ASOS JOURNAL

The Journal of Academic Social Science

Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, Yıl: 9, Sayı: 121, Ekim 2021, s. 303-316

ISSN: 2148-2489 Doi Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/ASOS.52464>

Yayın Geliş Tarihi / Article Arrival Date
25.08.2021

Yayınlanma Tarihi / The Publication Date
29.10.2021

Prof. Dr. Nezir Metin ÖZMUTAF

İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi
nezih.metin.ozmutaf@ikc.edu.tr

Bülent ERGANİ

Biostone Hayvan Sağlığı İth. İhr. San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.
Biostone.tr@biostoneah.com

EXECUTIVE'S PERCEPTIONS ON STRATEGIC ORIENTATION IN THE PANDEMIA PROCESS: A RESEARCH IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY

Abstract

The main purpose of the research is to determine the strategic orientation framework within the scope of executive perceptions in enterprises during the pandemic process. In this framework, between May 2020 and February 2021, the questionnaire form prepared for the research was applied face-to-face and via e-mail to 102 executives from upper and middle level within the scope of 12 large-scale companies that import and export in the food industry in the Aegean Region. Within the scope of the research, it has been determined that executives pay high attention to pandemic change conditions, pandemic process conditions and pandemic strategic context. It has been determined that in the pandemic process, male executives comparing to women executives pay more attention to pandemic change conditions, pandemic process conditions and pandemic strategic context. A moderate and high level correlation has been determined within the context of pandemic change conditions, pandemic process conditions and pandemic strategic context. On the other hand, it has been determined within the framework of the perceptions of executives that the processal conditions and pandemic change conditions significantly affect the strategic context during the pandemic period.

Keywords: Pandemi, Pandemic Process, Executives, Strategic Orientation, Food Industry

I. INTRODUCTION

It can be emphasized that today's contemporary organizations tend to exhibit their management in a flexible manner open to change and transformation towards the future in the context of strategic management. In this context, it leads organizations to tend towards continuous changes and transformations of external environmental conditions within the framework of their adaptation. In this context, it can be stated that the pandemic process has brought about the transformation of organizations all over the world in a way that affects their management style and processes. In that case, there is a de facto situation here.

Although organizations do not change their corporate philosophy (mission, vision, values, principles, etc.), decision and allocation processes and activities will naturally be affected by the changing pandemic conditions in connection with strategic goals and objectives and strategies. Within the scope of this study, in fact, "How and in what way will executives reflect their strategic orientation to managerial processes by being confronted with pandemic change conditions and processes in the mentioned process? It has been tried to find answers to this question with a certain perspective within the framework of manager perceptions. Looking from the perspective we live in for this question, it can also be seen as an open-ended reality, full of consequences that will bring along processes that will directly affect the organizations we have passed and their future, positively or negatively.

In this context, in this study, the questionnaire forms prepared for the research were applied to executives between May 2020 - February 2021 who work in food industry in the Aegean Region in order to determine the perceptions of them towards strategic orientations during the pandemic process, which is an extraordinary process, within the strategic framework and within the context of changing conditions.

II. LITERATURE SUMMARY

A. Pandemic And Strategic Orientation Concepts

Pandemics are large-scale outbreaks of infectious disease that can cause considerable social, political and economic decays. Evidence suggests that the likelihood of pandemics has increased over the past century due to the increase of global travel and commerce, urbanization, agricultural development and greater exploitation of the natural environment (Jones et.al., 2008: 990; Morse, 1995: 9-13). These trends will likely continue to increase. To devise and implement effective prevention strategies, the factors influencing the emergence of pandemic must be recognized and addressed at a global level (Smolinsky et.al., 2003: 150).

As the definition of pandemic is geographic, it groups together multiple, distinct types of events and public health threats, all of which have their own severity, frequency, and other disease characteristics. The variety of pandemic threats is driven by the great diversity of pathogens and their interaction with humans. Pathogens vary across multiple dimensions, including the mechanism and dynamics of disease transmission. These and other factors determine if cases will be identified and contained rapidly or whether an outbreak will spread (Fraser et.al., 2004: 6146-6151).

Pandemic risk is driven by the combined effects of spark risk and spread risk. The foci of both risk factors often overlap, especially in some LMICs making these areas particularly vulnerable to pandemics and their negative consequences (Jamison et.al., 2017: 316).

Many important epidemics such as black death, Spanish flu, HIV/AIDS are pandemics known to affect humanity throughout history. As of the beginning of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in unexpected changes to the lives of people across the globe (Huremovic, 2019: 7-10).

A large proportion of the initial cases in early January 2020 had a direct link in Wuhan City. Samples taken from Wuhan City tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. Wuhan City was the source of this outbreak or played a role in the initial amplification of the outbreak. The virus could have been introduced into the human population from an animal source in the Wholesale Seafood Market in Wuhan City or an infected human could have introduced the virus to the market (WHO, 2020: 1).

In 2020, COVID-19 affected almost all countries and more than 50 million people around the world. The coronavirus is now widely recognised that the pandemic triggered the most serious economic crisis since World War II. (OECD, 2020a: 16).

Because of the difficulties in controlling that spread of the COVID-19 virus, governments have been changing policies constantly. Many governments have quickly taken measures implementing national measures for the COVID-19 crisis. On the socio-economic front, governments are providing fiscal support to firms and households, on the health front, they have surrounding masks and lockdowns policies (Ardito et.al., 2021: 383-384).

The COVID crisis has massively accelerated some pre-existing trends, in particular digitalisation. Market for digital interaction platforms keep growing. New technologies expand as especially young people's reluctance to leave home is sustained (OECD, 2020b: 7).

Strategic orientations are the guiding principles that influence a firm's marketing and strategy-making activities. They represent the elements of organizational culture that guide market interactions with customers and competitors (Noble et.al., 2002: 25-39).

Strategic orientation creates capabilities dynamically in a changing business environment and enable companies to respond quickly to these changes. Strategic orientation refers to how a company responds to factors in the business environment. Firms that adopt a strategic orientation will be able to predict the potential for external changes in the business environment and adapt to them (Morgan and Strong, 2003: 163-164).

Start-up orientations encourage corporate behavior to be oriented towards creating competitiveness (Gatignon and Xuereb, 1997: 77-90). Strategic orientations create positive effects on small and medium-sized companies due to the high competition faced by companies.

Organizations have different strategic orientations that vary strongly with regard to internal and external conditions. Four dominant strategic orientations, resource orientation, market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and learning orientation, are apparent in today's strategy literature (Hakala, 2010: 199-217). Companies with strategic orientation are willing to act proactively relative to environmental opportunities, be aggressive toward competitors, take risks and utilize their limited resources better (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996: 135-172).

Strategic orientations have been considered as organizational resources (Hoq and Chauhan, 2011: 373). According to recent researches interrelation among different strategic orientations provides sustainable competitive advantage for organizations (Hult et.al., 2004: 429-438). Strategic orientation is very important for the success of organizations in developing countries (Dharmasiri, 2009: 121).

B. Pandemic and Strategic Orientation Relationship

With a worldwide impact, the spread of covid-19 (SARS-CoV-2) created a scenario of many uncertainties. For example, it is uncertain how to control, treat, or cope with the disease, and predict the duration of the pandemic and its effects. This is a stressful event that can be seen in the daily lives, working environments and daily work of individuals and institutions (Brooks et.al., 2020: 912-920).

In the presence of pandemic crisis, countries have implemented different and effective strategies. Some of the strategies based on pandemic policies are stay-at-home, business closures, full lockdown in society. It can be stated that some strategic decisions prevent encountering worse situations in pandemic (Ardito et.al., 2021: 381-382).

Strategic orientation gives a wide-ranging outline leaving the details regarding the content and implementation of the strategies uncompleted (Slater et.al., 2006: 1221-1231).

The strength of the strategic orientation classification is that it determines the relationships among strategy, structure and process that allows the identification of firms as integrated wholes in interaction with their environments (Gimenez, 1999: 1-14). This typology is a useful tool for classifying as well as providing better understanding of types of strategies to be followed by firms (O'Regan and Ghobadian, 2006: 603-620).

Strategic orientation can be effective in shortage of resource and competence. It can help to overcome the existing difficulties through the use of innovative activities in a way to develop their innovation process (Cassia and Zilber, 2016: 447-458).

Strategic orientation affects how to determine valuable areas of knowledge, the areas of knowledge that need to be assimilated, and the areas that need to be applied (Lane et.al., 2006: 833-863). It could be stated that during the COVID-19 pandemic, access to social contexts and the duration of interactions have changed significantly with social isolation measures.

The current historical and social context of the new coronavirus pandemic puts the characteristics of both historical and non-normative events in close articulation. In other words, the covid-19 pandemic represents a global health crisis with profound economic and social repercussions never before experienced in the contemporary globalized scenario. Covid-19 pandemic already has been considered a historical event whose effects are imposed on several generations (Moura et. Al., 2021: 375-394).

C. Researches within the Scope of Pandemic and Strategic Orientation

A great deal of research in the strategic orientation has been carried out on. Miles and Snow strategic orientation researches are one of the most important and intensely studied typologies on this subject worldwide.

Miles and Snow researches have the most frequently empirically proven strategic classifications (Ingram et. Al., 2016: 17-45). However, this typology was principally focused on the

influences of top managers on the overall direction and vision of the organization (O'Regan and Ghobadian, 2005: 81-97).

Miles and Snow incorporated the organizational strategies, structures, and process variables into a certain framework which resulted in a multifaceted typology. Their viewpoint was that strategy can adjust the connection between a company and its environment. They also maintained that internal processes and structures must be well matched with the strategy in order for the company to succeed (Miles and Snow, 1978: 546-563).

Between 1987 and 1994, more than 50 papers have applied Miles and Snow's model. As a result, the strategic orientation created by Miles and Snow is sufficiently robust for analysing competencies and strategies of the firms. In addition, the created strategic orientation has been extensively applied in different industries (Conant et.al., 1990: 365-383; Davig, 1986: 38-46).

Studies by Ritala, Henttonen, Salojarvi, Sainio, and Saarenketo have proven that adopting various strategic orientations has an impact on the degree to which companies use different sources of external information (Ritala et.al., 2013: 328-348).

If companies can adopt an effective market orientation, they can easily access market information and manage customer information effectively (Lin et.al., 2012: 42-63). Similarly, externally market orientation focused to the customers' needs, accumulation and analysis of information and knowledge close to the market has a positive impact on knowledge management (Pawlowsky and Schmid, 2012: 185-209).

Events arising from the pandemic affecting the lives of individuals have been also examined in Developmental Psychology. Life event can change the status development of individuals and can be defined from different points of view (Bleidorn et.al., 2018: 83-96). According to Woyciekoski, a life event refers to a daily event that can be psychological or physical and which can mobilize changes in the person's routine in the personal or social domains (Woyciekoski et.al., 2014: 13-24).

III. RESEARCH

A. Purpose Of The Research

The main purpose of this study is to determine the strategic orientation framework within the scope of managers' perceptions in enterprises during the pandemic process. In this context, the factors affecting the perceptions of managers in food industry regarding their strategic orientation in pandemic processes and their relationality were also revealed.

B. Data Collection Tools

The questionnaire form prepared for the research consists of two basic parts. In the first part, the independent variables of the research, age, gender, education level and duration of experience take place. In the second part, the level of strategic importance in the pandemic process as an extraordinary process, the corporate strategic perception and the strategic perception of the managers towards the employees take place. In the third part, 30 propositions about the strategic orientation that were created as a result of the literature review take place. In this content, there are researches by Miles and Snow (2005), Titala et.al., (2013), Bleiodom et.al., (2018) and Lin et.al., (2012). For statistical evaluations, the propositions have been given a weight value for

strongly disagree 1, for disagree 2, for somewhat agree 3, for agree 4, for strongly agree 5 within the scope of a 5-point Likert scale. The 30 propositions were grouped under 6 factors.

C. Data Collection And Analysis

The questionnaire form prepared for this research was applied face-to-face and via e-mail to 102 executives between May 2020 and February 2021 from upper and middle level within the scope of 12 large-scale companies that import and export in the food industry in the Aegean Region. All of the questionnaires have been included in the analysis. SPSS software has been used in the study in the scope of statistical analysis. Within the context of research, factor analysis, one-sample t test, correlation analysis and structural equating modeling have been practised.

D. Basis Hypotheses Of The Research

The basis hypotheses of the research are as follows:

H₁: Executives perceive the ..... factor within the scope of strategic orientation as important in the pandemic process. (Factors: Pandemic change conditions I and II, Pandemic process conditions I and II, Pandemic strategic context I and II)

H₂: Within the framework of independent variables, the factor within the scope of strategic orientation during the pandemic process differs in terms of the ..... independent variable. (gender, educational status, experience period).

H₃: There is a positive linear correlation between the factors within the scope of strategic orientation during the pandemic process.

H₄: The effect of orientation (change and process) in pandemic conditions on strategic context under pandemic conditions is important.

IV. FINDINGS

A. Findings On Independent Variables

The average age of the executives of the food industry is (n = 102) and standard deviation is 36.9 ± 8.03 that participated in the study. 46.1% (n = 47) of the participants are female and 53.9% (n = 55) are male. 15.7% (n = 16) of the participants are at the high school level, 77.5% (n = 79) of them are undergraduate and 6.9% of them are graduate (n = 7) education level. The distribution of experience is 55.9% (n = 57) less than 10 years and 44.1% (n = 45) 10 years or more.

For executives, the strategic importance level of the pandemic process as an extraordinary process, the corporate strategic perception and the strategic perception level of executives towards employees were determined to be very high and high. This result shows that the pandemic process attaches more importance to the strategic orientation for the executives than the usual processes (Table 1).

Table 1. Executives Strategic Importance Level, Corporate Strategic and Employee Strategic

Importance Level	Strategic Importance Level		Corporate Strategic Perception		Perception Towards Employees	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Very High	23	22,5	39	38,2	36	35,3
High	69	67,6	48	47,1	56	54,9
Middle	9	8,8	13	12,7	10	9,8
Low	1	1,0	2	2,0	-	-
Total	102	100	102	100	102	100

B. Validity And Reliability Of The Measurement Tools

Within the scope of the remote studies put forward for the strategic orientation of executives in pandemic processes in the third part of the questionnaire, 30 propositions affecting communication were gathered under factors. For 30 propositions, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value is 0.898 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is (Chi-Square = 3734,639, Sd = 435, p = 0.000). Factor analysis was carried out within the framework of principal component analysis. The diagonal values of the Anti-image correlation matrix for the 30 propositions range between 0.946 and 0.852. According to these three results, it is inferred that the structure is proper for factor analysis. As a result of factor analysis, 6 factors for 30 propositions that affect communication within the scope of remote studies explain the total variance at a rate of 79.379%. The first factor explains the total variance at 24.330%, the second factor at 13.539%, the third factor at 13.068%, the fourth factor at 9.962%, the fifth factor at 9.809% and the sixth factor at 8.673%. The Cronbach Alpha value is 0.973 for the 30 proposition structure. According to this result, it is revealed that the factors indicated by the propositions in the questionnaire explain the subject at a very high level. Cronbach Alpha values also show consistency on the basis of general, factor and item. The factors are named by considering the propositions they contain. In this context, strategic orientation factors and names in the pandemic process; f1: Pandemic change conditions I, f2: Pandemic processual conditions I, f3: Pandemic strategic context I, f4: Pandemic change conditions II, f5: Pandemic process conditions II and f6: Pandemic strategic context II (Table 2).

Table 2. Validity and Reliability

During the pandemic, relevance ..... is a strategic orientation.	Factor						Cronbach Alfa	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	General=0,973	
Within the privacy framework for changing conditions (family members, relatives, habits)	,868	,098	,228	,133	,230	,159	,965	,969
In social issues for changing circumstances (distance, communication styles, measures etc.)	,866	,118	,193	,173	,242	,125	,965	
To their sensitivity to staying home for changing conditions	,857	,103	,246	,171	,206	,169	,965	
In transport security for changing conditions (infection, timing etc.)	,792	,188	,197	,293	,221	,133	,965	
In workplace measures for changing conditions (hygiene, location, warning boards, measurement etc.)	,731	,269	,183	,406	,126	,109	,965	
In equipment offering for changing conditions (mask, suit, protective products etc.)	,711	,463	,200	,244	,020	,095	,966	

In payments / pricing for changing conditions	,673	,406	,215	,214	,115	,232	,966	
In union issues for changing conditions	,667	,500	,236	,231	,037	,158	,966	
In ways of working (flexible, remote, permission etc.)	,584	,336	,219	,350	,223	,299	,967	
In insurance frame	,499	,353	,199	,493	,222	,198	,968	
Within the scope of process training subjects (before, during, after)	,286	,720	,152	,190	,228	,113	,836	,877
In processional communicative (before, during, after)	,158	,683	,112	,169	,429	,067	,853	
In the process effective use of time (before, during, after)	,327	,648	,108	,154	,197	,271	,839	
In dealing with process stress (before, during, after)	,363	,547	,206	,047	,416	,165	,859	
In process stakeholder relations (internal and external customers, suppliers, public, NGO, press etc.)	,344	,495	,484	,169	,086	,227	,865	
In corporate philosophy (mission, vision, values, principles)	,290	,103	,811	,103	,212	,135	,853	,895
In the framework of the strategies	,314	,132	,806	,093	,181	,105	,856	
Within the framework of business policies	,186	,123	,785	,279	,188	,114	,859	
In decision processes and resource allocation	,079	,487	,647	,159	,007	,274	,887	
In managing risks (health, financial, image and reputation, etc.)	,297	,094	,509	,169	,378	,382	,893	
In legal procedures for changing conditions	,344	,115	,221	,744	,231	,170	,898	,920
In health procedures for changing conditions	,432	,259	,201	,715	,172	,211	,831	
In technological possibilities and their use for changing conditions	,406	,233	,220	,714	,187	,169	,887	
In processual motivational framework (before, during, after)	,042	,316	,295	,364	,697	,104	,886	,898
In process leadership (before, during, after)	,307	,195	,130	,177	,680	,353	,884	
In processional volunteering (before, during, after)	,486	,282	,290	,154	,621	,157	,849	
In procedural health measures (before, during, after)	,402	,347	,288	,145	,591	,199	,853	
In strong and weak sides	,214	,194	,175	,193	,206	,820	,682	
In aims and targets	,345	,121	,258	,139	,209	,696	,826	,843
In opportunities and threats	,039	,538	,188	,166	,098	,628	,826	

C. Findings On Factors

As a result of the research, H1 (Executives perceive the ..... factor within the scope of strategic orientation as important in the pandemic process) hypothesis has been accepted for all the six factors. Executives perceive pandemic change conditions I and II, pandemic process conditions I and II, pandemic strategic context I and II factors as highly important (Table 3).

Table 3. Perception of Importance for Pandemic Factors

Factors	N	Avg.±SD	Test Value=3	
			t	P
Pandemic change conditions I (f1)	102	4,4±,62	23,734	,000
Pandemic procedural conditions I (f2)	102	4,3±,64	20,979	,000
Pandemic strategic context I (f3)	102	4,3±,67	20,328	,000
Pandemic change conditions II (f4)	102	4,4±,68	21,237	,000
Pandemic procedural conditions II (f5)	102	4,3±,70	19,850	,000

Table 3. Perception of Importance for Pandemic Factors

Factors	N	Avg.±SD	Test Value=3	
			t	P
Pandemic change conditions I (f1)	102	4,4±,62	23,734	,000
Pandemic procedural conditions I (f2)	102	4,3±,64	20,979	,000
Pandemic strategic context I (f3)	102	4,3±,67	20,328	,000
Pandemic change conditions II (f4)	102	4,4±,68	21,237	,000
Pandemic procedural conditions II (f5)	102	4,3±,70	19,850	,000
Pandemic strategic context II (f6)	102	4,2±,71	18,423	,000

In terms of gender, H2 hypothesis (within the framework of independent variables, the factor within the scope of strategic orientation during the pandemic process differs in terms of the ..... independent variable) has been accepted for all the six factors. The perception of difference arises from male managers for all six factors. In other words, female managers, in terms of strategic orientation during the pandemic process, attach more importance to the factors “Pandemic change conditions I (f1), Pandemic process conditions I (f2), Pandemic strategic context I (f3), Pandemic change conditions II (f4), Pandemic procedural conditions II (f5) and Pandemic strategic context II (f6) than male managers (Table 4).

Table 4. Pandemic Factors and Gender

Factor	Gender	N	Avg±SD	T test	
				t	p
Pandemic change conditions I (f1)	Female	47	4,2±,78	-2,758	,007
	Male	55	4,6±,40		
Pandemic procedural conditions I (f2)	Female	47	4,1±,86	-2,754	,007
	Male	55	4,5±,30		
Pandemic strategic context I (f3)	Female	47	4,1±,89	-2,779	,007
	Male	55	4,5±,33		
Pandemic change conditions II (f4)	Female	47	4,2±,83	-2,265	,026
	Male	55	4,5±,47		
Pandemic procedural conditions II (f5)	Female	47	4,1±,93	-2,683	,009
	Male	55	4,5±,35		
Pandemic strategic context II (f6)	Female	47	4,0±,94	-2,991	,004
	Male	55	4,4±,33		

In the context of education and experience period (years), H2 hypothesis (within the framework of independent variables, the factor within the scope of strategic orientation during the pandemic process differs in terms of the ..... independent variable) has not been accepted for any education group. In other words, the point of view of the factors in terms of education level and experience period (years) is indifferent ($p > 0.05$).

H₃ hypothesis (there is a positive linear correlation between the factors within the scope of strategic orientation during the pandemic process) has been accepted for all binary groups

(Table 5). There is a moderate correlation between pandemic change conditions II (f4) and Pandemic strategic context II (f6). There is a high level of correlation between other binary factor groups (Table 5).

Table 5. Correlations within the Factors

Factor		Pandemic change conditions I (f1)	Pandemic procedural conditions I (f2)	Pandemic strategic context I (f3)	Pandemic change conditi- ons II (f4)	Pandemic procedural conditions II (f5)
Pandemic procedural conditions I (f2)	r	,743**				
	p	,000				
Pandemic strategic context I (f3)	r	,650**	,657**			
	p	,000	,000			
Pandemic change conditions II (f4)	r	,776**	,647**	,609**		
	p	,000	,000	,000		
Pandemic procedural conditions II (f5)	r	,727**	,755**	,686**	,667**	
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	
Pandemic strategic context II (f6)	r	,601**	,647**	,609**	,575**	,635**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

The H4 hypothesis (the effect of orientation in pandemic conditions (change and process) on the context of strategicity in pandemic conditions is important.) put forward within the scope of structural equation has been accepted within the framework of pandemic change conditions (pc) and strategic context (ps) ($p < 0.05$). The fit values are CIMIN / DF = 0.043, GFI = 0.932, CFI = 0.941, NFI = 0.936 and RMSEA = 0.069. It reveals an acceptable level of fit for this model. Beta value is 0.83. This value reveals that the conditions (conditions-oriented practices!) of pandemic change during the pandemic process significantly affect the strategic context (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Pandemic Change (pc) and Pandemic Strategic (ps) Context

The H4 hypothesis (the effect of orientation in pandemic conditions (change and process) on the context of strategicity in pandemic conditions is important.) put forward within the scope of structural equation has been accepted within the framework of pandemic process (pp) and strategic context (ps) ($p < 0.05$). The fit values are CIMIN / DF = 0.049, GFI = 0.937, CFI =

0.944, NFI = 0.934 and RMSEA = 0.071. It reveals an acceptable level of fit for this model. Beta value is 0.85. This value reveals that the procedural conditions (we can call it the managerial context for the conditions!) of pandemic change during the pandemic process significantly affect the strategic context (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Pandemic Process (pp) and Pandemic Strategic (ps) Context

V. CONCLUSION

It can be stated that the pandemic process that organizations face as an extraordinary process increases the importance of strategy for managers by revealing new versions. Although the dynamic conditions and perspective of the past remain static today, it should not be an exaggerated approach to express this process as a vital administrative school where administrators learn by living and transforming. With this study, how and in what way managers' perceptions respond to this ultra-dynamic era of the pandemic process and possible extraordinary processes in the future is considered in a way.

In this context, the findings of the study reveal that in the context of strategic orientation during the pandemic process, managers attach great importance to pandemic change conditions, pandemic process conditions and pandemic strategic context. This process can be expressed as the beginning of a process that transforms dynamism into static within the framework of its extra and unexpected orientations due to its nature.

On the other hand, within the framework of the research, pandemic change conditions for managers during the pandemic process are perceived as highly important in terms of the reflections of the changes in pandemic process conditions and the strategic context of the pandemic. Therefore, it has been determined that the interactions of these variables as a holistic and visible in business life are also seen as a strategic orientation. Although the change of corporate philosophy and culture is not generally foreseen for an institutionalized organization, perhaps this process and possible future processes may force managers and management research to move in this direction. Here, perhaps, the transformation of the long-term strategicness by differentiating into the short-term that is traditionally expressed would also be seen. In other words, in the pandemic process, both the past and the future can be flexibly perceived as an integrated purpose, goal, strategy, perception, process, decision, resource allocation... etc.

REFERENCES

- Ardito, L., Coccia, M., Messeni, P. A., (2021). Technological exaptation and crisis management: Evidence from COVID-19 outbreaks. R&D Management, RADM12455 <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12455>
- Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., Lucas, R. E., (2018). Life events and personality trait change. Journal of Personality, 86(1), 83–96.

- Brooks, S., Webster, R., Smith, L., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., Rubin, G. J., (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*, 395, 912– 920.
- Cassia, A. D. R., & Zilber, S. N. (2016). Strategic orientation and innovative activities: An analysis using the PINTEC data from 1998 to 2011. *Gestao & Produção*, 23(3), 447-458.
- Conant, J. S., Mokwa, M. P., Varadarajan, P. R., (1990). Strategic types, distinctive marketing competencies and organizational performance: A multiple measures-based study. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol.11, 365-383.
- Dharmasiri, A. S., (2009). Strategic orientation of HR managers in commercial banks in South Asia. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(6), 121.
- Fraser, C., Riley, S., Anderson, R. M., Ferguson, N. M. (2004). “Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak controllable.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101 (16): 6146–51.
- Gatignon, H., Xuereb, J. M. (1997). Strategic orientation of the firm and new product performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 77-90.
- Gimenez, F. A. P. (1999). Miles and Snow’s strategy model in the context of small firms.
- Hakala, H. (2010). Strategic orientations in management literature: Three approaches to understanding the interaction between market, technology, entrepreneurial and learning orientations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*.
- Hoq, M. Z., Chauhan, A. A. (2011). Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 373.
- Hult, G. T. M., Hurley, R. F., Knight, G. A. (2004). Innovativeness: Its antecedents and impact on business performance. *Industrial marketing management*, 33(5), 429-438.
- Huremovic, D. (2019). “ Psychiatry of pandemics: A mental health response to infection outbreak.
- Ingram, T., Krasnicka, T., Wronka-Pospiech, M., Glod, G., Glod, W. (2016). Relationships between Miles and Snow strategic types and organizational performance in polish production companies. *Journal of Management and Business Administration*, 24(1), 17-45.
- Jamison, DT., Gelband, H., Horton, S. and others. (2017). “Disease control priorities: Improving health and reducing poverty, 3rd edition.” Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank
- Jones, K. E., Patel, N. G., Levy, M. A., Storeygard, A., Balk, D. and others. (2008). “Global trends in emerging infectious diseases.” *Nature* 451 (7181): 990–93.
- Lane, P. J., Koka, B. R., Pathak, S. (2006). The reification of absorptive capacity: A critical review and rejuvenation of the construct. *Academy of management review*, 31(4), 833-863.
- Lin, R.-J., Che, R.-H., Ting, C.-Y. (2012). Turning knowledge management into innovation in the high-tech industry. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 112(1), 42-63.

- Lumpkin, G. T., Dess, G. G. (1996), Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 135-172.
- Miles, R. E., Snow. (1978). *Organizational strategy, structure and process*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Morgan, R. E., Strong, C. A. (2003). Business performance and dimensions of strategic orientation. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(3), 163-176.
- Morse, S. S. (1995). "Factors in the emergence of infectious diseases." *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 1 (1): 7–15.
- Moura, G. G., Nascimento, R. C. R., Ferreira, J. M. (2021) "COVID-19: Reflections on the crisis, transformation and interactive processes under development" *Trends in Psychology* (2021) 29:375–394
- Noble, C. H., Sinha, R. K., Kumar, A. (2002). "Market orientation and alternative strategic orientations: A Longitudinal Assessment of Performance Implications" *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (4): 25-39.
- OECD (2020a), *OECD Economic Outlook, Interim Report September 2020*, OECD Publishing, Paris,
- OECD (2020b), *Strategic foresight for the COVID-19 crisis and beyond: Using futures thinking to design better public policies*, OECD Publishing
- O'Regan, N., Ghobadian, A. (2005). Innovation in SMEs: the impact of strategic orientation and environmental perceptions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 54(2), 81-97.
- O'Regan, N., Ghobadian, A. (2006). Perceptions of generic strategies of small and medium sized engineering and electronics manufacturers in the UK: The applicability of the Miles and Snow typology. *International Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, Vol. 17, No. 5, 603-620.
- Pawlowsky, P., Schmid, S. (2012). Interrelations between strategic orientation, knowledge management, innovation and performance. Empirical findings from a national survey in Germany. *International Journal of Knowledge Management Studies*, 5(1-2), 185-209.
- Ritala, P., Henttonen, K., Salojärvi, H., Sainio, L.-M., Saarenketo, S. (2013). Gone fishing for knowledge? The effect of strategic orientations on the scope of open knowledge search. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 8(3), 328-348
- Slater, S. F., Olson, E. M., Hult, G. T. M. (2006). The moderating influence of strategic orientation on the strategy formation capability–performance relationship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(12), 1221-1231.
- Smolinsky, M. S., Hamburg, M. A., Lederberg, J. (2003). *Microbial Threats to Health: Emergence, Detection, and Response*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- World Health Organization, *Origin of SARS-CoV-2*, (2020)
- Woyciekoski, C., Natividade, J. C., Hutz, C. S. (2014). Eventos de vida constituem um construto? Evidências da impossibilidade de considerar eventos de vida um construto [Are life

events a construct? Evidence of the impossibility of considering life events as a construct]. Temas em Psicologia, 22(1), 13– 24.