), 945-957.
- [46]. Morris, W. L., DePaulo, B. M., Hertel, J., & Taylor, L. C. (2008). Singlism—another problem that has no name: Prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination against singles. In T. G. Morrison & M. A. Morrison (Eds.), *The psychology of modern prejudice* (pp. 165-194). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- [47]. Na, Y. K., Kang, S., & Jeong, H. Y. (2019). The effect of market orientation on performance of sharing economy business: Focusing on marketing innovation and sustainable competitive advantage. *Sustainability*, 11(3), 729-741.
- [48]. Narver, & Slater. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4), 20-35.
- [49]. Nasir, W. M., Al-Mamun, A., & Breen, J. (2017). Strategic orientation and performance of SMEs in Malaysia. *SAGE Open*, 7(2), 1-14.
- [50]. Nduati, P., & Kavale, S. (2015). How does strategic orientation affect organisational competitiveness? Evidence from a large cement manufacturing firm in Kenya. *Basic Research Journal of Business Management and Accounts*, 4(5), 113-119.
- [51]. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, J. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd Ed.). McGraw-Hill.

- [52]. Obeidat, B., Tarhini, A., Masa'deh, R., &Aqqad, N. (2017). The impact of intellectual capital on innovation via the mediating role of knowledge management: a structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Knowledge Management Studies*, 8(3/4), 273-298.
- [53]. O'Regan, N., &Ghobadian, A. (2005). Innovation in SMEs: The impact of strategic orientation and environmental perceptions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 54(2), 81-97.
- [54]. Otache, I. (2019). The mediating effect of teamwork on the relationship between strategic orientation and performance of Nigerian banks.*European Business Review*, 31(5), 744-760.
- [55]. Özbağ, G.K. (2013). Resource based view, core competence and innovation: A research on Turkish manufacturing industry. *Scientific Research Journal*, 1(3), 9-17.
- [56]. Paladino, A. (2007). Investigating the drivers of innovation and new product success: A comparison of strategic orientations.*Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 24(6), 534 - 553.
- [57]. Proshare (2020).Nigerian capital market service report.*The Capital Market Service Report*,1(238), 1-34.
- [58]. Ramachandran, I., Lengnick-Hall, C. A., &Badrinarayanan, V. (2019). Enabling and leveraging ambidexterity: Influence of strategic orientations and knowledge stock. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23, 1136–1156.
- [59]. Saqib, M., Baluch, N.H., &Udin, Z.M. (2017).Moderating role of technology orientation on the relationship between knowledge management and SMEs' performance in Oman: A conceptual study.*International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(1), 433–441.
- [60]. Sreejesh, S., Mohapatra, S., &Anusree, M. R. (2014).*Business research methods.An applied orientation*.Springer.
- [61]. Tho, N. D. (2019). Strategic orientations and firm innovativeness: a necessary condition analysis. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 14(3), 427-442.
- [62]. Tutara, H., Nart, S., &Bingöl, D. (2015). The effects of strategic orientations on innovation capabilities and market performance: The case of ASEM. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 709-719.
- [63]. Venkatraman, N. (1989). Strategic orientation of business enterprises: The construct, dimensionality, and measurement, *Management Science*, 35(8), 942-959.
- [64]. Voss, G. B., & Voss, Z. G. (2000).Strategic orientation and firm performance in an artistic environment.*Journal of Marketing*, 64(1), 67-83.
- [65]. Warrens, M. (2015).A comparison of reliability coefficients for psychometric tests that consist of two parts. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, 10(1), DOI: 10.1007/s11634-015-0198-6.
- [66]. Wynd, C., Schmidt, B., & Schaefer, M. (2003). Two quantitative approaches for estimating content validity. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 25(5), 508-18.
- [67]. Yadav, M. R., Parihar, C. M., Jat, S. L., Singh, A. K., Kumar D., Pooniya V., Parihar M. D., Saveipune, D., Parmar, H., &Jat, M. L. (2016). Effect of long term tillage and diversified crop rotations on nutrient uptake, profitability and energetics of maize.*Indian Journal of Agriculture Science*, 86(6), 743-749.
- [68]. Yadav, S. K., Tripathi, V., &Goel, G. (2019).Modelling strategic orientation dimensions and performance of small and medium enterprises.*Journal of Modelling in Management*, 14(3), 754-772.
- [69]. Yu, S., Alper, H., Nguyen, A., Brackbill, R., Turner, L., Walker, D., Maslow, C., & Zweig, K. (2017).The effectiveness of a monetary incentive offer on survey response rates and response completeness in a longitudinal study.*BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 17(1), DOI:10.1186/s12874-017-0353-1.
- [70]. Zayed, A., &Alawad, N. (2017).The relationship between market, learning orientation, innovation and business performance of Egyptian SME's.*Business Management Review*, 8(5), 150–162.
- [71]. Zeebaree, M. R. Y., &Siron, R. B. (2017).The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on competitive advantage moderated by financing support in SMEs.*International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(1), 43-52.
- [72]. Zhao, Y. (2012). A study of strategic orientation and product competitive advantage in Chinese emerging market.*International Journal of Quality and Innovation*, 2(1), 44-60.

SECTION A

Personal Data:

1. Name of organisation
2. Gender: Male Female
3. Age: 20-35 36-50 51 Above
4. Marital status: Single Married Separated Divorced
5. Educational Qualification: WAEC-OND HND/B.Sc MSc and above
6. Position in the organisation

SECTION B

The statements below describe the Strategic Orientation construct. Please tick one choice for each of the following statement that is applicable to your organisation.

(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=not disagree nor agree, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree)

STRATEGIC ORIENTATION		1	2	3	4	5
Technology Orientation						
1	Our firm's policy is to adopt up-to-date technologies					
2	Our firm purchases and uses technologies to position itself ahead of competitors					
3	Our firm is often to be first to try out new methods and technologies					
4	Our firm frequently improves internal processes such as speed, reliability and information management					
5	Our firm allocates resources for investments in latest technologies and future forecasted technological changes					
Market Orientation						
1	Our firm has proactive dialogues and mutual relationships with customers					
2	Our firm is geared toward quality customer service culture					
3	Our firm implements immediate responses when our customers are targeted by other firms					
4	Our firm frequently takes advantage of targeted opportunities to benefit from competitors' weaknesses					
5	Our firm encourages internal sharing of market information to understand consumer/competitor behaviors					
6	Our firm pays close attention to after sale service					