THE DEGREE OF MARKET ORIENTATION OF THE TEACHER IN THE ECONOMIC-ADMINISTRATIVE AREA OF THE AUTONOMOUS UNIVERSITY OF NAYARIT

Arnulfo Garcia Muñoz
Academic Degree: Master in Market Research Engineering, Institution where he works: ``Universidad Autónoma de Nayarit``
ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9932-135

Hector Manuel Martinez Ruiz
Academic Degree: Master in Taxes. Institution where he works:
`` Universidad Autónoma de Nayarit``.

Aldara Maria Diaz Ponce Madrid
Academic Degree Master in Administrative Sciences. Institution where she works:
``Universidad Autónoma de Nayarit``.

Aline del Sol Munoz Trejo
Academic Degree: Master in Administrative Sciences. Institution where she works:
``Universidad Autónoma de Nayarit``.

Abstract: The objective of this research is to analyze the degree of Market Orientation (OM) of teachers in the economic-administrative area of ``Universidad Autónoma de Nayarit``. The OM proposed in this research is based on the behavioral perspective, this work projects the constitutive actions of market orientation (generation of information, dissemination and response) from the perspective of the teacher, and applies a measurement index to the context of the Institution. of Higher Education with data from a survey. The results obtained are consistent with the results presented in the literature and confirm that the teacher exhibits OM behavior.

Keywords: Market Orientation, Higher Education Institutions (IES) and Teacher.

INTRODUCTION

In the highly competitive world that is currently being experienced due to changes in the environment and changing customer preferences, companies seek how to survive and for this they look for different strategic options to improve their performance, but such changes in the environment and in customer preferences, not only does the business context occur, but it is also occurring in HEIs and one of the strategic options that has been successful in the business world is showing similar results in HEIs, in this case the The strategic option is OM, since the results of research carried out in this orientation allow improving performance (Caurana et al, 1998; Flavian and Lozano, 2006; Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka, 2010; Zebal and Goodwin, 2012; Webster et al, 2014; Chaudhry et al., 2016; Mokoena and Dhurup 2017; Mokoena, 2018; Mokoena, 2019).

This is mainly due to the fact that market-oriented HEIs generate a set of beliefs that prioritizes the interests of clients, but at the same time they have the need to generate information on the competition and increase interdepartmental activities that aim to satisfy customer needs, in order to gain competitive advantage in turbulent and competitive environments (Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka, 2010).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

MARKET ORIENTATION (OM) IN HEIS (HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS)

In the early 1990s, the theoretical current of MO emerged, with two important contributions: Narver and Slater (1990) and Kohli and Jaworski (1990). In the first one, the authors give a cultural approach to said orientation, while the one developed by Kohli and Jaworski (1990) give it a behavioral approach, the base is the generation of market intelligence and the premise is that they consider that under This approach puts the concept of marketing into practice. And define it as:

> " The generation of information by the entire organization, related to the present and future needs of customers, the dissemination of intelligence through all departments of the organization and the response capacity of the organization."

There are many definitions and meanings of the term MO. However, Küster (1999) explains that there is a certain consensus among scholars with the most significant contributions being Kohli and Jaworski (1990). In a subsequent study Kohli et al. (1993, p. 467), redefines the concept of OM as follows:

> OM is the broad generation of market intelligence in the organization with reference to the current and future needs of customers, the horizontal and vertical diffusion of that intelligence within the organization, and the broad capacity for action or response to said market intelligence.

They propose that the OM is made up of:

1. Generation of market intelligence

2. Dissemination of market intelligence

3. Response to market intelligence

Now, continuing with the behavioral model, Mokoena (2019), contextualizes it to the environment of the universities, as follows:

Market intelligence generation. It is the starting point of an OM university. The generation of market intelligence is a broader concept than the needs and preferences expressed by customers and includes:

- Collect and analyze information on current and future customer needs

- Monitor and analyze exogenous factors (such as competition, government, technology, and other environmental forces).

- Collection and monitoring of market intelligence through formal and informal means (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990).

Market intelligence dissemination. The generated market intelligence must be communicated and disseminated to the relevant HEI departments and individuals (Harris and Ogbonna, 1999). To this end, the process of disseminating market intelligence involves two aspects:

- Share existing and anticipated information across the organization, and

- Guarantee the effective use of information, which is a two-way process that includes lateral and horizontal communication (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990).

Answer's capacity. Market intelligence responsiveness refers to the organization's ability to respond to market information generated and disseminated and is divided into two types of activities:

- The first of these is response design (the use of market intelligence to develop plans) (Harris and Ogbonna, 1999).

- The second is the execution of the plan (Harris and Ogbonna, 1999).

From the MO perspective and in view of the above, there is no doubt that HEIs can and need to apply marketing concepts and theories since, as they are organizations, their MO level will be determined by their ability to: generate intelligence in their broader environment, disseminate that intelligence throughout the organization, and act in response to the intelligence generated and disseminated. Furthermore, as Kohli and Jaworski (1990) and Narver and Slater (1990) point out, the degree of MO is a continuum rather than a presence or absence, which means that, as with for-profit organizations, universities have a greater or less MO grade.

TEACHER

In Higher Education Institutions, teachers are frequently professionals who come from very diverse disciplinary fields and venture into teaching, both because of a personal inclination to this task and as a job option that is presented to them at a given moment. However, they do not always have training for this task, they have not been "taught to teach" and in many cases they tend to face the challenges of teaching by reproducing what they once experienced as students (Díaz Barriga et. al. 2002).

The educational changes are based on the need to have true educators within the university, who go beyond the delivery of information, that is, they educate. Education is one of the most demanding functions, due to its high commitment to the new generations and to the destiny of a country. Educating goes beyond the delivery of information: it encompasses patterns and behaviors that, to a large extent, cannot be measured in the short

term, but are only valued over time (Küster, Vila and Avilés (2013)

For this, the teacher has to develop three desirable characteristics or attributes Küster, Vila and Avilés (2013):

1. Intrinsic motivation: capacity of a teaching that stimulates the intellectual curiosity of the student

2. The self-concept: it is the perception that one has of oneself and includes all the beliefs of one's own nature

3. Social skills. the interrelationship with people inside the institution and outside it. For this, communication, flexibility of thought, leadership, and empathy developed by the teacher are important.

To develop it, the Institutions must develop strategic plans for the formation of competences and that these are reflected in the teaching activity (Ulloa et al., 2020).

H1. The teachers of the economic-administrative area carry out an OM behavior.

METHODOLOGY

Objective: to determine the OM index of the professor of the economic-administrative area of the UAN.

Sample determination

Teacher	51
Knowledge area	Economic-administrative
Shift	Morning, Evening and Semi-school.
Semester	Indistinct
Type of contract	Full Time and Hour Week Month
Cross-section	September 2021

Table 1. General research data

The teachers considered for this study teach classes in Learning Units in the Disciplinary-Professional Training Area.

In the Bachelor of Administration, Accounting and Marketing there are a total of 122 teachers who teach classes in the Professional Area, and for the present investigation a response rate of 41.8% was obtained.

INSTRUMENT

The scale used to determine the degree of OM was developed by Flavian and Lozano (2007). The instrument consists of 16 items and uses a five-point Likert scale.

The level of OM of the teachers was calculated following what was indicated by Gaski and Etzel (1986), an index was prepared to determine the level of OM of each of the elements that make up the sample under study. Said index was built from the total scores obtained in relation to each of the different items of the sub-scales, according to the process represented in the following formula:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}x_{ij}\right)$$

where:

ij = response given by individual i to the item in dimension/subscale j;

m = number of items in the subscale j;

n = number of sub-scales.

To make the scores more understandable, and given that each of the 16 items has a score between the values 1 (*strongly disagree*) y 5 (*strongly agree*) For each aspect of market orientation under consideration, which implies a minimum total score of 16 and a maximum of 80, four determining intervals of as many levels of market orientation were generated (*not oriented, somewhat oriented, quite oriented, and very oriented*). This way, the section of *"indifference"*, which was to be assumed by its surrounding tranches in order to improve the interpretation of the index.

RESULTS

DEGREE OF MARKET ORIENTATION OF THE TEACHER

Range	Categories	Total sample % S/ sample
(15-29)	Not oriented	2
(30-44)	Something oriented	12
(45-59)	Pretty oriented	35
(60-75)	Very oriented	51
		100

Table 2. Level of market orientation of teachers in the economic-administrative area

In view of graph No.2, it can be seen how 51% of teachers turned out to have a high level of OM (that is, to be placed within the category *Very oriented*), and an additional 35% have a medium-high level in relation to that same orientation (category *Fairly Oriented*). On the contrary, 2% of teachers in the sample were found with the category *not oriented*.

However, taking this type of analysis to each of the subscales, the results indicate the following:

INTELLIGENCE GENERATION

Range	Categories	Total sample, % S/sample
(5-9)	Does not Generate Intelligence	12
(10-14)	Some Intelligence Generation	15
(15-19)	Pretty Intelligence Generation	22
(20-25)	Very Intelligence Builder	51
		100

Table 3. Level of Intelligence Generation of teachers in the economic-administrative area.

In view of graph No.3, it can be seen how 51% of teachers have a high level of Market Intelligence Generation (that is, to be placed within the category *Very Intelligence Builder*), and an additional 22% have a medium-high level in relation to that same Generation (category *Pretty Intelligence Generation*). A low percentage of 15% of teachers in the sample with low Generation of Intelligence was verified (category *some Intelligence Generation*). It must also be noted that 12% of the members of the sample analyzed identified themselves with the category *It does not generate Intelligence.*

MARKET INTELLIGENCE DISSEMINATION

Range	Categories	Total sample % S/ sample
(5-9)	Not Disseminator Intelligence	11
(10-14)	Some Intelligence Disseminator	29
(15-19)	Quite a Disseminator of Intelligence	30
(20-25)	Very Disseminator of Intelligence	30
		100

Table 4. Level of Intelligence Dissemination of teachers in the economic-administrative área

In view of graph No. 4, it can be seen how 30% of the teachers in the sample turned out to have a high level of Market Intelligence Dissemination (that is, to be located within the category *Very Disseminator*), and an additional 30% have a medium-high level in relation to that same Dissemination (Pretty category *Intelligence Disseminator*) and only 29% present a medium-low level of Dissemination (category *Something Intelligence Disseminator*). A low percentage of 11% of teachers in the analyzed sample was found to be in the category *Does Not Disseminate Intelligence.*

RESPONSE TO MARKET INTELLIGENCE

Range	Categories	Total sample % S/ sample
(6-11)	Not Responding to Market Intelligence	4
(1 2 - 17)	Something Responds to Market Intelligence	22
(1 8 - 23)	Fairly Responds to Market Intelligence	27
(2 4 - 30)	Very Responsive to Market Intelligence	47
		100

Table 5. Level of Response to Market Intelligence of teachers in the economic-administrative area

In view of graph No. 4, it can be seen how 47% of the teachers in the sample turned out to have a high level of Response to Market Intelligence (that is, to be located within the Very Responsive category), and a An additional 27% have a medium-high level in relation to that same Answer (Pretty category *Respond to Intelligence*). A low percentage of 4% of teachers members of the sample analyzed with the category *Not Responding to Market Intelligence*.

CONCLUSIONS

In this sense, and based on the behavioral model presented by Kohli and Jaworski (1990), and Jaworski and Kohli (1993, 1996) in the field of business organizations, as well as taking into account the specific characteristics that govern the operation of the IES, it has been concluded that the market orientation of the university professor consists of the generation, dissemination and response to information to satisfy the needs of the target market.

The foregoing has allowed the construction of an index for the measurement of the level of OM of the university professor. Despite the fact that the index indicates that only 51% of teachers have a high level of OM, in the present investigation it was found that 2% of teachers do not exhibit a market-oriented behavior. However, at the sub-scale level, a greater area of opportunity is observed in the Dissemination of Market Intelligence where only 30% of teachers present a high level of Dissemination.

LIMITATIONS

The results obtained in this study are relevant in the area of the teacher's OM, but they cannot be generalized since they are specified to the OM of the teacher in the economic-administrative area of the UAN and the sample is not representative.

REFERENCES

Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B., & Ewing, M. T. (1998a). Do universities that are more market oriented perform better? *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Tomo 11, No. 1, pp. 55-70.

Chaudhry, N. I., Mahesar, H. A., Ansari, M. A., & Ali, M. (2016). Impact of market orientation on the performance of private universities in Pakistan. International Research Journal of Arts and Humanities 44(44), 21–32.

Flavián, C. and Lozano, J. (2006). Organisational antecedents of market orientation in the public university system. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* Vol. 19 No. 5, 2006 pp. 447-467.

Harris, L. G. y Ogbonna, E. (1999). Developing a market orientated culture: a critical evaluation. *Journal of Management Studies*. 36:2 pp. 177-196.

Hemsley-Brown, J. y Oplatka, I. (2010). Market orientation in universities: A comparative study of two national higher education systems. *The International Journal of Educational Management*; Bradford Tomo 24, Nº 3, (2010): 204-220

Kohli A.K., Jaworski B.J. y Kumar, A. (1993): "MARKOR: A measure of Market Orientation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. XXX (November), págs. 467-477.

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

Küster, I. 1999. La implantación de la Orientación al mercado en la fuerza de ventas industrial. *Tesis Doctoral, Univesitat de València, València.*

Mokoena, B. A. (2018). Exploring the applicability of the MKTOR scale in predicting university performance: a focus on universities of technology in South Africa. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*; Izmir Tomo 10, Nº 1, (2018): 1-16.

Mokoena, B. A. (2019). The relationship between selected market orientation dimensions and organizational performance within universities in South Africa. Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai: Oeconomica; *Cluj-Napoca,* Tomo 64, Nº3, (Dec 2019): 54-68.

Mokoena, B. A. y Dhurup, M. (2017). Effects Of Market Orientation and Barriers to Market Orientation on University Performance: A Study of Universities of Technology In South Africa. *International Business & Economics Research Journal* –First Quarter 2017. Volume 16, Number 1pp. 17-29.

Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, 20-35.

Webster, R. L; Hammond, K. L. (2014). Market orientation effects on business school performance: views from two management levels. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*; Tomo 18, N.º 4, (2014): 231-244.