Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Industry: A Study of Maasai Mara National Park in Kenya

Tom Imbali*   Dr. Willy Muturi   Dr. Mogwambo Vitalis Abuga
Lecturer, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

Abstract
Many organizational failures occur due to inadequate implementation of strategy; that 66% of corporate strategy is never implemented creating strategy-to-performance gap than the gap in the formulation-to-implementation process. The ability to implement a strategy lies on firm's ability to overcome obstacles through formula-to-process implementation. The purpose of this study was to o evaluate the factors influencing strategy implementation in the tourism sector in Kenya particularly Maasai Mara national park. The objectives of the study were to examine the influence of change management on strategy implementation, to determine the influence of organizational culture on strategy implementation, to establish the influence of leadership on strategy implementation and to assess the influence of performance contracting on strategy implementation in the tourism industry in Kenya. This study adopted a case study design. The study target population was 132 respondents selected by census sampling technique. A questionnaire was used for data collection. Data collected was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics involved working out the percentages and frequencies and preparation of frequency tables. The findings of this study showed that constructs observed during change management activities to establish their influence on strategy implementation in the tourism sector found that organization pre-positioning as construct of change management influenced strategy implementation to a moderate extent, planning of implementation focus and support and consolidation were more influential on strategy implementation; values held by top management; strength of organizational culture relating to the degree of consistency of beliefs, values assumptions and practices in the sector was the most influential to strategy implementation; provision of leadership direction to implement strategies, persuading to seek goal setting for strategy implementation as elements of leadership were more influential on strategy implementation; clear planning and implementation correlation as a determinant for performance contracting was more influential to strategy implementation; finally the results leadership and change management factors were key factors influencing strategy implementation in the tourism sector particularly in national parks in Kenya. The study recommends that management and Kenya tourism board should use leadership and change management approaches to improve on strategy implementation in the sector.
Keywords: Strategy Implementation, National Parks, Tourism Industry, Maasai Mara, Kenya

1. Introduction

Strategic management is an organized development of the resources of the functional areas; financial, manufacturing, marketing, technological and manpower in the pursuit of its objectives (Ritson, 2011). Past research indicates that involvement by managers and other organizational members in strategy implementation and other organizational processes can affect a variety of firm outcomes. Many authors have suggested a coexisting relationship between organizational processes and the internal or external context of a firm (Harrington, 2004). In particular, researchers have indicated a relationship between involvement and participation in the strategy implementation process and manager-implementation preferences, organizational size, environmental complexity, and environmental uncertainty (Harrington, 2004). Strategy implementation is the critical link between formulation of strategies and superior organizational performance (Noble and Mokwa, 2009). Further, Nutt (1999) studied strategy decisions in organizations located in the USA and Canada and concluded that half of the strategic decisions failed to attain their initial objectives mainly because of the problems during strategy implementation process. Even though the stream of research which deals with strategic decision making is well developed, there are only a few empirical studies on strategy implementation. A comprehensive review of strategy implementation literature reveals that only very few studies have examined the relationship between strategy implementation and performance (Hickson, Miller and Wilson, 2003).

Strategic management is viewed as the set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation, implementation and control of plans designed to achieve an organisation's vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives within the business environment in which it operates (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). Strategy implementation is an integral component of the strategic management process and is viewed as the process that turns the formulated strategy into a series of actions and then results to ensure that the vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives of the organisation are successfully achieved as planned (Thompson and Strickland, 2003). For the past two decades, strategy formulation has been widely regarded as the most important component of the strategic management process and is more important than strategy implementation or strategic control. However, recent research indicates that strategy implementation is a key requirement for superior

business performance. In addition, there is growing recognition that the most important problems in the field of strategic management are not related to strategy formulation, but rather to strategy implementation (Kaplan and Norton, 2000). The high failure rate of organizational initiatives in a dynamic business environment is primarily due to inadequate implementation of new strategies.

The concept of 'performance management' remains ambiguous in spite of the enormous attention it has received in academic writings (Carroll, 2005). The confusion, according to Carroll and Dewar (2006), stems from the fact that many scholars continuously use it interchangeably with 'performance measurement' and other forms of performance assessment including performance evaluation, performance monitoring, and performance reporting (Bruijn, 2007; Halachmi, 2005; McAdam et al., 2005; Pollitt, 2006; Talbot, 2005). Yet, one may argue that these forms of performance assessment are part of the generic idea of performance management system. According to Schwartz (2009), one should not confuse performance management with performance appraisal and evaluation. The distinction of performance management consists in the fact that it has three main components: understanding and setting goals and expectations; providing on-going feedback; and appraising performance. Mupazviriho (2008) is also of the view that 'performance management extends beyond the concept of performance appraisal or performance related pay of the 1980s, which only tries to address how a person should be rewarded after the completion of tasks over a given period', while Briscoe and Claus (2008) say that performance management is the system through which organizations 'set work goals, determine performance standards, assign and evaluate work, provide performance feedback, determine training and development needs, and distribute rewards'. Performance management is, therefore, 'conceived as a framework with system properties' (Bouckaert & Halligan, 2008). Further, Rubiensak and Bovaird (2009) say that performance management 'is a system for focusing managers on the goals of the organization, in order to shape their work so that it contributes more systematically to the success of the organization', while Varma et al., (2008a) see it as 'the key process by which organizations set goals, determine standards, and assign and evaluate work'. Perhaps the most profound definition is the one given by Carroll and Dewar (2008). Examining the ambiguity that has surrounded the concept and with a thorough review of the literature, the two concluded that it is the 'collecting, reporting, and using of information about government programs to assess and improve the delivery of government services'.

1.1 Statement Problem

Many organizational failures occur due to inadequate implementation of strategy; Johnson (2004) reveals that 66% of corporate strategy is never implemented. Crittendens (2008) relate the problem to "strategy-to-performance gap, than the gap in the formulation-to-implementation process", the sequence of implementation of strategy is comprised of communication, interpretation, adoption and enactment; which when inadequately addressed, implementation may not be actualised. A company's ability to implement its strategy lies on its ability to overcome obstacles through formula-to-process implementation. Some studies (Hickson et. al, 2003) have examined the relationship between strategy implementation and organizational performance, while overlooking at strategic planning and business level strategy. Strategy implementation is critical in linking strategy formulation and organizational performance, the extent to which an organization has been successful in implementing strategy has a direct impact on organizational performance. This study seeks to evaluate factors influencing strategy implementation in Tourism sector in Kenya, with a particular interest in Maasai Mara National Park, tourism site in Narok County.

1.2 Research Objectives

The study was guided by the following specific objectives:
   (i)   To examine the influence of change management as a factor on strategy implementation in the tourism industry in Kenya
   (ii) To establish the influence of organizational culture as a factor on strategy implementation in the tourism industry in Kenya
   (iii) To investigate the influence of leadership as a factor on strategy implementation in the tourism industry in Kenya
   (iv) To establish the influence of performance contracting as a factor on strategy implementation in the tourism industry in Kenya

1.3 Empirical Literature

Hrebiniak's (2006 and 2008) argument that, while formulating a strategy is hard, making it work, like "executing or implementing it throughout the organisation", is even harder is supported by past empirical studies which report weak relationships between strategy formulation and its implementation. Fortune magazine (Gurowitz, 2007) finds that less than 10% of well-formulated strategies are also effectively executed. Identical results of just 10% of strategies being successfully implemented are also reported by Judson (1991) and Speculand (2006). A

2003 survey by the Economist Intelligence Unit and Makaron Associates (Mankins and Steele, 2005) reports slightly better but still very disappointing achievements, discovering that on average companies deliver a mere 63% of the potential financial performance their strategies have promised. Raps (2004), the real success rate of strategy implementation lies between 10% and 30%. Therefore, most companies have strategies but only a few actually realise them. These low success rates are discouraging, especially since many companies recently have invested huge sums of money to improve their strategic planning.

Hitt, Ireland and Hokinson (2005) state that resources based view model and the industrial organization model are used by organizations to generate the strategic inputs needed to successfully formulate and implements strategies and the mountain strategic flexibility. The resources based theory aspires to explain the internal sources of firm sustained completive advantage, its central preposition is that if a firm is to achieve the state of sustained competitive advantage it must acquire and control valuable, rare, imitable and non-substitutable resources.

Past studies indicate that it is not the environment but the resources of the organization which form the foundation of the firm strategy organization to utilize its resources and capabilities relative to opportunities in the external environment. Werner let (1984)defined a fundamental principle that the basis of competitive advantage of an organization lies in the application of the bundle of vulnerable resources at the organization disposal. The resources have to fulfill the VRIN criteria of being valuable, rare, inimitable and non substuitable in order to achieve a sustainable advantage (Barney 1991)

More recent studies seem to be more structured and focus on two different but closely connected views of strategy implementation; the structural view and the interpersonal process view (Skivington and Daft, 1991). The structural view proposes that managers make adjustments to formal, structural elements of the organisation in order to enact strategic decisions while the interpersonal process view deals with a range of interpersonal and cognitive factors that managers must also address to interpret and respond to a strategic initiative. In addition, some authors propose specific divisions of the key areas of strategy implementation such as people, culture and control systems and instruments (Raps, 2004). Besides the activities that need to be accomplished if a company wants to implement its strategies, one should not neglect variables in the organisational context that could hinder effective strategy implementation. Hrebiniak (2005) identifies four broad contextual factors that deserve special attention when discussing obstacles to strategy implementation. These include the change management context, the organisational culture context, the organisational power structure context and the leadership context. Managing change is difficult but absolutely critical for successful strategy execution (Hrebiniak, 2008). Hrebiniak (2005) study found that problems with change management constitute the single biggest threat to strategy implementation. Leaders must therefore identify areas of necessary change and overcome any potential resistance to change. They are instrumental in changing and managing key people, incentives and organisational structures.

Organisational culture refers to the shared values, attitudes and norms of behaviour that create the propensity for individuals in an organisation to act in certain ways. One of the most common culture-related problems in companies is inadequate trust (Hrebiniak, 2005), which usually results in poor or inadequate information and knowledge sharing between individuals and or business units responsible for strategy implementation. This problem was ranked as one of the largest obstacles to strategy execution by American managers (Hrebiniak, 2005). Another common cultural problem is the domination of the short-term orientation in a company. Two independent studies conducted by Alexander (1985) and Al-Ghamdi (1998) report that competing short-term activities distract attention from strategy implementation in 64% and 83% of companies, respectively.

The organisational power structure is important because it influences decisions regarding the allocation of all kinds of resources necessary for strategy execution. Hrebiniak (2005, 2006) and Gurkov (2009) argue that even well-prepared and sound plans die if the implementers fail to confront difficult organisational and political obstacles that stand in the way of effective implementation. Therefore, strategy executors must persuade all relevant employees to carry out all activities necessary to implement the strategy (Hrebiniak, 2005). Obviously, the top manager's guidance, support and active involvement in strategy implementation is critical (Brenes et al., 2008). If those in power do not care about or even resist execution of the strategy, the success of the implementation process is clearly jeopardised (Hrebiniak, 2005).

Finally, proper leadership skills are also needed to ensure employees will execute the selected strategies. One of the biggest problems is usually the lack of co-ordination and clear guidelines (Hrebiniak, 2005). According to Kaplan and Norton (2006), this problem can be partly solved by using strategic maps which connect a strategy paper with an operative execution plan and can therefore substitute organising efforts for strategy implementation. Another important function of leadership is to "sell" the strategy to everyone who matters (Hambrick et. al, 1989). A strategy must therefore be successfully communicated to the employees (Hrebiniak, 2005b). Kaplan and Norton (2005) argue that on average 95% of a company's employees are unaware of or do not understand the company's strategy. And if the employees are unaware of the strategy, they

surely cannot help the company implement it effectively. Studies also confirm the success of the strategy execution depends on the adoption of a compensation system that motivates managers and employees to achieve company goals (Terborg et. al., 1985).

In addition to the four organisational context variables one should not forget that a strategy cannot be successfully implemented if the strategic planning, that is, strategic analysis (Pucko and Cater 2008) and strategy formulation (Hrebiniak (2005), is inadequate. In this regard, Giles (1991) argues there are three reasons why poor strategic planning is an obstacle to strategy implementation; a strategy is not really a strategy but "a mixture of budgets and management wish list"; a strategy is not executable; and a strategy is not owned by the executors because they did not participate in its formulation and therefore do not accept it as "their own". Therefore thirteen of the most commonly addressed obstacles to strategy implementation that can be classified in five broad groups: problems in strategy formulation, change management problems, organisational culture problems, problems related to organisational power structure and leadership problems.

1.4 Research Methodology

This study adopted a case study design to assess implementation of strategies in terrestrial National Parks in Kenya. The study target population was 132 respondents who were selected using census sampling technique. A structured questionnaire was used for data collection. Quantitative data collected in this study was organized for consistency before processing. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and the five point Likert scale.

1.5 Results and Discussion

1.5.1 Factors for Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Industry

The study established the factors influencing the strategies implemented in the tourism industry particularly the national parks in Kenya.

Table 1 Factors influencing Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Industry

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Change Management Approaches	40	30.3%
Leadership Approaches	53	40.15%
Organizational Culture	15	11.36%
Performance Contracting	24	18.2%
Total	**132**	**100%**

Table 1 reveals that leadership approaches influence strategy implementation in the tourism industry as expressed by 40.15% of the total respondents. 30.3% of the respondents felt that change management approaches as factor influence strategy implementation in the tourism industry. 18.2% of the respondents felt that performance contracting influenced strategy implementation in the national parks in Kenya. For organizational culture 11.36% of the respondents indicated that it contributed to strategy implementation

The study further established the factors that have been used by the tourism industry frequently in the strategy implementation for the last ten years.

Table 2 Factors Frequently used in Strategy Implementation in the Industry

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Change Management Approaches	45	34.1%
Leadership Approaches	37	28.0%
Organizational Culture	18	13.6%
Performance Contracting	32	24.2%
Total	**132**	**100%**

Table 2 indicate that change management approaches as factors have been used by the tourism industry in the strategy implementation more frequently than others as expressed by 34.1% of the respondents in this study. While 28.0% of the respondents indicated that leadership approaches were more frequently used followed by performance contracting at 24.2% and organizational culture at 13.6% of the total respondents expressed that it is used more frequently in strategy implementation.

The study further established the extent to which the factors influenced strategy implementation in the tourism industry in the national parks in Kenya. The responses obtained from the field ranged from no extent (1.0), less extent (2.0) moderate extent (3.0), greater extent (4.0) and to greater extent (5.0) and recorded as in table 3 below

Table 3 Factors influence on Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Industry

Factors in the Industry	Rating of Responses						Total %
	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	f	
Change Management Approaches	19 (14.39%)	23 (17.4%)	58 (43.9%)	21 (15.9%)	11 (8.3%)	132	100%
Leadership Approaches	33 (25%)	40 (30.3%)	51 (38.6%)	5 (3.7%)	3 (3.7%)	132	100%
Performance Contracting	20 (15%)	29 (21.96%)	38 (28.8%)	41 (31.1%)	4 (3.0%)	132	100%
Organizational Culture	15 (11.36%)	32 (24.57%)	43 (32.57%)	28 (21.2%)	14 (10.6%)	132	100%

Table 3 indicate the extent to which each factor do influence strategy implementation in the industry in a scale of 5.0 to 1.0; the responses obtained indicate that change management approach influenced to moderate extent as indicated by 43.9% of the respondents; leadership approach was rated at moderate extent in influencing strategy implementation in the industry. Performance contracting was rated by majority of the respondents 31.1% to influence strategy implementation to a less extent. For organization culture majority of the respondents expressed that it influences strategy implementation to moderate extent and its response rate was 32.57% as indicated by the respondents.

1.5.2 Change Management Approach and Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Sector

The study sought to establish the extent to change management approach influence the strategy implementation in the industry. The constructs observed during change management activities were used to establish the influence on strategy implementation in the tourism sector. The focus of change management approach was anchored on organizational positioning, change management plans implementation focus on objectives, and support and consolidation phases in the change management processes. The constructs were rated on a scale of 5.0 for most influential, 4.0 for more influential,3.0 for moderately influential, 2.0 for less influential and 1.0 for not influential.

Table 4 Focus on Constructs of Change Management and Strategy Implementation

Focus on Constructs of Change Management	Rating of Responses						Total %
	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	f	
Organization Pre-Positioning	41 (31.1%)	32 (24.2%)	51 (38.6%)	5 (3.8%)	3 (2.3%)	132	100%
Plans Implementation focus	38 (28.8%)	46 (34.8%)	32 (24.2%)	14 (10.6%)	2 (1.5%)	132	100%
Support and Consolidation	19 (14.4%)	48 (36.4%)	43 (32.5%)	10 (7.5%)	12 (9.09%)	132	100%

Table 4 shows that organization prepositioning as a construct of change management influence strategy implementation to a moderate extent as expressed by 38.6% of the total respondents. Plans implementation focus is more influential on strategy implementation as expressed by 34.8% of the total respondents in this study. While support and consolidation was also rated more influential to strategy implementation by 36.4% of the total respondents in this study.The findings in this study concur with past studies literature on the tourism sector as one of the steadily growing industries in the world; made primarily of small and medium enterprises (By and Dale, 2006). The tourism industry is faced with an increasingly dynamic and complex environment whose evolution and shifts have a major influence on ability of the businesses to compete and perform. In the most general sense, the noticeable difference in form, quality or state in the dimensions of tourism sector at different moments of time (Poole and Van de Ven, 2004). Poole and Van de Ven (2004) organizational change involves three aspects: differences in form, different temporal moments, and different states of the entity. Other authors feel a greater need for conceptual precision and try to specify elements suffering modifications or being subject to human interventions. For instance Wood (2000, cited in Gomes, 2009) defines organizational change as structural, strategic, cultural, technological or human transformation with an impact on the organization. By this, the author offers types of organizational changes rather than a precise definition. Burduş, et al. (2003) make a step further and define change as replacement, modification, transformation of the form or the substance of an object, product, work, service, activity or process.

1.5.3 Determinants of Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation

The second objective was to establish the influence of organization culture on strategy implementation in the tourism sector particularly in the national parks. The determinants of organization culture were used to elicit opinions of respondents in this study. The response were rated on a scale of 5.0 for most influential, 4.0 for more influential,3.0 for moderately influential, 2.0 for less influential and 1.0 for not influential and were recorded as in table 5 below

Table 5 Determinants of Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation

Determinants of Organization Culture	Rating of Responses						Total %
	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	f	
Values held by top management	15 (11.36%)	49 (37.12%)	42 (31.8%)	23 (17.4%)	3 (2.3%)	132	100%
History of the Organization	12 (9.09%)	23 (17.4%)	45 (34.1%)	50 (37.9%)	2 (1.5%)	132	100%
Top management Vision	23 (17.4%)	14 (10.6%)	56 (42.4%)	34 (25.75%)	5 (3.8%)	132	100%
Strength of organizational Culture (degree of consistency of beliefs, values assumptions and practices) in the sector.	42 (31.8%)	41 (23.5%)	39 (29.5%)	9 (6.8%)	10 (7.5%)	132	100%

Table 5 shows that values held by top management were more influential on strategy implementation

as indicated by majority of the respondents 37.12%. The history of the organization was less influential on strategy implementation as indicated by 37.9% of the total respondents. For top management vision it influenced strategy implementation to a moderate extent as expressed by 42.4%of the total respondents. But strength of organizational culture relating to the degree of consistency of beliefs, values assumptions and practices in the sector were most influential to strategy implementation as expressed by 31.8% of the respondents in this study. This study results concur with past studies like Schein (1985) which defines culture as a "pattern of basic assumptions-invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that have worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to the new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. Culture is defined as cumulative preferences of some states of life over others(values), response predispositions towards several significant issues and phenomena like attitudes, organized way of filling time in relation to certain affairs rituals, and ways of promoting desired behaviors and preventing undesirable ones (sanctions). Pareeck (2003) defined culture as the cumulative beliefs, values and assumptions, underlying transaction with nature and important phenomena. Hulya et al (2010) observed that an organizations' cultural orientation is a contributing factor to its perceived performance. The study revealed that while clan organizational culture is a sole contributing factor for project and business performance, Project Management Maturity interacts with market culture in improving business performance. Shunzhong- Liu (2009) found that there exist strongly complementary relationships among innovative supportive culture, market orientation culture, learning culture and customer communication culture. Braunscheidel, et.al. (2010) examined the effects of organizational culture on cultural characteristics to determine the types of cultural characteristics that are strongly associated with efforts to integrate the supply chain and delivery performance.

1.5.4 Leadership factor and Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Sector

The study established the elements of leadership factor that influenced strategy implementation in the tourism sector particularly in the national parks; the response rate obtained from the field were on a scale of 5.0 for most influential, 4.0 for more influential,3.0 for moderately influential, 2.0 for less influential and 1.0 for not influential and were recorded as in table 6 below.

Table 6 Leadership factor and Strategy Implementation

Elements of Leadership	Rating of Responses					f	Total %
	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0		
Provision of leadership direction to implement strategies	41 (31.06%)	47 (35.6%)	24 (18.2%)	19 (14.3%)	1 (0.75%)	132	100%
Persuading to seek goal setting for strategy implementation	18 (13.6%)	51 (38.64%)	36 (27.2%)	24 (18.2%)	3 (2.2%)	132	100%
Binding groups and motivating them towards goals for strategy implementation	14 (10.6%)	32 (24.2%)	53 (40.1%)	28 (21.2%)	5 (3.7%)	132	100%
Exerting some influence through leadership power to influence followers on the chosen direction	33 (25%)	44 (33.3%)	49 (37.12%)	4 (3.0%)	2 (1.5%)	132	100%

Table 6 indicate that provision of leadership direction to implement strategies as elements of leadership is more influential 35.6% (47), while persuading to seek goal setting for strategy implementation was also more influential at 38.64% (51) response rate. Binding groups and motivating the groups towards goals for strategy implementation was rated moderately influential at 40.1% (53) by the respondents; exerting influence through leadership power to influence followers on the chosen direction was rated to influence strategy implementation at a rate of 37.12% (49) as expressed by the respondents in this study. The findings in this study concurs with past studies that the capabilities of the managers, their role in creating the organisation or their relationship to their network, may affect the translation of knowledge into organizational performance. Managers' capabilities are acquirable assets whose ownership has a fundamental influence on organizational performance. Different traits of managers like gender, age, experience, and education may lead to different levels of organizational performance. Although a variety of leadership concepts have been introduced. Burns (1978) proposed that the most promising are transformational and transactional leadership that fosters progress in an organization or sector.

1.5.5 Determinants of Performance Contracting and Strategy Implementation

The study sought to establish the influence of determinants of performance contracting on strategy implementation in the tourism sector. The response rate obtained from the field was presented as in table 4.8 below (on a scale of 5.0 for most influential, 4.0 for more influential,3.0 for moderately influential, 2.0 for less

influential and 1.0 for not influential).

Table 7 Determinants of Performance Contracting and Strategy Implementation

Determinants of Performance Contracting	Rating of Responses						fTotal %
	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0		
Clear appointment of responsibility for action	29 (21.9%)	47 (35.6%)	51 38.64%	2 (1.5%)	3 (2.3%)	132	100%
Clear planning and implementation correlation	32 (24.2%)	46 (34.84%)	45 (34.1%)	5 (3.78%)	4 (3.0%)	132	100%
Creating fair and accurate impression on performance	14 (10.6%)	35 (26.5%)	43 (32.57%)	28 (21.2%)	12 (9.1%)	132	100%

Table 7 reveal that clear appointment of responsibility for action as a determinant for performance contracting to strategy implementation was rated moderately influential at 38.64% (51) by the respondents. Clear planning and implementation correlation was rated more influential by majority of respondents at 34.84% (46); while creating fair and accurate impression on performance was rated moderately at 32.57% (43) by the majority of the respondents in this study. This study results concurs with past studies that Performance Contracting is a Management Control Systems and contractual agreement to execute a service according to agreed-upon terms, within an established time period, and with a stipulated use of resources and performance standards (Cole, 2002). Performance contracting as an element of broader public sector reform is aimed at improving efficiency and effectiveness, while reducing total costs (Domberger, 1998). A performance contract constitutes a range of management instruments used to define responsibilities and expectations between parties to achieve mutually agreed results. Performance Contracts has been acclaimed as an effective and promising means of improving the performance of public institutions including the Ministry of Tourism. Over the last three periods of performance contracting, the public has raised dissatisfaction on the results as they do not relate to performance (service delivery) on the ground as perceived and received by the public. The dissatisfaction with the performance results may not be limited to members of the public but also to Ministries, Departments and Agencies that are challenged by their performance (Kobia and Mohammed, 2006).

1.5.6 Factors influencing Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Sector.

The study sought to establish how each of the factors influenced the strategy implementation in the sector. The magnitude of influence was rated on a scale of 5.0 for most influential, 4.0 for more influential,3.0 for moderately influential, 2.0 for less influential and 1.0 for not influential. The response rate obtained from the field was recorded as in table 8 below.

Table 8 Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation in the Tourism Sector

Factors for Strategy Implementation	Rating of Responses						Total %
	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	f	
Leadership factor	28 (21.2%)	63 (47.7%)	23 (17.4%)	8 (6.0%)	10 (7.5%)	132	100%
Change management factor	34 (25.75%)	57 (43.2%)	32 (24.2%)	2 (1.5%)	7 (5.3%)	132	100%
Organization Culture factor	18 (13.64%)	26 (19.72%)	32 (24.2%)	52 (39.4%)	4 (3.0%)	132	100%
Performance Contracting factor	15 (13.6%)	34 (25.7%)	47 (35.6 %)	31 (23.5%)	5 (3.78%)	132	100%

Table 8 indicate that the leadership factor is the more influential at 47.7 % (63) response rate on strategy implementation whereas change management factor also rated as ,more influential at 43.2% (57) response rate by the respondents. Organizational culture factor was rated less influential by majority of the respondents at 39.4% (52) on strategy implementation in the tourism sector whereas performance contracting was rated moderately influential at 35.6% (47) by the respondents in this study. From these results leadership and change management factor stand out as factors influencing strategy implementation in the tourism sector particularly in national parks in Kenya.

1.6 Conclusion

From the findings of the study objectives the study concludes that leadership approaches, change management approach, organization culture approach and performance contracting approach and their construct elements influence strategy implementation in the tourism sector particularly in the national parks in Kenya.

1.7 Recommendations of the Study

Based on the findings and conclusions on the objectives of this study, the study recommends that management of the national parks and the tourism sector at large should observe leadership, change management, organization culture and performance contracting approaches as factors to assist in improving performance

References

Alexander, L.D. (1985): *Long Range Planning,* New York Free Press18, 3, 91-97.

Al-Ghamdi, S.M. (1998): *Obstacles to successful implementation of strategic decisions*: The British experience. European Business Review, 98, 6, 322-327.

Allio, M.K. (2005). *'A Short Practical Guide to Implementing Strategy'.* Journal of Business Strategy, 26(4). pp. 12-21.

Barnes, Jeff; O'Hanlon, Barbara; Feeley, Frank; McKeon, Kimberly; Gitonga, Nelson; Decker, Caytie. (2010). *Private health sector assessment in Kenya*. World Bank paper; no. 193. Washington D.C.

Beer, M. & Eisenstat, R. A. (2000). '*The Silent Killers of Strategy Implementation and Learning'*. Sloan Management Review, 41(4), pp. 29-

Bititci, U.S., Mendibil, K., Martinez, V. and Albores, P. (2005), "*Measuring and managing performance in extended enterprises*", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 333-53.

Bouckaert, G. and Halligan, J. (2008) *Managing Performance*: *International Comparisons*. London: Routledge.

Bourgeois, L.J. III and Brodwin, D.R. (1984): *Strategic implementation: Five approaches to an elusive phenomenon*. Strategic Management Journal, 5, 3, 241-264.

Bourne, M., Melnyk, S. and Faull, N. (2007), "*The impact of performance measurement on performance*", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 27 No. 8

Brenes, E.R. and Mena, M. and Molina, G.E. (2008): *Key success factors for strategy implementation in Latin America*. Journal of Business Research, 61, 6, 590-598.

Briscoe, D.B. and Claus, L.M. (2008) *Employee performance management: policies and practices in multinational enterprises* .Performance management system vol 8

Bruijn, H.D. (2007) *Managing Performance in the Public Sector*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Carroll, B.W. (2005) '*Some Obstacles to Defining and Measuring Results'*, Optimum 31(1): 1–15.

Burns, J. M. (1978) "Leadership New York," Harper and Row Publishers,.

Carroll, B.W. (2006) '*An Overview on Performance and Performance Reporting'*, paper presented to the IPAC National and Hamilton Regional Group Seminar on New Frontiers in Public Sector Performance Reporting (February), Oakville.

Carroll, B.W. and Dewar, D.I. (2008) '*Performance Management*: Panacea or Fool's Gold', in C. Dunn (ed.) *The Handbook of Canadian Public Administration*, pp. 400–29. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Christian, C. (2006). *The legal Aspects of Doing Business in Africa*. York Hill law Publishing

Connor, T. (2001): *Product levels as an aid to functional strategy development.* Strategic Change, 10, 4, 223-237.

Crittenden, V.L. and Crittenden, W.F. (2008): *Building a capable organization: The eight levers of strategy implementation*. Business Horizons, 51, 4, 301-309.

CrittendenV.L.andCrittenden,W.F.(2008),"*Buildingacapableorganization*: *The eight levers of strategy implementation*", Business Horizons, Vol. 51, pp. 301-309.

Farsight B. *Leadership Organisation* (2007): Strategy implementation and realisation, www.businessballs.com and businessstrategyimplementation.htm.

Flood, P.C., Dromgoole, T., Carrol, S.J. & Gorman, L. (eds). (2000). *Managing Strategy Implementation: An Organizational Behaviour Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Freedman, M. (2003). '*The Genius is in the Implementation'*. Journal of Business Strategy, 24(2), pp. 26-31.

Freedman, M. (2003). '*The Genius is in the Implementation'*. Journal of Business Strategy, 24(2), pp. 26-31.

Giles, W.D. (1991): *Making strategy work*. Long Range Planning, 24, 5, 75-91.

Gimbert, X., Bisbe, J. and Mendoza, X. (2010), "The *role of performance measurement systems in strategy formulation processes*", Long Range Planning, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 477-97.

Gottschalk, P. (2008): *Organizational structure as predictor of intelligence strategy implementation in policing*. International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 36, 3, 184-195.

Gurkov, I. (2009): *Strategy process as formulation and realization of corporate goals: The synthesis of surveys in Russian firms*. Journal for East European Management Studies, 14, 1, 48-64.

Gurowitz, E.M. (2007): *The challenge of strategy implementation,* www.gurowitz.com and articles and strategy.pdf

Halachmi, A (2005) *Performance Measurement: Test the Water before you Dive in,* International Review of Administrative Sciences, 71 (2), 255-266

Halamachi, A. (2002) '*Performance Measurement, Accountability, and Improved Performance'*, Public Performance and Management Review 25(4): 370–4.

Hambrick, D. C. & Cannella, Jr., A. A. (2009). '*Strategy Implementation as Substance and Selling'*. Academy of Management Executive, 3(4), pp. 278-

Harrington, R. J. (2004). *The environment, involvement, and performance: Implications for the strategic process of food service firms.* International Journal of Hospitality Management, 23 (4), 317-341.

Hickson, D. J., Miller, S. J. & Wilson, D. C. (2003). *'Planned or Prioritized? Two Options in Managing the Implementation of Strategic Decisions'.* Journal of Management Studies, 40(7), pp.1803-1836.

Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D. & Hoskisson, R. E. (2007). *Strategic Management Competitiveness and Globalisation*, (7 ed.). Ohio: Thomson South-Western.

Holman, P. (2009). *'Turning great strategy into effective performance',* Strategy (Strategic Planning Society, UK), September.

Homburg, C., Fassnacht, M. and Guenther, C. (2000), "*The role of soft factors in implementing a service-oriented strategy industrial marketing companies*", ISBM Report 18-2000, Pennsylvania University

Hrebiniak, L. G. & Joyce, W. F. (2005). '*Organisational Adaptation: Strategic Choice and Environmental Determinism'*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 30, 336-349

Hrebiniak, L.G. (2005a): *A strategic look at strategy execution*. Optimize, 4, 3, 57-59.

Hrebiniak, L.G. (2005b): *Making strategy work: Leading effective execution and change*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.

Hrebiniak, L.G. (2006): *Obstacles to effective strategy implementation*. Organizational Dynamics, 35, 1, 12-31.

Hrebiniak, L.G. (2008): *Making strategy work: Overcoming the obstacles to effective execution*. Ivey Business Journal Online, 72, 2, 1.

Hrebiniak, L.G. and Joyce, W.F. (1984): *Implementing strategy*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Hutchings, K. and Michailova, S. (2006): *The impact of group membership on knowledge sharing in Russia and China. International Journal of Emerging Markets, 1, 1, 21-34.*

Johnston, R. and Pongatichat, P. (2008), "*Managing the tension between performance measurement and strategy*: coping strategies", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 28 No. 10, pp. 941-67.

Judson, A.S. (1991): *Invest in a high-yield strategic plan*. Journal of Business Strategy, 12, 4, 34-39.

Kalali, N.S., et al. (2011). *Why does strategic plans implementation fail? A stu dy in the health service sector of Iran*, African Journal of Business Management, 9831-9837.

Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (2000), "*The balanced scorecard - measures that drive performance",* Harvard Business Review, Vol. 70 No. 1, pp. 71-9.

Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (2005): *The office of strategy management.* Harvard Business Review, 83, 10, 72-80.

Lorange, P. (1982*): Implementation of strategic planning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

McAdam, R., Hazlet, S. and Casey, C. (2005) '*Performance Management in the UK Public Sector: Addressing Multiple Stakeholder Complexity',* International Journal of Public Sector Management 18(3): 256–73.

Micheli, P. and Manzoni, J.-F. (2010), "*Strategic performance measurement: benefits, limits and paradoxes",* Long Range Planning, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 465-76.

Michlitsch, J. F. (2000). '*High Performing, Loyal Employees: The Real Way to Implement Strategy'*. Strategy and Leadership, 28(6), pp. 28-33.

Miller, S., Wilson, D. and Hickson, D. (2004), "*Beyond Planning: Strategies for Successfully Implementing Strategic Decisions",* Long Range Planning, Vol. 37, pp. 201-218.

Mintzberg, H. (1990). *'The design school: reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management'*. Strategic Management Journal, 11(3), pp.171-195

Mupazviriho, P. (2008) *Understanding Performance Management in the Public Service,* African Journal of Public Administration and Management, xiv (1 & 2), 1-9

Neely, A. (2005), "*The evolution of performance measurement research: developments in the last decade and a research agenda for the next*", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 25 No. 12, pp. 1264-77.

Noble, C.H. (1999): *The eclectic roots of strategy implementation research*. Journal of Business Research, 45, 2, 119-134.

Noble, C.H., and Mokwa, M.P. (2009). "*Implementing Marketing Strategies: Developing and Testing a Managerial Theory"*. Journal of Marketing, 63, 57-73.

Nutt, P. C. (2009). '*Surprising but true: Half the decisions in organizations fail'*. Academy of Management Executive, 13(4), pp. 75-90.

Pearce, J.A. & Robinson, R.B. (2007). *Formulation, Implementation and Control of Competitive Strategy*, 9th edition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Pellegrinelli, S. and Bowman, C. (1994): *Implementing strategy through projects*. Long Range Planning, 27, 4, 125-132.

Pinto, J. K. & Slevin, D. P. (1987). '*Critical Factors in Successful Project implementation'*. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, EM-34, pp. 22

Pollitt, C. (2006) '*Performance Management in Practice: A Comparative Study of Executive Agencies',* Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 16(1): 25–44.

Pucko, D. and Cater, T. (2001): *Business annual planning and controlling in Slovenian managerial practice.* Journal for East European Management Studies, 6, 4, 355-375.

Rand, G. K. (2004). *Diagnosis and Improvement of Service Quality* Retrieved 2 2, 2014, from Lancaster University Management School: http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/30650/1/000297.pdf

Raps, A. (2004): *Implementing strategy*. Strategic Finance, 85, 12, 48-53.

Ritson, N. (2011). *Strategic Management*. Ventus Publishing.

Rubiensak, A. and Bovaird, T. (2009) '*Performance Management and Organizational Learning; Matching Processes to Cultures in the UK and Chinese Services',* International Review of Administrative

Sciences 65(2): 251–68.

Rumelt, R. P., Schendel, D. E & Teece, D. J. (1994). *Fundamental Issues in Strategy: A Research Agenda for the 1990s. Boston*: Harvard Business School Press Books

Schmidt, J. (1994). '*The Case of the Sales-driven Company'*. Journal of Business Strategy, 15(5), pp. 17-20.

Schwartz, A. (2009) *Performance Management, Hauppauge*, NY: Barron's Education Series

Shah, A. M. (2005). '*The Foundations of Successful Strategy Implementation: Overcoming the Obstacles'*. Global Business Review, 6(2), pp. 293-302

Skivington, J.E. and Daft, R.L. (1991*): A study of organizational "framework" and "process" modalities for the implementation of business-level strategic decisions*. Journal of Management Studies, 28, 1, 45-68.

Speculand, R. (2006): *The great big strategy challenge*. Strategic Direction, 22, 3, 3-5.

Talbot, C. (2005) '*Performance Management', in E. Ferlie, L.E. Lynn Jr and C. Pollitt (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Public Management, pp. 491–517. Oxford*: Oxford University Press.

Terborg, J.R. and Ungson, G.R. (1985*): Group-administered bonus pay and retail store performance:* A two-year study of management compensation. Journal of Retailing, 61, 1, 63-77.

Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J., III. (1978). *Strategy and Policy: Concepts and Cases. Dallas*: Business Publications Inc.

Thompson, A.A. & Strickland, A.J. (2003). *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases, 13th edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Varma, A., Budhwar, P.S. and DeNisi, A. (2008) '*Performance Management around the Globe: Introduction and Agenda', in A. Varma, P.S. Budhwar and A. DeNisi (eds) Performance Management Systems:* A Global Perspective, pp. 3–14. London: Routledge

Walker Jr., O. C. & Ruekert, R. W. (1987). '*Marketing's Role in the Implementation of Business strategies: A Critical Review and Conceptual Framework'*. Journal of Marketing, 51(3), pp.15-33.

Wernham, R. (1985). '*Obstacles to Strategy Implementation in a Nationalized Industry'*. Journal of Management Studies, 22(6), pp.632-648.

Wessel, J. R. (1993). '*The Strategic human resource management process in practice'*. Planning Review, 21(5), pp. 37-38.

Wheelen, T.L. and Hunger, D.J. (2006): *Concepts in strategic management and business policy*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson – Prentice Hall.

Wheelen, T.L. and Hunger, J.D. (2004), *Strategic Management and Business Policy,* Nineteenth edition, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Williams, R.S. (2002). *Managing Employee Performance: Design and implementation in organizations*. London: Thomson Learning.