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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study is to examine the strategic orientation of real estate banks in al-Dewaniya province in Iraq. The paper presents primary data collected by questionnaire. The collected data consists of: 80 forms were distributed; 70 questionnaires were returned out of which 53 were usable (valid and complete). The set was subjected to correlation and regression analysis. It was discovered that strategic orientation is positively related with the bank performance. It was revealed that competitive advantage represented mediating variable and it also influences performance. In order to be successful, the real estate banks considered the best combination between competitor orientation and customer orientation to reach the highest performance level among competitors.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Housing is a key need for the Iraqi population and will be a key driver of the construction boom. Iraq is facing a serious housing shortfall due to: high population growth rates. At present rates (2.6% annual growth), the population of Iraq will reach 40 million by 2025, creating a need for almost 2 million new housing units. To achieve the economies of scale needed to overcome financing, cost, and technical obstacles, Iraq needs real estate developers that are capable of planning, designing, developing, and delivering planned community housing at the necessary price point. Though housing input prices have risen, so have wages and the large number of government employees with steady cash flow create a pool of potential buyers for moderate price-point housing units. Foreign investment can bring new designs and techniques as well as efficient lower-cost building materials for planned communities and a wide variety of creative low-cost housing units (National investment commission, Iraq, 2008).

Another important factor, of course, is the local real estate market, which experienced a post-war boom that saw prices increase more than 1.000%. For Iraqi banks, lending has historically been largely secured by real estate, the borrowing capacity of local businesses that owned their own premises suddenly grew exponentially. However, the market contracted in 2004, as investors shied away from the increasingly insecure Iraqi business environment (IZDIHAR, 2007).
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The main objective for this study is to examine the effect that a bank's strategic orientation has on the market orientation-organizational performance relationship. In order to achieve this objective, first of all, the relationship between market orientation and competitive advantage was examined. Secondly, the examination between dimensions of strategic orientation and organizational performance was performed and thirdly the competitive advantage and organizational performance were examined.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Strategic orientation

Strategic orientation is related to the decisions that businesses make to achieve superior performance. Strategic orientation is an organization's direction for reaching a suitable behavior in order to attain superior performance. Competitor and customer orientations are the most important for organizations to achieve long term success (Hult et al., 2005; Yang et al., 2012; Al-Mohammad, 2010; Langerak et al., 2004; Kumar et al., 2011; Nasution et al., 2011; Lau, 2011). On the other hand, some research indicates that strategic orientation does not automatically lead to better performance (Hao and Song, 2016).

However, according to the most recent research that has been conducted in advanced countries, the role of market orientations and competitive advantages is still unclear especially in Iraq. To fill this gap, researchers studied real estate banks in al-Dewaniya province to clarify the role of strategic orientations and competitive advantages in reaching successful performance.

Moreover, the strategic orientation has deep effects on different organization's dimensions, like effectiveness and competitive advantage and it indicates the value of organization's trend to discover, create and maintain a set of responds suitable to the environment. According to Hult and Ketchen, 2001 the examination of market orientation is in the domain of strategy researchers as much as it is for marketing researchers.

In short, strategic orientation involves the implementation of strategic trending that guides the activities of an organization to embedded behaviors that achieve permanence in optimal conditions for the business. Strategic orientation is therefore important in finding out the organization's chances and abilities support environment and to secure competitive advantage for itself.

2.2. Market orientation

Marketing concept was originally structured in the late 1950s. Marketing was positioned among top functions of an organization, which indicated that fact that all the marketing functions need to be integrated and coordinated in order to maximize profit on long term (Kirca, 2011). According to Zhou and Dev, 2009, by adopting marketing orientation, the organization manages to satisfy its customers’ needs over the long term (Chad, 2013; Kirca, 2011). Market orientation developed its origins from the marketing as the management philosophy meaning that the organizational goals are to determine the needs and preferences of customers and to deliver customer satisfaction.

Market orientation leads to better positioning on the market in the sense that it tends to maximize the approach on how to produce an offer that is designed based on the preferences of the target market (Kim et al., 2013).

The majority of the recent studies integrate market orientation form either behavioral or a cultural perspective. The behavioral perspective is built on the information collected through various activities, as generate, disseminate and respond (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990). On the contrary, the cultural perspective focuses the organizational criteria on values that encourage behaviors that are consistent with market, such as customer orientation, competitor orientation and inter-functional coordination (Narver and Slater, 1990; Altuntaş et al., 2013; Kirca, 2011; Al-Mohammad, 2010; Tutar et al., 2015).
The study of Hult et al., 2005, illustrates that market orientation is an ideology that places the emphasis on the creation and maintenance of superior customer value and that urges employees to develop and exploit market for maximization. When an organization follows market orientation to produce value for a customer that is rare and difficult to imitate it can be a sustainable source of competitive advantage which will allow organization to outperform their less market-oriented competitors (Altuntaş et al., 2013).

Market orientation is a centrally important idea on marketing in a growing number of fields. Although the concept of market orientation has received considerable attention, the ways organizations can develop greater market orientation has received little attention. Research in strategic management has identified the characteristics of market-oriented organizations, so the market orientation is a foundation of marketing and is increasingly important in other fields such as strategic management. However, how organizations change to become more market-oriented has received less attention (Altindag & Zehir, 2012).

Researchers’ efforts to provide a perfect understanding of the impact of marketing on organization performance is reflected in many studies which indicate a positive relationship between market orientation and performance (Kumar et al., 2011; Kirca, 2011; Idar et al., 2012; Hult & Ketchen, 2001). Other author identified a negative or non-significant relationship (e.g. Grewal & Tansuhaj, 2001).

Any fierce competitive environment brings about changes in organizations and forces executives to search for the best strategies that will enable their organization to gain or sustain a competitive advantage in the marketplace (Avci, 2011).

2.3. Customer orientation

The origin of customer orientation can be traced to the development of the marketing concept, which is basically a business philosophy. The customer orientation concepts were presented early in the literature as the application of the marketing concepts at individual level individual of the salesperson. Customer orientation determines the degree to which the salesperson is willing to help customers satisfy those needs and make better buying decisions by offering products that satisfy their needs by adopting the sales presentation tactics and high pressure selling (Pousa & Mathieu, 2014). In the research literature, customer orientation is defined as “an employee’s tendency or predisposition to match customer needs in an on-the-job context. It seems that creating a customer-oriented business culture is important for successful operations in an increasingly competitive service-oriented market”. Moreover, customer orientation is sufficient understanding of one's target buyers to be able to create superior value for them continuously.

Likewise, in a customer orientation the customer focus has been described as customer of marketing. Customers have preferences both immediately as well as long term and short term preference. The immediate or short term preferences are felt and clearly articulated while long term preferences (or needs) tend to be latent (Korunka et al., 2007; Theoharakis & Hooley, 2008). Customer orientation is the organization-wide gathering, sharing and use of intelligence about customer coordinated actions based on that intelligence (Rapp et al., 2010).

Jones et al., 2003 agree with the definition that states that customer orientation is a selling behavior in which salespeople assist customers to satisfy their long-term wants and needs versus a sales orientation which places the selling organization and or/sales person before the customer. These aspects of customer orientation would help a firm to garner market share and profitability by identifying customer needs. Customer adoption is built in such way that mirrors in the market orientation. Market-oriented organizations need to learn about their customer and continue to update their learning (Da Silva et al., 2002).

On the other hand (Singh & Koshy, 2011) customer orientation is illustrated as part of a broader concept - service quality which could be directly influenced by human factors dimensions (Korunka
et al., 2007). Although the link between customer orientation and performance has been challenged (Theoharakis & Hooley, 2008; Paarlberg, 2007) customer orientation may improve organization performance by providing greater value and motivation to customers.

2.4. Competitor orientation
A manager with a competitor orientation wants to win over others even at the expense of profitability (Bendle & Vandenbosch, 2014). Competitors are the most important stakeholders that an organization must observe permanently. An organization is forced to act constantly so that its customers will not be attracted by its competitors. An organization must present its products to the customer optimally, demonstrating how it’s different from its competitors. It must at all times proceed at high levels and be respectful towards its competitors, despite of fierce competition (Dahan & Shoham, 2014).

Some scholars describe the competitor orientation as the focus on in depth estimation of a group of chosen competitors. Under this kind of strategic orientation, business units concentrate on the competitor. The goals of strategic functions is to offer resources and capabilities as well as to disseminate the information gathered from this estimation. The competitor orientation refers to the continuous observation of the competitor and catching opportunities by creating products and services that are differentiated from those competitor (Reulink, 2012; Al-Mohammad, 2010).

Empirical studies have widely ramified results on the relationship between competitor orientation and organizational performance. Some studies specify a positive relationship between the two, others find that no relationship occurs while other state the existence of a negative or a polygonal relationship between them. Some scholars warned that competitor orientation minimizes the organization’s profitability in order to be better that the rival by pressure. They advised organizations not to focus on rival tactics, but focus on maximizing their own profits.

2.5. Competitive advantage
In the field of competitive strategy, some researchers have highlighted the use of hybrid competitive strategies, which asserted both low costs and differentiation, and have defined their use to reach best performance: Corte & Aria, 2016; Handoko et al., 2015; Dereli, 2015; Izuchukwu et al., 2014. Competitive advantage is present when the firm is able to produce the same benefits for customers compared to its competitors but at lower cost (cost advantage), or to introduce benefits that exceed those of competing products (differentiation advantage). Thus, competitive advantage enables the firm to increase its performance and creates benefit value for its customers and great revenue for itself. If the organization processes the most suitable resources and capabilities, the organization adopts a strategy that utilizes these resources and capabilities effectively. It should be possible for it to create competitive advantage which is rare, non-replicable and non-transferable for competitors (Agha et al., 2012).

Moreover, the competition is the main engine of economic development, encouraging all organizations to reach for new competitive advantages that would ensure their competitiveness (Kavaliauskiene et al., 2014). Competitiveness is the ability to reach and maintain high growth rates. The competitive advantage could be related to various aspects of the organization’s activity: price, product, quality, service level, logistic system, shared values, social responsibility and so on. Therefore, competitive advantages are those unique tunable and intangible means that organization possess in the areas of activities that are strategically important for the business success and cannot be replicated by the competitors in a short-term period. The competitive edge that is based on intangible assets is also connected to the mastery in combining the resources (tangible and intangible) in a distinctive manner by the organization.
The biggest mistake made by organizations is not fully utilizing their competitive advantage. One mistake is to assume that they know their competitive advantage, but in fact they do not possess it, another mistake is to actually have the advantage, but failing to utilize it (Švárová & Vrhota, 2014). Some authors refer to sustainable competitive advantage, which means the long-term benefits of implementing some unique values - creating products which competitors cannot implement simultaneously, along with the inability to duplicate the benefits of this strategy (Mahdi and Almsafire, 2014).

An organization's ability to sense and its speed of response is strategy that enables the organization to catch opportunities and avoid threats, enhancing its competitive advantage (Herrera, 2015). Moreover, Bhuiyan, 2011; Pelc, 2014, argued that the source of competitive advantage is based on three dimensions: resources, distinctive capabilities and core competence. Tangible assets are resources such as property, vehicles and machinery, that have fixed long-term capacity and are difficult to transfer for cash. However, tangible assets are not a source of competitive advantage because they are easy to be replicated and are therefore relatively imitable, substitutable and mobile. In contrast, intangible resources are the most important strategically: knowledge or information for example organizational culture, product reputation, organization brand and the perception of service quality. All of these may be transferred for a competitive advantage at any time (Pearson et al., 2015; Othman et al., 2015; Ismail et al., 2014). To gaining competitive advantage by attaining a certain level of organizational performance is the primary condition for the successful organization on long-term (Striteska & Jelinkova, 2015). Several ways have been tried to make it possible by improving quality and reducing costs. Therefore, in studies of strategic management the subject of the competitive advantage is often raised, but among scholars and practitioners there were doubts about the sources of conceptualization and measurability of the competitive advantage (Pelc, 2014). Most of recent research has found a positive relationship between competitive advantage and organizational performance (Pearson et al., 2015; Nilssen et al., 2015).

2.6. Performance

Business performance is a broad concept that includes both financial performance, as well as operational performance indicators. Performance measurement depending only on financial indicators is not enough so non-economic indicators (market share, product development or production efficiency) are used for measuring business performance (Dahan & Shoham, 2014). Moreover, achieving superior performance represents a central area in strategic management and marketing management (Tutar et al., 2015).

In the same view (Reijonen et al., 2015; Deutscher et al., 2015; Avci et al., 2011) argued that the financial measurement is not sufficient for understanding the organizational performance because the complexity of the factors variables. Non-financial measurement has increased due to this observation.

Furthermore, performance is an ongoing and flexible process that includes managers and those who they manage acting as partners within the organization. A work environment that is set out on how they can best work together to achieve the required results will lead to performance. Performance is the end result of activities. It includes the actual outcomes of strategic management process (Agha, 2012).

Literature review on organizational performance clearly shows a general finding of all researchers that there is no single universal measure that can be utilized to assess overall organizational performance. Also, classical financial measurements are unacceptable as indicators for organizational performance. Many performance measurements and models have been developed and supported by various authors, such as: profitability, productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, adoptability, growth, innovation (Harrim, 2010).
Thus, organization performance is affected by many factors with different outputs. These outputs can be either economical such as profit margin, raise of new investments or some types of different types. or characteristics which cannot be measured. Business performance is a measurable result and the organizational decision includes the success and accomplishment. Costs are the basic parts of the performance, while performance includes competitive purpose, spiritual prevalence, reliability, flexibility, quality and rapidity (Amirkhani & Reza, 2015).

Performance could be estimated in both subjective and objective methods. For this purpose, there are three types of indicators that have been mostly adopted in organizational performance studies: growth, profitability and market share expressed by financial or non-financial indicator. Since financial indicators and performance indicators are even weakened, particularly in the changing competitive environment, non-financial performance should be represented in order to fill the gap of incomplete information (Zehir et al., 2015).

Therefore, performance measurement has been defined as the process of quantifying activities that lead to performance, from the perspective of strategy. Organizations achieve their goals by satisfying their customers with higher efficiency and effectiveness than their rivals (Maurya et al., 2015).

Organizational performance can be seen as a multi-dimensional structure that includes more than simply financial performance. It is described as the scope to which the organization is capable to match the scope of its stakeholders and its own needs for survival. Although financial and operational results are inter-related, they nevertheless reflect different faces of organizational performance and their normal direction is complicated (Lau, 2011). Deutsher et al., 2015 presented a few reasons for using a subjective performance measurement. First, given that many organizations in the sample are privately held, respondents may be resistant to detect secret objective financial data. Second, as profit levels differ across industries, subjective performance measures are more suitable in some studies. Third, objective performance measurement may not adequately indicate the financial condition of high-technology organizations. Therefore, the present study provides interesting insights concerning the effect of a strategic orientation and the relationship with performance. For the above reasons, this study will be using subjective measures in real estate banking.

3. DEVELOPMENT AND HYPOTHESES

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between strategic orientation and organizational performance based upon the literature review. Hypotheses were proposed based on groups of relationship between variables put to test:

- H1: there is a relationship between strategic orientation through competitive advantage and organizational performance.
- H2: there is a relationship between strategic orientation and competitive advantage.
- H3: there is a relationship between strategic orientation and organizational performance.
- H4: there is a relationship between competitive advantage and organizational performance.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main goal of this study is to understand the relationship among the dimensions of strategic orientations, competitive advantage and organizational performance. This paper introduces are view of literature as the dimensions of strategic orientation is determined competitor orientation, customer orientation. Competitive advantage in real estate banks is very important because of its contribution to the bank’s position among rivals and because it represents the basic role for
organizational performance. The research model developed within the context of this study is presented in Figure 1: strategic orientation, competitive advantage, organizational performance.

![Figure 1. The conceptual framework](source: prepared by authors)

### 4.1. The measuring scale

The hypothesis measurement model is shown above in Figure 1. The data were obtained from developing a questionnaire with dimensions of the strategic orientation that represented competitor orientation from Idar et al., 2012; Nasution et al., 2011; Kumar et al., 2011; Langerak et al., 2004 and customer orientation from Yang et al., 2012; Hult et al., 2005; Theoharakis, 2008. Competitive advantage from Kumar et al., 2011; Molina–Azorin et al., 2005 and organizational performance from Reluink, 2012; Hult et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2015 with five points ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The gathered data from questionnaires were analyzed through SPSS 20.0. The items of the questionnaire were divided into 8 items for competitor orientation, 7 items for customer orientation, 5 items for differentiation, 5 items for low–cost leadership and 6 items for organizational performance. Table 1 shows all the items from each of the dimensions and Cronbach’s Alpha for each one of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>No. of item</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitor orientation (comp)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer orientation (cus)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation (diff)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low–cost leadership (low)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational performance (per)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: prepared by authors*

### 4.2 Analysis

To test the hypotheses, a Pearson correlation analysis has been conducted to find the relationships among the components of strategic orientation (competitor orientation and customer orientation), competitive advantage (differentiation and low-cost leadership) and organizational performance. After using correlation, we tested the effects among variables by regression analysis to determine all the effects. Firstly, it was determined the effect between all independent variables (competitor orientation and customer orientation) and mediating variables (differentiation and low-cost leadership) and the effect on organizational performance. Secondly, we needed to test the effect of
independent variables on organizational performance. And thirdly, we needed to test the effect of the mediating variables and organizational performance.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Competitor orientation is significantly correlated with customer orientation \( r=0.866; p<0.05 \), and significantly correlated with differentiation \( r=0.723; p<0.05 \), with the same results with low–cost leadership - significantly correlated \( r=0.879; p<0.05 \), and is significantly correlated with organizational performance \( r=0.727; p<0.05 \). Customer orientation is significantly correlated with differentiation \( r=0.717; p<0.05 \), is significantly correlated with low-cost leadership \( r=0.862; p<0.05 \) and is significantly correlated with organizational performance \( r=0.726; p<.05 \). Differentiation is significantly correlated with low–cost leadership \( r=0.676; p 0.05 \) and is significantly correlated with organizational performance \( r=0.878; p 0.05 \). Finally, the low–cost leadership is significantly correlated with organizational performance \( r=0.629; p<0.05 \). All correlations are positive and hypotheses are accepted.

Following Pearson correlation analysis, a linear regression analysis has been done to find interaction among variables. Firstly, organizational performance has been taken as dependent variable and competitor orientation, customer orientation, differentiation and low- cost leadership as independent variables to develop a model that presents the effect of independent variables on the dependent, as in model 1. As can been seen in Table 3., linear regression analysis reveals that the effect of low-cost leadership is 0.737 \( p<0.001 \) and customer orientation effect is 0.228 \( p<0.10 \). These findings are consistent with literature (Powpaka, 2006; Hult et al., 2005; Wong & Tong, 2012). There is no interaction between the organizational performance and the other independent variables (competitor orientation and low-cost leadership) and this is not similar to the previous literature (Al-Mohammad, 2010; Wong & Tong, 2012). When competitive advantage is taken as dependent variable, there seems that competitor orientation has an effect of 0.530 \( p<0.001 \) and customer orientation has an effect of 0.408 \( p<0.001 \). Model 2is like previous literature (Hult et al.,2001; Al-Mohammad, 2010). Competitive advantage was excluded from model 3 to determine the effect of strategic orientation as independent variable on organizational performance. Competitor orientation has an effect of 0.392 \( p<0.05 \) and customer orientation an effect of 0.387 \( p<0.05 \). This result is consistent with literature (Kirca, 2011; Idar et al., 2012; Altuntaş et al.,2012). In model 4, when organizational performance is taken as dependent variable excluding strategic orientation, differentiation has an effect of .850 \( p<0.001 \). There is no interaction between organizational performance and low-cost leadership, although they are highly correlated to each other.

Table 2. Correlations and descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Cus</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cus</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.866*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.723*</td>
<td>.717*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.158</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.829*</td>
<td>.862*</td>
<td>.676*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.727*</td>
<td>.726*</td>
<td>.887*</td>
<td>.629*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

Source: prepared by authors
The main objective of this research is to examine the influence of strategic orientation on banks’ performance and the important mediating role that competitive advantage plays in this relationship. The results of this study indicate that competitive advantage has a direct effect on the performance of the bank, especially the differentiation strategy when introducing a new service to its customers. This competitive advantage is not affected in low-cost leadership, because the higher costs are represented in highly risk to personal loans. Another observation is that real estate banks must take into consideration the rapid changes in customer preferences and competitive actions of the market. Therefore, when the bank is attacked by competitors on different dimensions, it requires a clear view and monitoring of rivals by determining the strengths and weakness of the competitors in order to introduce a competitive advantage that will overcome all the rivals’ actions. This is not obvious in real estate banks, according to the findings. Moreover, the study reveals the positive role of customer orientation to attain the best organizational performance and this accomplished by identifying the wants and needs of the customers.

The study finds the positive influence of strategic orientation (competitor orientation and customer orientation) on competitive advantage. These results suggest that strategic orientation will be more successful in responding to customer needs and wants and in achieving a sustainable competitive advantage by focusing on differentiation. Competitor orientation is insignificant in the relationship between competitor orientation and organizational performance when all independent variables are analyzed to determine the effects of dependent variable. Nevertheless, its effect appears when strategic orientation is taken as independent variable by separating competitive advantage from organizational performance.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This research was valuable in highlighting the benefits of strategic orientation by recognizing the role of competitive advantage in enhancing the organizational performance. The findings suggest the development of new methods to monitor rivals in any time and produce new services for customers that will not imitate the products of the competitors. Another important conclusion of this study is the need for performance measurements that truly describe the business performance, which is the final goal of organizations. To attain performance, future studies need to make combinations between financial and non-financial measurements. This study established the importance of strategic orientation in order to obtain a sustainable competitive advantage by relating the recognizing the strategic orientation to enhance organizational performance. In the light of the overall analysis, the researchers arrive the conclusions that competitor orientation is not clear...
and not adopted by real estate banks in Al-Dewaniya province. Most probably, the banks exercise competitor orientation concept and other strategic orientations. Another interesting finding of this study is the trend of these banks to differentiate to deal with customers. They overlook the low-cost leadership in spite of its role in bringing more customers because of the economic crisis.
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