Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Yıl: 2023 Cilt: 32 No: 1 Sayfa: 262-279
https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/cusosbil

ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION AS A NEW AGGRESSIVE BUSINESS MODEL IN THE FAMILY AND NON-FAMILY FIRMS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Özden ALTINDAĞ [1], Gökten ÖNGEL [2]

Article Info

Conceptual Article
DOI: 10.35379/cusosbil.1123931
Article History:
Received 31.05.2022
Accepted 22.03.2023
Keywords:
Family Firms,
Non-Family Firms,
Firm Performance,
Strategic Orientations,
Entrepreneurial Orientation.

ABSTRACT

The study aims to define strategic orientations and examine the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation activities and firm performance. For this purpose, the concepts of strategic orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance are explained in the relevant sections based on the research in the literature. The study used international examples that associate the entrepreneurial orientation of family and non-family companies with firm performance. One of the most important results of the study is that the entrepreneurial orientation of family firms has a weak or non-existent relationship with firm performance. Family businesses tend to be less involved in entrepreneurial orientation activities than non-family companies. Another important result is that entrepreneurial orientation has a more positive effect on the performance of non-family firms than family firms. This study is likely to positively contribute to the literature by providing a new perspective to scientists and administrators and summarizing important resources in one place. The study differs from similar studies as it deals with the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance by including family and non-family companies in the process with a holistic approach. Since the samples subject to the study were selected without making any distinction between country, sector and size in this research, the scope is limited. The relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance could not be determined statistically since the study is qualitative.

AİLE VE AİLE DIŞI FİRMALARDA YENİ BİR AGRESİF İŞ MODELİ OLARAK GİRİŞİMCİLİK YÖNELİMİ: BİR LİTERATÜR İNCELEMESİ

Makale Bilgisi

Kavramsal Makale
DOI: 10.35379/cusosbil.1123931
Makale Geçmişi:
Geliş 31.05.2022
Kabul 22.03.2023
Anahtar Kelimeler:
Aile Firmaları,
Aile Dışı Firmalar,
Firma Performansı,
Stratejik Yönelimler,
Girişimcilik Yönelimi.

ÖZ

Çalışma, stratejik yönelimleri tanımlamayı ve girişimci yönelim faaliyetleri ile firma performansı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla stratejik yönelim, girişimci yönelim ve firma performansı kavramları literatürdeki araştırmalara dayalı olarak ilgili bölümlerde açıklanmıştır. Çalışmada aile şirketlerinin ve aile dışı şirketlerin girişimci yönelimini firma performansıyla ilişkilendiren uluslararası örnekleri kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın en önemli sonuçlarından biri, aile şirketlerinin girişimci yöneliminin firma performansı ile zayıf veya hiç ilişkisinin olmadığıdır. Aile şirketleri, aile dışı şirketlere göre girişimci yönelim faaliyetlerine daha az dâhil olma eğilimindedir. Bir diğer önemli sonuç ise girişimci yönelimin aile dışı firmaların performansı üzerinde aile firmalarına göre daha olumlu bir etkiye sahip olmasıdır. Bu çalışmanın bilim insanlarına ve yöneticilere yeni bir bakış açısı sunması ve önemli kaynakları tek bir yerde özetlemesi açısından literatüre olumlu katkı yapması muhtemeldir. Çalışma, aile ve aile dışı şirketleri bütüncül bir yaklaşımla sürece dâhil ederek girişimci yönelimi ile firma performansı arasındaki ilişkiyi ele almasıyla benzer çalışmalardan ayrılmaktadır. Bu araştırmada ülke, sektör ve büyüklük ayrımı yapılmadan çalışmaya konu örneklemler seçildiğinden kapsam sınırlıdır. Çalışma nitel olduğundan girişimcilik yönelimi ile firma performansı arasındaki ilişki istatistiksel olarak belirlenememiştir.

[1] Dr., ozdenaltindag@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-4341-6519.
[2] Uzm. Dr. ve Dr., İstanbul Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastanesi, Çocuk Sağlığı ve Hastalıkları, goktenkorkmaz@yahoo.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-4165-3601.
Alıntılamak için/Cite as: Altındağ, Ö. ve Öngel, G. (2023). Entrepreneurial orientation as a new aggressive business model in the family and non-family firms: A literature review. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 32* (1), 262-279.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past years, the concept of strategic orientation has gained high importance for the companies who wish to exist in the market in the condition of increasing competition and development of the international markets due to globalization. Adaptation and application of new management strategies provide companies with unique competitive advantages. In this concept, particularly structural qualification, the types of organizations defined as family firms have become the most important market players. In the new dynamic environment, we are in, family or non-family firms that want to gain high performance using various administrative tactics have begun to use many strategic orientations with different dimensions actively in their organizational structures. The focal point of actual scientific works in this scope is the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation in family companies and other strategic orientations and firm performance (Cruz and Nordqvist, 2012; Hernández-Linares and & López-Fernández, 2018; Pittino et.al., 2018; Arz, 2019; Arzubiaga et.al., 2019).

Strategic orientations of businesses, management, marketing, and innovation is a topic that is frequently discussed in studies in the field. Strategic orientations reflect a firm's strategic stance or concentration on generating a new idea, transforming that idea into a product or service, and marketing that idea (Zhou et al., 2021). The internationalization of the economy, uncertainties, the need for continuous innovation, and the increasing use of information technologies have confronted businesses with the reality of how difficult it is to develop their competitive capabilities. In this context, the importance of defining the entrepreneurial orientations that companies follow to create the appropriate behaviors for continuous superior performance has been mentioned in the research on strategic orientation (Kalkan & Aladağ, 2021). Entrepreneurial orientation refers to the tendency of individuals to explore entrepreneurial opportunities. In the literature, entrepreneurial orientation has generally been evaluated together with the sub-dimensions of "risk-taking", "innovation," and "proactivity". "Risk-taking" dimension is to act boldly in uncertain situations, the "innovation" dimension is to be able to implement creative and original ideas "proactivity" dimension is defined as a necessary feature in recognizing opportunities (Tangör & Özgen, 2022). In recent years, academic publications examining the relationship between strategic orientations, entrepreneurial orientation, and firm performance through empirical studies (Lin et al., 2018; Adams et al., 2019; Agyapong and Acquaah, 2021; Lentu et al., 2021; Abdulrab et al., 2021) there has been an increase. Lin et al. (2018) tested the effects of firms' strategic orientations on firm performance in their study on firms operating in the manufacturing sector in China. The research results show that service orientation directly affects firm performance in the manufacturing industry. However, customer orientation and learning orientation do not directly impact firm performance. Adams et al. (2019) investigated the relationship between three types of strategic orientations (customer, technology, and combined customer/technology orientation) and the performance of firms operating in the French manufacturing sector. They found that organizations with a combined customer/technology orientation outperform organizations with only one customer or technology orientation. Agyapong and Acquaah (2021) compare the impact of interactions between the corporate capabilities and strategic business orientations of micro and small family businesses and non-family businesses on performance. According to the research findings, the interaction between managerial skills and cost strategy on performance is more significant in family companies. Lentu et al.'s (2021) study determine the impact of strategic orientation on the performance of public hotel businesses in Kenya. According to the survey results, entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation, and technological orientation affected the performance of enterprises positively and significantly. Abdulrab et al. (2021), in their study on SMEs in Saudi Arabia, examined the mediating role of strategic orientations in the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance. The study's findings show that strategic orientations mediate the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance.

Firms use different techniques to competitive advantage in our rapidly globalizing world. It is a fact that companies, particularly family firms' characteristics, ought to apply several strategic orientations in their company to ensure a strong position in the market. Strategies used for gaining time-based competitive advantage are essential techniques that effectively reduce the preparation time of products and services and get procedures like labor and delivery done faster, producing high-quality products and flexibility according to the performance criteria. Narver and Slater (1990) stated in their studies that strategic orientations positively affect performance criteria that show profitability effects such as return on assets, the success of a new product, and an increase in market share. Strategic orientations directly affect the firm's performance and may cause the firm's competitiveness to strengthen or weaken (Berthon et al., 2004). For instance, disciplined learning and learning orientation may independently affect the development of a new product (Baker & Sinkula, 1999). If the family companies have a significant skill to change the structural balance of the targeted area, this change could benefit the family area by using various strategies despite their market powers and other obstacles (Porter, 2009). Market orientation is another strategic orientation designed for gaining dominance in a particular business, born as a philosophy at the beginning, developed by administrators as a concept, and defined as the application of special studies and applications in the organization (Narver & Slater, 1990).

Relationship orientation is a competitive advantage gaining technique in which supply chain orientation focuses on and includes all relationship dimensions both in companies and between organizations and institutions (Panayides, 2007). The family companies acting proactively in their markets and taking risks when needed show that the tendencies of supporting and doing innovations bring performance alongside them. This is why entrepreneurial firms are more willing to make decisions on their own, and there use this fact as pressure on their competitors to form a situation for their benefit (Lumpkin & Dess 1996). Innovation orientation brings together many factors such as integrating technology into the business, developing new products and services, the importance of R&D activities in a company’s strategic decisions, and its significance (Berthon et al., 2004). So lastly, customer orientation, as Kohli and Jaworski (1990) stated in their description, customer orientation is a management style that tries to measure and develop how fast an organization, as they said can respond to customer requests and needs. In light of all their information, updated strategic orientations should be integrated into the firm's administrative capabilities to be the surviving company in dynamic markets in which dense competition is prominent.

There are so many publications in the literature investigating strategic orientations and firm performance. However, the number of holistic qualitative studies comparing the effects of the entrepreneurial orientation of family and non-family companies on the firm's performance is highly few. For this reason, the primary motivation was to gather the research results of family and non-family companies in different countries and sizes under a single roof. The study includes examples in the literature investigating the effect of entrepreneurial orientation of family and non-family firms operating in the international arena on firm performance.

In this study, which is based on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in businesses and organizations, we sought to answer these questions: "Do firms have mechanisms that allow them to transform their entrepreneurial orientation into performance results?", "Is there a relationship between family and non-family firms' entrepreneurial orientations and firm performance?" "What are these differences?"For this purpose, in the first part of the study, family companies are defined, and their characteristics are explained in detail. In the following section, to better understand the source of the entrepreneurial orientation, all the strategic orientations with which it is in relation are explained with the studies of various researchers. Then, examples of the effect of entrepreneurial orientations of family and non-family companies on firm performance are given using multiple literature studies. Finally, the effects of entrepreneurial activities that affect the firm's performance have been revealed in two different firms. Since the samples used in the research belong to other countries, sizes, and sectors, the findings cannot be generalized. In addition, the effect of the sub-dimensions constituting the entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance has not been generally focused on. For this reason, future research can be classified to cover a certain geographical region and economic systems of the world, homogeneous groups can be formed, and how the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation affect individual firm performance can be investigated more comprehensively with quantitative research.

1. Definition of Family Firms

Family firms are the most widespread form of business organization worldwide. They are essential for the growth and well-being of the economy due to the wealth and employment they generate (Hernández-Perlines et al., 2019). The first studies on family businesses were made in the early 1980s and examined how a company can pass down from generation to generation (Mullens, 2018). The general definitions of family companies are discussed widely in the literature, and it is still challenging to use a detailed description. However, a typical family firm is generally administrated by members of the same family (Lansberg, 1999). The administrative model of family companies can be described as a 'hybrid model' because it involves two different sets of values, expectation structures, and rules - one from the family and one from the business. (Gersick et al., 1997). This organization focuses on and tries to have evident characteristics such as ownership, institutionalism, and success, wrapping them in a unique structure (Chrisman et al., 1999).

Some definitions evaluate family companies with a narrower angle, the others with a wider one. Mohammed (2019) reports that family companies are present due to the mutual economic and non-economic value created by combining business and family systems. According to Ernst et al. (2022), family businesses consist of certain members. There are close ties between family members and their businesses, and they want to derive both mutual and emotional benefits from their companies. A family company is a business in which more than one family member has significant amounts of investment and participation in administrative decisions or activities of the organization. Family can be taken as people in a relationship with each other who are bound by blood, marriage, or lifetime commitment. A family company is a business in which most of the ownership or control of two or more family members directly relates to the initiative (Rosenblatt et al., 1990). Kırım (2000), who defines family companies as "companies under the control of the family," speaks of two other essential criteria:

- Companies and other kinds of partnerships in which one single family has the majority of votes.
- A single family is influential in the strategic decisions and mainly elects the director-general.

Another definition of the family firm is the type of organization represented by at least two generations. Family members mostly fill the management line, and important decisions are taken, significantly affecting family members. Most of these firms have a limited lifespan to that of their founder. The firm's founder, who started on a small scale and gradually expanded it to a level that could be considered a great success in a lifetime, usually ends when the second generation, sons, daughters, or sons-in-law, i.e., the founder, dies. In this case, the firm is closed, there is a transfer, and it is returned to the beginning. Although family companies are a type of partnership/business, some features distinguish and characterize them from others. These features can be listed as follows (Karpuzoğlu, 2001):

- Generally, at least two generations of the family are involved in company management. Companies with mother/father-child partnerships, sibling partnerships, cousin partnerships,
- Business policy is usually compatible with family interests. Family companies that are founded for assets and integrity are affected by family values and beliefs,
- Administrative personnel is usually obtained from family and relatives. In these companies, employing administrative personnel from out of the family does not hold with when you have family members who hold reliability dearer than expertise. Thus, family members have the priority in personal choices and placement.

This information becomes prominent when looking up the typical definitions of organizations showing family firm features in literature (Fındıkçı, 2005):

- Say the least of it; a family company is a family founded company,
- Family firm culture is a social culture in which the family's characteristic culture and tradition are reflected in the business,
- The family firm is a union that is formed from various family member versions like entrepreneur family leader, leader, and spouse, leader, and children, leader spouse and children, leader and siblings, only siblings and cousins, leaders' children, sons/daughters-in-law,
- Family companies are a type of business in which dominant characters and decision-makers are from the same family,
- The family firm is an organization that forms an economic union, and ownership belongs to the family.

Family firms have an important place in the world socially and economically. A family usually holds significant ownership of their business and assumes management positions. Thus, the family can largely decide on the company's strategies and identify potential points of gain or loss for financial growth (Wu et al., 2022). At the same time, family members can potentially perpetuate the vision of the business for generations. In general, they follow strategies such as long-term orientation, risk aversion, and preference for equity financing (Berrone et al., 2020).

2. Strategic Orientations

While an organization's long-term direction is expressed by strategy, the permanent aspect of orientation, thought, disposition, or interest is called orientation. All firm activities to achieve improved profitability, financial performance, and competitive advantage express the definition of strategic orientation (Masa'deh et al., 2018). Strategic orientation is a fundamental concept that determines the performance of organizations, and it attracts great attention in the literature on marketing and entrepreneurship (Aloulou, 2019). Strategic orientation is the direction of the strategies implemented by a business and aims to create appropriate behaviors so that the company can consistently show superior performance (Nasir et al., 2017). Herath (2013) defines strategic orientation as dynamic capabilities representing the organization's ability to integrate and build its internal and external competencies. And according to the author, if a business uses different strategic orientations together and can balance its relationships, it will be able to achieve sustainable competitive advantage in the future.

While it was seen that organizational learning came to the fore in the past, researches investigating the relationships between strategic orientations and firm performance, entrepreneurship, and innovation orientations are at the forefront of current studies (Lin & Kunnathur, 2019). According to what and how businesses choose the stimuli in their environment, how they interpret these stimuli and their reactions are different, and all these activities constitute their strategic orientations. Values, beliefs, and business philosophy guide the superior performance of companies, and the sum of these forms their strategic orientation. Businesses gain a responsive and proactive organizational mindset while helping them focus on multiple aspects of their environment through their strategic orientation (Gotteland et al., 2020). Kalkan and Aladağ (2021) listed the sub-headings of strategic orientation as follows in their study in which they examined the articles in the strategic orientation literature: a) Entrepreneurial Orientation, b) Market Orientation (innovativeness orientation, customer orientation, relationship orientation), c) Learning Orientation, and d) Technological Orientation. These topics will be briefly explained in the following section.

2.1. Entrepreneurial Orientation

Entrepreneurial orientation, first of those, is an essential strategic orientation that may answer firms' potential market needs in the future. Along with many definitions market-based, in Morris and Paul's (1987) definition, the top management tends to take risks, evaluate proactive applications, and think innovatively. In addition to this definition, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) state that entrepreneur firms are more willing to make decisions independently and display a more autonomous appearance; moreover, they use more aggressive tactics towards their competitors. Miller (1983) tried to define entrepreneurial orientation using concepts like market innovation, risky investments and being the first in its field. Vij and Bedi's (2012) entrepreneurial orientation; is the sum of the efforts of an organization's top managers to support change and innovation by taking business risks to compete aggressively with other firms and to gain an advantage in the industry for their firms. Frank et al. (2010) define entrepreneurial orientation as "a potential tool to stimulate established companies," which is accomplished through risk-taking, innovation, and proactive competitive behavior. Entrepreneurial orientation reflects “the organizational processes, methods and styles that firms use to act entrepreneurially” (Pittino et.al., 2018).

According to Yang (2008), an innovative and proactive firm gains new knowledge and experience thanks to its entrepreneurial orientation. Organizations benefit from entrepreneurial orientation to discover new knowledge bases and take advantage of market opportunities (Real et al., 2012). Hernández-Linares et al. (2018), on the other hand, states that entrepreneurship is one of the most critical processes that form the basis of entrepreneurial decisions and actions in organizations. Based on this explanation, entrepreneurial orientation Hernández-Perlines et al. (2021) defines it as an organization's attempts to take new offers, take risks by opening up to new markets, and differentiate itself from its competitors acting proactively.

Entrepreneurial orientation has been defined by Taşkıran and İyigün (2019) as the intentions and actions of key players functioning in a dynamic generative process aimed at new-venture creation. Entrepreneurial orientation is a strategic decision-making orientation that measures the organizations and their top managers in a continuum ranging between conservative and entrepreneurial. It locates them into this continuum by considering their entrepreneurial activities. In general, entrepreneurial orientation has critical features such as risk-taking, proactive efforts, autonomy, and competitive aggression (Li et al., 2006). Hughes and Morgan (2007) state that entrepreneurial orientation can be functionalized through risk-taking, innovation, proactivity, competitive aggression, and autonomy. An organization takes risks; it has accepted uncertainty and reflects this in its actions. By innovating while improving its goods, services, and processes, it improves its R&D, tries to catch the technological leadership, and increases its creativity. Proactively, it shapes the events and elements around it, develops a new product, and improves its forward-looking perspective. On the other hand, autonomy is the authority and independence that an individual or team within the organization has to develop a new concept or vision. Similarly, Mahmood and Hanafi (2013) define entrepreneurial orientation as three dimensions; innovation, proactivity, and risk-taking. Innovation is the firm's ability and willingness to result in new products/services by supporting creativity, new ideas, and experimentation. Proactivity is competitive competition in pursuing opportunities and predicting future demand to create change. Regarding risk-taking, the firm deliberately allocates resources to projects with a high chance of a return but may also involve a high probability of failure.

2.2. Market Orientation

Market orientation is an accepted building block of marketing. It has an increasing market orientation accepted as the building block of marketing and has an increasingly important part in studying fields like strategic management in the world of science. Although market orientation is an increasing research field and a remarkable concept, many companies put minimal effort into establishing an actual market-based structure. Analyses indicate that companies who want to achieve a market-based system transition through a four-stage change. As the result of this period that develops in four chapters, being beginning, reconstruction, institutionalization, and providing continuity, a market-focused company structure that shapes according to customer requests is activated. While this process reveals a management model that supports market-oriented activities, it also allows a market structure that the entire organization can understand (Gebhardt et al., 2006). Market orientation defines all business employees' efforts to form superior values that provide the customer with continuity (Narver et al., 1993).

2.3. Innovativeness Orientation

A definition of innovativeness in the framework of the organizational approach was given by Luecke and Katz (2003). Innovativeness, in general, means to present a product or a method successfully. At the same time, its synthetics embody combination forming, giving the original information suitable for the company and its customers, new and valued products, process, and services. Approaches to the innovation philosophy can be defined as continuous innovations in new products, technologies, and procedures to focus on customer and customer satisfaction (Berthon et al., 2004). Fu (2020) argues that innovation is one of the three dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation (innovation, proactivity, and risk-taking). And the innovation orientation of an organization covers the innovation activities of that organization.

According to Erdogan et al. (2020), family firms must change and innovate to remain competitive. Innovation requires breaking with continuity to develop new competencies and skills. Family firm prosperity across generations depends on innovation to achieve desired future outcomes and long-term goals. All these ideas concentrate on products and services that result from innovativeness, and family companies' orientation is to be released. They again developed each other with change thanks to customer satisfaction, time-based competitive strategy, new product and consumption processes, labor and timely delivery, rapid processes, and innovativeness orientation (Toni et al. 2001).

2.4. Customer Orientation

According to Conduit and Mavondo (2001), for an organization to be market-oriented, it must generate market intelligence about its customers' needs and preferences. This step is a necessary step for customer orientation. Other additional activities required for customer orientation are: (i) Understanding the requirements for effective delivery of external customers' needs and preferences. (ii) Learning about external customers' needs and preferences through effective interdepartmental communication. (iii) Additionally, the final buyer is to create value. According to Narver and Slater (1990), customer orientation requires a sufficient understanding of services and products which add high value to customers. This value creation is achieved by improving the benefits for buyers and customers while reducing their expenditures. Developing an understanding at such a level requires gaining information about buyers and customers and comprehending the economic and political limitations. Being customer-focused or customer orientation is rendered as activities designed to sufficiently understand the target customers and produce superior values. Accordingly, customer-focused requires understanding the customers first to deliver services and products that create value. The customer orientation dimension would be able to support the firm with suggestions that attract customers. According to Kutner and Cripps (1997), customer relationships orientation stands on four basics in doctrine:

- Customers should be managed as the most crucial source of the business.
- The state of customer profitability may vary depending on the case; not all customers have requested an equal level.
- Customers should be classified according to their requests, buying habits, and price sensitivity.
- According to customer requests, customer profitability depends on maximizing the values of products and services they provide in customer portfolios.

On the other hand, Lee et al. (2021), customer orientation is related to recognizing customers' future needs and innovative solutions that provide superior value to them. Customer focus is an effective strategy for companies to gain a sustainable competitive advantage regardless of their size and sector.

2.5. Relationship Orientation

According to Viio and Grönroos (2016), business relationships are based on matching or harmonizing operations between two companies. Relationship orientation refers to the willingness and desire to do more than transact or exchange with the interested party. Relationship orientation means maximizing the company’s revenues and earnings by bold design, forming and developing relationships with customers, and external environment factors (Harker, 1999). Relationship orientation, a multi-dimensional concept, has been examined by different authors in various dimensions.

According to Panayides's (2007) model, it consists of five different sizes trust, limits, communication, shared values, and empathy. For example, shared values affect organizational climate directly along with the behavior of employees. Another factor, empathy, is understanding and knowing employees and sharing feelings like sorrow or joy. The title "communication" explains the feature of employees' being able to share their ideas with other team members. Top management of a family company that attaches importance to relationship orientation should also be theoric adopters and applier of supply chain management and logistics management concepts.

2.6. Learning Orientation

Wang (2008) defines learning orientation as a set of values (i.e., commitment to learning, open-mindedness, and shared vision) that affect a firm's tendency to create and use knowledge. Such values guide a firm's behaviors and processes to acquire diverse knowledge, develop a shared understanding of acquired knowledge, and generate new knowledge or organizational insights. According to Baker and Sinkula (1999), learning orientation is an organization's tendency to use mental models and substantial rationality factors to bring itself into the most competitive position in the market. Learning orientation is a mechanism that includes a firm's competition with old values and activities to fit new techniques into the system. Learning orientation is focused on developing and leveraging knowledge within an organization. In a broader approach, intra-organizational knowledge-sharing is added as another component; it assumes an effective knowledge transfer system that allows an organization to analyze current decision-making processes and implement new ways or organizational activities (Krzakiewicz & Cyfert, 2019).

Wang and Ahmed (2003) suggested that traditional management strategies could not be sufficient in changing environmental conditions and dynamic markets. It depends on learning orientation to make radical progress in gaining a more revolutionary perspective and leadership. According to this point of view, it can be justified that organizational learning is a continuous activity; authentic changes should be done to provide increased information, new ideas can be gathered from system thinking, and constant development should follow the path towards innovative change. The organizational learning paradigm can have a direct effect on innovativeness and firm performance, and particularly family companies should use this activity in their management activities (Lee & Tsai, 2005).

2.7. Technological Orientation

Song and Jing (2017) technological orientation is a guiding principle that enables the application of technologies in products and operational procedures. Technological orientation is an organization's strategic orientation concerning technologies and reflects how an enterprise acquires and implements complex technologies. Technological orientation is a learning process necessary for a firm to obtain the latest technical knowledge. Technological orientation is a paradigm that demonstrates the firm's ability to apply specialized knowledge, adoption, and innovative technologies for the firm's success (Mubarak & Petraite, 2020). Technological orientation is recognized as a critical determinant of innovation or strategic mechanism that helps create innovative ideas for business firms. Technological orientation is a necessary technical skill for business sectors that want to generate maximum returns based on better products and services in the job market. The technology orientation also improves the operational capacity of commercial firms to deliver better customer value (Asheq et al., 2021).

Technology orientation is the ability of a business to use its know-how to create a new technical solution to quickly meet the needs of consumers (Gatignon & Xuereb, 1997). Companies develop innovative technologies as their technological orientation strengthens. Integrating these into product development and marketing processes can bring superior, creative goods and services to market. This includes developing products and services and the ability to provide competitive advantages that competitors cannot easily imitate sustainably. Businesses can also increase firm performance by providing innovative customer value superior to their competitors through technology orientation (Lee et al., 2019).

3. Firm Performance

Literature relating to performance measurement in companies consists of two stages. Between the 1880s and 1980s, the first stage focuses on financial criteria like profit, investment return, and productivity. The second stage started due to changes in world markets in the 1980s (Ghalayini & Noble, 1996). Time-based competition strategy, which gains significance in our day, focuses not only on period standards but also on reducing preparation times, performance criteria which emphasize the flexibility of labor force and ability to produce high-quality products being loyal to delivery time (Toni et al., 2001). The word performance is defined as the number of products and services produced in a particular amount of time, as well as being expressed with concepts of “yield”, “activity”, “output” according to its function, and also defined as a result of interaction between individual’s skills and motivation. Performance; is the good, service, or idea produced towards fulfilling the responsibility and achieving the purpose in a way that meets designated criteria in the framework of the responsibility (Helvacı, 2002).

Each strategic orientation has a different effect on a firm’s growth and profitability performance. In previous studies, there are positive and strong relationships between profitability performance criteria and active return rate, sales increase, the success of a new product, and market share (Narver & Slater, 1990). Memili et al. (2020) stated that variant ownership types, governance, business structure, goals, and strategies are important determinants of firm performance. Criteria are designated for evaluating the performance can be of both objective and subjective manner. Objective evaluation includes measurable values such as profitability, market share, and cash. The second approach consists of individuals’ thoughts on a company’s sense of success that can be evaluated relatively. This research has tried to analyze financial and growth performances from the administrators’ point of view. Financial performance considers how the firms use their owning and production values. In other words, firm performance evaluates how efficiently the family firm is administrated. Firm performance in this study includes market share, profitability, sales increases, investment return rate, and overall performance. Research indicates that all strategic orientations directly and positively affect firm performance (Olson et al., 2004). Although there also are researches in which there are no absolute relationships on the same subject (Noble et al. 2002).

4. The Relationship Between Entrepreneurial Orientations and Firm Performance

Entrepreneurial orientation is one of the critical drivers of entrepreneurial activity and firm performance. Entrepreneurial orientation, a part of the competitive strategy model, has become an essential issue in the literature (Diandra & Azmy, 2021). According to most of the research conducted in today's competitive business world, the profit flows of companies are under constant threat. In response to these threats, entrepreneurial orientation can increase firms' profitability by constantly seeking new opportunities, thus ranking them at the top of the market. Firms with a strong entrepreneurial orientation can gain a significant competitive advantage. In addition, a solid entrepreneurial orientation can bring new customers to the firm and help the firm retain existing customers by introducing new products. Entrepreneurial firms can proactively seize business opportunities in the market and gain first-mover advantages by entering uncharted territory (Gupta & Gupta, 2015). According to Hakala (2011), entrepreneurial orientation is an important phenomenon that describes entrepreneurial skills in the strategies of firms. Entrepreneurial-oriented organizations change and shape the environment and are willing to dedicate resources to capitalize on uncertain opportunities.

These companies discover new and creative ideas that can lead to changes in the market and increase their competitive chances by anticipating future demands. Constantly examining and shaping the environment positively affects the firm's performance. Lee (2011) investigated the relationships between these companies' technology, market, and entrepreneurial orientations and firm performance in a survey conducted with 426 companies in South Korea. The empirical findings of this research show that appropriate interrelationship actively provides an organization with the ability to achieve and maintain a competitive advantage. Market and technology orientations do not directly affect firm performance. Companies' market and technology orientations can only improve firm performance when combined with entrepreneurial orientation. Another finding of this research shows that it is vital for a firm to have an organizational structure that integrates these three areas to achieve and maintain a positive firm performance.

In the studies of Lumpkin and Dess (1996), considering the conditions of competition in today's economy, they emphasized the importance of exploring the relationships between the entrepreneurial behavior of firms and their performance. According to the authors, entrepreneurial activity or processes can occasionally lead to positive results in one performance dimension and negative impacts in another performance dimension. For example, heavy R&D and product innovation investment can enable a firm to successfully enter new product-market areas and ultimately increase sales growth in the long run. However, the required resource commitment can reduce short-term profitability. Therefore, it is necessary to include the sub-dimensions of both phenomena for the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation (autonomy, innovation, risk-taking, proactivity, and competitive aggression) and performance (growth, profit, and productivity) to be understood correctly. In their study, Morgan and Strong (2003) obtained the data from the survey questions applied to medium, large and high-tech industrial manufacturing firms. They investigated the relationship between the strategic orientations of firms and their firm performance. As a result of the research, there was no relationship between the aggressiveness, proactivity, and risky dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. Future awareness, advocacy, and proactivity are closely related to firm performance. The authors attributed the most crucial reason for this situation to companies with high firm performance paying close attention to analytical skills and abilities and defense tactics.

4.1. Non-Family Firms

Entrepreneurial orientation reflects a firm's strategic stance towards taking risks and engaging in innovative and proactive behaviors that will continually affect firm performance. Focusing their work on high-tech companies in China, Cui et al. (2018) examined how entrepreneurial orientation affects firm performance. The research results show that the positive effect of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance is mediated by firms' absorptive capacity and their activities to expand their boundaries. In their work with senior managers, Lumpkin and Dess (2001) investigated how proactivity and competitive aggression, which are the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation, are related to firm performance. Research findings show that firms with proactive orientation are positively related to performance in dynamic environments, while the performance of competitive and aggressive firms increases in uncertain and risky environments. There is a statistically significant positive relationship between these companies' competitive and aggressive work and sales growth. Madison et al. (2014) aimed to reveal the crucial differences between family and non-family firms by investigating the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in small-scale (family and non-family) firms. The authors' work sampled small firms in fourteen city centers in two Midwestern states. Findings revealed that entrepreneurial orientation has a more significant impact on the performance of non-family firms than family firms.

Galbreath et al. (2020) analyzed the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in their study on 229 Italian firms. The analysis results show that an entrepreneurial orientation in firms is positively related to firm performance. In addition, firms' competitive strategies, a low-cost strategy, negatively affects the relationship, while differentiation strategies affect the relationship positively. In their study conducted in 2020, Soares and Perin (2020) aimed to analyze the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and corporate performance through an updated and expanded meta-analytic review involving mediators, moderators, and performance outcomes. The study's findings reveal that entrepreneurial orientation directly affects corporate performance, which is more vital for multi-item and income-based performance measures. In addition, partly learning orientation and partly innovativeness also affect the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance.

Basco et al. (2020) selected small and medium-sized companies from three countries (China, Mexico, and Spain) as a sample in their study. They analyzed firm entrepreneurship orientation in different contexts. The three main factors (innovation, proactivity, and risk-taking) that define the firm's entrepreneurial orientation have a significant effect on the positive impact of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance. Rezaei and Ortt (2018) studied three dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation (innovation, proactivity, risk-taking) and three types of functional performance of firms (R&D performance, production performance, marketing, and sales performance) in their study on SMEs in high-tech industries in the Netherlands. The results of the research show that entrepreneurial orientation dimensions are differently related to the performance of functions in a firm. A positive relationship is observed between innovation and R&D performance, proactivity, and marketing and sales performance. There is a negative relationship between risk-taking and production performance. It was concluded that R&D, production and marketing, and sales functions support each other in a logical order and their effects on overall firm performance are complementary.

4.2. Family Firms

Family firms emerge due to the founder(s) entrepreneurial attitudes. Family firms dominate the business environment and are responsible for industrial output, entrepreneurial activity, corporate growth, economic development, innovation, and employment in most economies. Research on these firms in the literature has mainly focused on the advantage of intergenerational involvement, long-term strategic orientation, and members' joint efforts for the firm's survival. A study conducted on 250 small family companies in the Ghanaian economy; revealed that entrepreneurial orientation is positively related to strategic orientation, not firm performance, and strategic orientation also positively affects firm performance. In addition, strategic orientation did not soften the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. As a result of the research, it is suggested that family companies should be more proactive and innovative in their management to compete more effectively in the market and survive in turbulent environments (Voss & Voss, 2000). Naldi et al. (2007) investigated the link between risk-taking and performance, one of the critical dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation in family companies in Sweden. According to the results, risk-taking in family firms is negatively related to performance. Because; i) individuals in these firms are generally members of the same family. ii) Members control both ownership and management. iii) Risk-taking in family firms is not strictly tied to systematic and formal procedures and does not adequately include outsiders' perspectives and opinions. iv) Family firms avoid establishing formal control and monitoring systems such as active boards, financial controls, and strategic planning to improve performance. Rachmawati et al. (2020) investigated whether entrepreneurial orientation directly affects family firm performance in Indonesia. The results showed that entrepreneurial orientation did not significantly affect the family firm's performance. Garcés-Galdeano et al. (2016) examined how socio-emotional factors can affect the entrepreneurship-oriented activities of family companies and how this effect is managed by the technological intensity of the sector and firm performance. According to the research results, although family firms are less entrepreneur-oriented than non-family firms, this gap is closing with the increasing technological intensity of the sector. However, there is no evidence to suggest any change in entrepreneurial orientation in family firms resulting from a decline in firm performance. Because family firms operating in technology-intensive sectors are less entrepreneur-oriented than non-family firms. Not investing in entrepreneurship in technology-intensive environments is riskier than investing. Malpica Romero et al. (2014) conducted a study investigating the relationships between strategic orientations (market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and technology orientation) and their links to business performance in a family business. As a result of this qualitative research, descriptive data for strategic orientation scores and performance were examined and it was found that the effect of entrepreneurial orientation activities on firm performance was relatively low. The most critical factor in this is that the top management is not completely clear about how the company's competitive power can be increased. Managers stated that they are aware that adopting a better internal communication model and defining a better role can effectively improve performance. Expanding into different markets, using technical experience better (new product development), and looking for various applications with the same core product are other entrepreneurial orientations that managers want to implement to increase the company's performance. Hernández-Linares et al. (2019) examined how five key entrepreneurial orientation dimensions (risk-taking, innovation, proactivity, competitive aggression, and autonomy) affect family firm performance. Findings based on a sample of 609 Spanish and Portuguese family firms suggest that not all dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation are equally crucial for performance, as only proactivity, competitive aggression, and autonomy are essential. Other study findings suggest that not all family firms act in the same strategic way and should not be treated as a homogeneous group. Family firms cannot benefit from entrepreneurial orientation to increase their performance and even experience complexity in this regard. Family businesses need to develop entrepreneurial behaviors in order to survive in the long run (Arzubiaga et.al., 2019). This requirement is even greater in family businesses with a vision of success for generations (Cruz and Nordqvist, 2012).

While there are opinions that argue that there is no interaction between firm performance and entrepreneurial orientation, there are also examples in the literature proving that they affect each other. Hernández-Perlines et al. (2021), in their study of 106 Spanish family firms, investigated whether socio-emotional wealth anxiety increases the positive effect of entrepreneurial orientation on family firm performance. According to this research, entrepreneurial orientation positively affects firm performance. At the same time, the concern for the preservation of socio-emotional wealth positively affects both entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. Zainol and Ayadurai (2011) investigated the effects of entrepreneurial orientation on the firm performance of family firms in Malaysia based on personality traits. According to the research results, entrepreneurial orientation did not mediate the relationship between personality traits and firm performance. In this result, the tendency of members of family firms to invest in new areas and avoid risks, their beliefs, their resistance to getting extra work, and the view that the government's privileges and aid to encourage entrepreneurship are not sufficient. However, a positive correlation was found between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance of family firms in Malaysia. Klein et al.'s (2021) research results show that different strategic orientations, such as market orientation, technology orientation, and entrepreneurial orientation, affect innovation results and firm performance.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The benefits of various modern management practices to companies are innumerable. These include creating a customer-oriented business structure, adopting innovative methods, taking the role of creative leadership in the sector, combining their experience with the organization's vision, and creating a strong learning organization. In addition, it is to establish correct and tight relations with its internal and external environment, be a few steps ahead of other companies in the market, take risks when necessary, and make new investments by acting proactively. The strategic orientations firms use to achieve these benefits enable a firm to develop optimal performance, advance, and improve its organization.

Strategic orientation defines the principles that shape and affect the activities of enterprises and are necessary to increase their performance. Regardless of its type, size, structure, and culture, the relationship of this concept with performance, which is of critical importance for every business, needs to be examined in detail. In many studies in the literature, it is emphasized that entrepreneurial activities such as innovation, proactivity, and risk-taking positively affect the financial performance of companies and are essential for organizational success. To obtain comparable and more objective results, classifying companies as family and non-family and collecting their effects in a single study can contribute to the literature. Considering the entrepreneurial characteristics and practices of family and non-family companies, the primary motivation of the study is to comprehend how entrepreneurial orientations affect firm performance and to evaluate these effects in terms of two different company types. For this purpose, international examples related to the subject in the literature were taken as a basis. According to other study findings, increasing pressure to remain competitive in the current economic situation may push some family businesses to become more entrepreneurial. In contrast, others may be more risk-averse to conserving existing resources and ensuring survival. Family firms tend to participate less in entrepreneurial orientation activities than non-family firms. Surely, it is necessary in terms of natural flow to include studies focused on family companies in this article (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Voss & Voss, 2000; Naldi et al., 2007; Cruz and Nordqvist, 2012; Hernández-Linares and & López-Fernández, 2018; Pittino et.al., 2018; Arz, 2019; Arzubiaga et.al., 2019).

It has been determined that entrepreneurial orientations in non-family firms, especially in technology-intensive firms, increase firms' absorptive capacity and their activities to expand their borders. It is determined that companies with a proactive orientation are positively related to performance in dynamic environments, while competitive and aggressive companies increase their performance in uncertain and risky environments. The relationship between the entrepreneurial orientation of enterprises and firm performance negatively affects competitive strategies and positively affects differentiation strategies. When all studies are summarized, it is revealed that entrepreneurial orientation has a more positive effect on the performance of non-family firms than family firms. However, some results show that it directly affects corporate performance, vital for revenue-based performance measurements. It is observed that the relationship between entrepreneurial activities (innovation, R&D performance, proactivity, etc.) and sales performance is more intense and positive than in family companies.

In the examples in the literature investigating the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in family companies, the relationship is less or absent compared to non-family companies. Considering the results obtained from these examples, the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance in family businesses is not positive. Because members of the same family control both property and management, they do not adhere to systematic and formal procedures for taking risks and do not care enough about the different perspectives and opinions. Based on proactivity, competitive aggression, and autonomy, not all dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation were equally crucial for performance in family businesses. Other study findings show that not all family businesses act in the same strategic way and should not be treated as a homogeneous group. Family firms cannot benefit from entrepreneurial orientation to increase their performance and even experience complexity in this regard. When the factors affecting all these findings are summarized, the following results emerge; (i) family businesses avoid establishing formal control and monitoring systems such as active boards, financial controls, and strategic planning to improve performance. (ii) Family business members tend to invest in new areas and avoid risks, beliefs, and resistance to innovation. (iii) Top management is not fully aware of how the company's competitiveness can be increased. (iv) Managers are unaware that adopting a better internal communication model and defining a better role can effectively improve performance.

Unlike these views, there are also studies proving the positive effect between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. When these studies are summarized, different strategic orientations such as market orientation, technology orientation, and entrepreneurship orientation affect innovation results and firm performance. Family members' personality traits and perspectives on entrepreneurial activities directly affect their entrepreneurial orientation, thus future investment decisions, growth rates, competitive attitudes, and the firm's performance. As a result of the information obtained from these studies, opening up to different markets, using technical experience better, and developing various applications are among the entrepreneurial orientations that the new generation managers in the family business want to implement to increase the company's performance. It has been concluded that family companies should be more proactive and innovative in their management to compete more effectively in the market and survive in turbulent environments.

The study has some limitations. Since the samples used in the study were chosen without distinguishing between country, sector, and size, the findings cannot be generalized. In addition, the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance is presented with a general point of view without focusing on the sub-dimensions that make up the entrepreneurial orientation one by one. For this reason, future research can be classified to cover a certain geographical region and economic systems of the world, homogeneous groups can be formed, and by examining the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation one by one, it can be investigated more comprehensively with quantitative research which dimension has a significant effect on the overall firm performance. It can also be explored in depth with quantitative research to understand better the results of firms' entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors on firm performance. As the last limitation, it was only possible to include some current sources in this study. It would be more accurate to update the new studies to be done with the sources of the last two years. Despite a few limitations, it is thought that this article will contribute positively to the literature in terms of providing a new perspective and summarizing important sources in one place. The most important difference of this study from other literature reviews is that it includes all strategic orientations and includes both family companies and non-family companies in the process.

Strategic orientations have been one of the most researched topics in the literature with their dynamic and open-ended aspects. The study results reveal that entrepreneurial activities can contribute to businesses' strategic moves and performances in today's competitive world, where the environment and demands are changing rapidly. The importance of strengthening the strategic orientation of the companies to be ready for risks and uncertainties, focusing on long-term growth, and taking flexible and fast action has been revealed. In this direction, managers and interested entrepreneurs can benefit from examples developed on how strategic orientations can be adapted to the firm and how entrepreneurial functions can increase overall firm performance. By examining different strategic orientations together, they can more easily identify mechanisms that will improve the performance of their companies. In this context, managers can easily understand how the structure and types of their companies affect performance indicators such as productivity, innovation quality, quality of goods and services, growth rate, brand performance, and customer satisfaction, especially considering their entrepreneurial orientation. Thus, they can improve their weaknesses and understand and meet customers' needs more efficiently. While developing their innovative competencies, they can increase their performance by making moves that will turn the changes in the market to their advantage.

REFERENCES

Abdulrab, M., Al-Mamary, Y. H. S., Alwaheeb, M. A., Alshammari, N. G. M., Balhareth, H., & Al-Shammari, S. A. (2021). Mediating role of strategic orientations in the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance of Saudi SMEs. *Brazilian Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *18*(4), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.14488/BJOPM.2021.029

Adams, P., Freitas, I. M. B., & Fontana, R. (2019). Strategic orientation, innovation performance and the moderating influence of marketing management. *Journal of Business Research*, *97*, 129-140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.12.071

Agyapong, A., & Acquaah, M. (2021). Organizational capabilities, business strategic orientation, and performance in family and non-family businesses in a sub-Saharan African Economy. *Journal of African Business*, *22*(3), 411-439. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2021.1907158

Aloulou, W. J. (2019). Impacts of strategic orientations on new product development and firm performances: Insights from Saudi industrial firms. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *22*(2), 257-280. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-05-2018-0092

Arz, C. (2019). Bridging the micro-macro gap: A multi-layer culture framework for understanding entrepreneurial orientation in family firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *10*(3), 100287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2019.04.006

Arzubiaga, U., Maseda, A., & Iturralde, T. (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: New drivers and the moderating role of the strategic involvement of the board. *Australian Journal of Management*, *44*(1), 128-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896218780949

Asheq, A. A., Tanchi, K., Kamruzzaman, M., & Karim, M. M. (2021). The impact of e-marketing orientation, technological orientation and learning capacity on online SME performance. *Innovative Marketing*, *17*(3), 168-179. http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/im.17(3).2021.14,

Baker, W.E. & Sinkula, J.M. (1999). The synergistic effect of market orientation and learning orientation on organizational performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *27*(4), 411-427.

Basco, R., Hernández-Perlines, F., & Rodríguez-García, M. (2020). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance: A multigroup analysis comparing China, Mexico, and Spain. *Journal of Business Research*, *113*, 409-421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.020

Berrone, P., Duran, P., Gómez-Mejía, L., Heugens, P. P., Kostova, T., & Van Essen, M. (2020). Impact of informal institutions on the prevalence, strategy, and performance of family firms: A meta-analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-020-00362-6

Berthon, P., Hulbert, J.M., & Pitt, L. (2004). Innovation or customer orientation? An empirical investigation. *European Journal of Marketing*, *38*(9-10), 1065-1090. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560410548870

Chrisman, J. J., Chua J. H., & Steier, L. (2003). An introduction to theories of family business. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *18*(4), 441-448. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(03)00052-1

Conduit, J. & Mavondo, F. T. (2001). How critical is internal customer orientation to market orientation? *Journal of Business Research*, *51*(1), 11-24. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00044-2

Cruz, C., & Nordqvist, M. (2012). Entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: A generational perspective. *Small Business Economics*, *38*(1), 33-49.

Cui, L., Fan, D., Guo, F., & Fan, Y. (2018). Explicating the relationship of entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: Underlying mechanisms in the context of an emerging market. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *71*, 27-40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2017.11.003

Diandra, D. & Azmy, A. (2021). How multidimensional approach of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) effect firm performance: A critical review. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, *12*(1), 30-40. https://doi.org/10.18196/mabis.v12i1.9743

Erdogan, I., Rondi, E. & De Massis, A. (2020). Managing the tradition and innovation paradox in family firms: A family imprinting perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *44*(1), 20-54. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719839712

Ernst, R. A., Gerken, M., Hack, A., & Hülsbeck, M. (2022). Family firms as agents of sustainable development: A normative perspective. *Technological Forecasting And Social Change*, *174*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121135

Fındıkçı, İ. (2008). *Aile şirketlerinde yönetim ve kurumsallaşma (Management and institutionalization in family-owned firms).* (3rd ed.). Alfa Publishing.

Frank, H., Kessler, A., & Fink, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance—a replication study. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, *62*(2), 175-198.

Fu, J. S. (2020). Understanding the internal and external communicative drivers of organizational innovativeness. *Communication Research*, 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650220981299

Galbreath, J., Lucianetti, L., Thomas, B., & Tisch, D. (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in Italian firms: The moderating role of competitive strategy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 26*(4), 629-646. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-07-2019-0457

Garcés-Galdeano, L., Larraza-Kintana, M., García-Olaverri, C., & Makri, M. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: The moderating role of technological intensity and performance. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *12*(1), 27-45.

Gatignon, H. & Xuereb, J. M. (1997). Strategic orientation of the firm and new product performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *34*(1), 77-90.

Gebhardt, G.F., Carpenter, G.S., & Sherry, JR, John F. (2006). Creating a market orientation: A longitudinal, multifirm, grounded analysis of cultural transformation, *Journal of Marketing,* October, *70*(4), 37–55.

Gersick, K. E., Davis, J. A., Mccollom, H., & Lansberg, I. (1997). *Generation to generation: Life cycles of family business.* Harvard Business School Press.

Ghalayini, A.M. & Noble, J.S. (1996). The changing basis of performance measurement. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *16*(8), 63-80.

Gotteland, D., Shock, J., & Sarin, S. (2020). Strategic orientations, marketing proactivity and firm market performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *91*, 610-620. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.03.012

Gupta, V. K. & Gupta, A. (2015). Relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in large organizations over time. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, *13*(1), 7-27.

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.

Harker, M. J. (1999). Relationship marketing defined? An examination of current relationship marketing definitions. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, *17*(1), 13–20.

Helvacı, M. A. (2002). Performans yönetimi sürecinde performans değerlendirmenin önemi, *Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences*, *35*(1-2), 155-169.

Herath, H. A., & Mahmood, R. (2013). Strategic orientation based research model of SME performance for developing countries. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, *2*(1), 430-440.

Hernández-Linares, R., Kellermanns, F. W., López-Fernández, M. C., & Sarkar, S. (2019). The effect of socioemotional wealth on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and family business performance. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*. 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brq.2019.03.002

Hernández-Linares, R. & López-Fernández, M. C. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and the family firm: Mapping the field and tracing a path for future research. *Family Business Review, 31*(3), 318-351. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486518781940

Hernández-Perlines, F., Covin, J. G., & Ribeiro-Soriano, D. E. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation, concern for socioemotional wealth preservation, and family firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, *126*, 197-208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.050

Hernández-Perlines, F., Moreno-García, J., & Yáñez-Araque, B. (2019). The influence of socioemotional wealth in the entrepreneurial orientation of family businesses. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *15*(2), 523-544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-019-00561-0

Hughes, M. & Morgan, R. E. (2007). Deconstructing the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance at the embryonic stage of firm growth. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *36*(5), 651-661.

Kalkan, P. K. & Aladağ, Ö. F. (2021). Stratejik yönelim ve işletme performansı: Bir literatür taraması. *Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Kafkas University*, *12*(23), 592-620. https://doi.org/10.36543/kauiibfd.2021.025

Karpuzoğlu, E. (2001). *Büyüyen ve gelişen aile şirketlerinde kurumsallaşm*a. Hayat Yayınları.

Kırım, A. (2000). *Aile şirketlerinin yönetimi.* Sistem Yayıncılık.

Klein, S. P., Spieth, P., & Heidenreich, S. (2021). Facilitating business model innovation: The influence of sustainability and the mediating role of strategic orientations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *38*(2), 271-288. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12563

Kohli, A.K. & Jaworski, B.J. (1990). Market orientation: The construct, research propositions, and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(2), 1-18.

Krzakiewicz, K. & Cyfert, S. (2019). Strategic orientations of the organization-entrepreneurial, market and organizational learning. *Management*, *23*(1), 7-19. https://doi.org/10.2478/manment-2019-0001

Kutner, S. & Cripps, J. (1997). Managing the customer portfolio of healthcare enterprises. *The Healthcare Forum Journal*, *40*(5), 52–54.

Lansberg, I. (1999). *Succeeding generations.* Harvard Business School Press.

Lee, C. M. J., Che-Ha, N., & Alwi, S. F. S. (2021). Service customer orientation and social sustainability: The case of small medium enterprises. *Journal of Business Research*, *122*, 751-760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.12.048

Lee, D.H. (2011). The influence of strategic orientations on business performance and mediating role of entrepreneurial orientation relationship among technology, market orientations and business performance in Korean technology intensive SMEs. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Portsmouth, UK). https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.543771

Lee, E. A., Seo, J. H., & Shim, Y. S. (2019). A study on the entrepreneurial orientation and the performance of startups: The mediating effects of technological orientation and social capital. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Venturing and Entrepreneurship*, *14*(2), 47-59.

Lee, T. & Tsai, H. (2005). The effects of business operation mode on marketing orientation, Learning orientation and innovativeness. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, *105*(3), 325-348.

Lentu, L. M., Khayiya, R., & Ondigi, A. (2021). Influence of strategic orientation on performance of publicly owned hotel enterprises in Kenya. *European Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, *9*(1), 37-57.

Li, Y., Liu, Y., & Zhao Y., (2006). The Role of market and entrepreneurship orientation and internal control in the new product development activities of Chinese firms. *Industrial Marketing Management, 35*(3), 336–347.

Lin, C., & Kunnathur, A. (2019). Strategic orientations, developmental culture, and big data capability. *Journal of Business Research*, *105*, 49-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.016

Lin, Y., Luo, J., Ieromonachou, P., Rong, K., & Huang, L. (2018). Strategic orientation of servitization in manufacturing firms and its impacts on firm performance. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, *119*(2), 292-316.

Luecke, R., & Katz R. (2003). *Managing creativity and innovation.* Harvard Business School Press.

Lumpkin, G. T. & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *21*(1), 135-172.

Lumpkin, G. T. & Dess, G. G. (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *16*(5), 429-451.

Madison, K., Runyan, R. C., & Swinney, J. L. (2014). Strategic posture and performance: Revealing differences between family and nonfamily firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 5*(3), 239-251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2013.11.006

Mahmood, R. & Hanafi, N. (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance of women-owned small and medium enterprises in Malaysia: Competitive advantage as a mediator. *International Journal of Business and Social Science (IJBSS)*, *4*(1), 82-90.

Malpica Romero, A. D., Ramírez Solís, E. R., & Baños Monroy, V. I. (2014). Strategic Orientations And Their Relationship With Performance: A Case Of A Mexican Family Firm. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *13*(2), 1-20.

Masa'deh, R., Al-Henzab, J., Tarhini, A., & Obeidat, B. Y. (2018). The associations among market orientation, technology orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and organizational performance. *Benchmarking: An International Journal, 25*(8), 3117-3142. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-02-2017-0024

Memili, E., Patel, P. C., Koç, B., & Yazıcıoğlu, İ. (2020). The interplay between socioemotional wealth and family firm psychological capital in influencing firm performance in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *34*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100651

Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, *29*(7), 770-791.

Mohammed, N. (2019). A related party transactions, family firms and firm performance. *Accounting Analysis Journal*, *8*(3), 179-183. https://doi.org/10.15294/aaj.v8i3.36665

Morgan, R. E. & Strong, C. A. (2003). Business performance and dimensions of strategic orientation. *Journal of Business research*, *56*(3), 163-176. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00218-1

Morris, M. H. & Paul, G.W. (1987). The relationship between entrepreneurship and marketing in established firms. *Journal Of Business Venturing*, *2*(3), 247-259. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(87)90012-7

Mubarak, M. F. & Petraite, M. (2020). Industry 4.0 technologies, digital trust and technological orientation: What matters in open innovation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *161*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120332

Mullens, D. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and sustainability initiatives in family firms. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, *9*(2), 160-178. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-03-2017-0020

Naldi, L., Nordqvist, M., Sjöberg, K., & Wiklund, J. (2007). Entrepreneurial orientation, risk taking, and performance in family firms. *Family Business Review*, *20*(1), 33-47.

Narver, J. C., Jacobson, R., & Slater, S. F. (1993*). Market Orientation and Business Performance: An Analysis of Panel Data*. Report-Marketing Science Institute Cambridge Massachusetts.

Narver, J.C. & Slater, S.F. (1990). Creating the effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, *48*(1), 69-73.

Nasir, W. M. N. B. W. M., Al Mamun, A., & Breen, J. (2017). Strategic orientation and performance of SMEs in Malaysia. *SAGE Open*, *7*(2), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017712768

Noble, C. H. Sinha, R. K., & Kumar, A. (2002). Market orientation and alternative strategic orientations: A longitudinal assessment of performance implications. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(4), 25–39.

Olson, E. M., Slater, S. F., & Hult, G. T. M. (2005). The performance implications of fit among business strategy, marketing organization structure, and strategic behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, *69*(3), 49–65.

Panayides, P. (2007) The impact of organizational learning on relationship orientation, logistics service effectiveness and performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *36*(1), 68-80.

Pittino, D., Martínez, A. B., Chirico, F., & Galván, R. S. (2018). Psychological ownership, knowledge sharing and entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: The moderating role of governance heterogeneity. *Journal of Business Research*, *84*, 312-326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.08.014

Porter, E. M. (2009) *Rekabet Stratejisi*. Sistem Yayıncılık.

Rachmawati, E., Suliyanto, & Suroso, A. (2020). Direct and indirect effect of entrepreneurial orientation, family involvement and gender on family business performance. *Journal of Family Business Management*, 12(2), 214-236. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFBM-07-2020-0064

Real, J. C., Roldán, J. L., & Leal, A. (2012). From entrepreneurial orientation and learning orientation to business performance: Analysing the mediating role of organizational learning and the moderating effects of organizational size. *British Journal of Management*, *25*(2), 186-208. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2012.00848.x

Rezaei, J. & Ortt, R. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: The mediating role of functional performances. *Management Research Review*, *41*(7), 878-900. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2017-0092

Rosenblatt, P. C. (1990). *The family in business: Human dilemmas in the family firm*. Jossey Bass Publishers.

Soares, M. D. C. & Perin, M. G. (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: an updated meta-analysis. *RAUSP Management Journal*, *55*, 143-159. https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-01-2019-0014

Song, L., & Jing, L. (2017). Strategic orientation and performance of new ventures: empirical studies based on entrepreneurial activities in China. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *13*(4), 989-1012. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-017-0433-z

Tangör, B. B. & Özgen, H. (2022). Öz-yeterlik ve bireysel girişimcilik yönelimi ilişkisinde mükemmeliyetçiliğin aracı rolü. *Gazi Journal of Economics and Business*, *8*(1), 164-178. https://doi.org/10.30855/gjeb.2022.8.1.011

Taşkıran, G. & İyigün, N. Ö. (2019). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and entrepreneurial orientation: A research in the hospitality industry. *Procedia Computer Science*, *158*, 672-679. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.102

Toni, A. D. & Tonchia, S. (2001). Performance measurement systems: Models, characteristics and measures. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *21*(1/2), 46-71. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570110358459

Viio, P., & Grönroos, C. (2016). How buyer–seller relationship orientation affects adaptation of sales processes to the buying process. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *52*, 37-46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.07.013

Vij, S. & Bedi, H. S. (2012). Relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: A review of literature. *The IUP Journal of Business Strategy*, *9*(3), 17-31.

Voss, G. B. & Voss, Z. G. (2000). Strategic orientation and firm performance in an artistic environment. *Journal of Marketing*, *64*(1), 67-83.

Wang, C. L. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, *32*(4), 635-657.

Wang, C. L. & Ahmed, P. K. (2003). Organisational Learning: A critical review., *The Learning Organization*, *10*(1), 8-17.

Wu, B., Monfort, A., Jin, C., & Shen, X. (2022). Substantial response or impression management? Compliance strategies for sustainable development responsibility in family firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *174*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121214

Yang, C. W. (2008). The relationships among leadership styles, entrepreneurial orientation, and business performance. *Managing Global Transitions*, *6*(3), 257-275.

Zainol, F. A. & Ayadurai, S. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: The role of personality traits in Malay family firms in Malaysia. I*nternational Journal of Business and Social Science*, *2*(1), 59-71.

Zhou, W., Su, D., Yang, J., Tao, D., & Sohn, D. (2021). When do strategic orientations matter to innovation performance of green-tech ventures? The moderating effects of network positions. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 279,* 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123743

Author Contributions
The contribution of the first author is 50%, the second author's contribution is 50%.