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ABSTRACT

The thesis examines how to improve tourism in Kenya and actualize untapped potential. The study compares Kenya’s tourism with South Africa, with the aim to providing a measurable benchmark for the sector in Kenya to emulate in order to increase the economic input it has on the country’s GDP. It seems as though tourism in South Africa is a far much success story as compared to Kenya. The study seeks to ascertain that the tourism sector in South Africa outperforms Kenya’s by comparing performance of the two countries over a period of ten years, between 2007 and 2017. Through examining the various factors that contribute to the success of tourism in South Africa as compared to Kenya, the discussion seeks to bring out what needs to be done in the Kenyan Tourism sector to maximize benefits associated with tourism.
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Operational Definition of Terms

Organizational Performance – Comprises three specific areas of a firm’s outcome, that is, financial performance (in terms of profits, return on assets, return on investment), product market performance (in terms of sales, market share, etc.), and shareholder return.

Supply Chain – System of organizations, resources and activities involved in moving products and services from supplier to consumer.

Supply Chain Collaboration – Two or more firms working jointly to execute and plan supply chain operations, in this case government agencies related to tourism working together to plan and execute tourism operations.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Kenya possesses a unique strategic advantage in tourism in Africa over most African countries, South Africa included. As the cradle of mankind and at the equatorial centre of the earth, it provides a unique attraction and a climate that is favourable for all year travel (Akama & Kieti, 2003). The tourism sector in Kenya recorded the highest number of arrivals ever at 1,265,136 tourists as at December 31, 2011. This was a 15.4 percent growth from the previous year, 2010. During this period the sector earned KES 97.9 billion, a significant percentage increase of 32.9 from the previous year (Kenya Tourism Board, 2016). This has been the highest performance in the sector over the years. In the same period South Africa increased the number of tourists from 13.2 million to 13.77 million tourists, a 4.21 percentage increase (Ramukumba, Mmbengwa, Mwamayi, & Groenewald, 2012).

The Vision driving Kenya’s Foreign Policy agenda is the pursuit of ‘A peaceful, prosperous and globally competitive Kenya’ while the Mission is “To project, promote and protect Kenya’s interests and image globally through innovative diplomacy, and contribute towards a just, peaceful and equitable world” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2014). However, some challenges need to be addressed to realize this vision as the world bank report on tourism outlines some of the challenges facing this sector; increasing human population, invasive cultivation, and overdevelopment (small towns coming up especially in wildlife reserves) that are negatively affecting wildlife and natural resources (and vice versa), overcrowding and unplanned tourism developments are also having detrimental effects, cross-jurisdictional and cross-sector policy challenges that are limiting the effectiveness of
land and wildlife management as well as coastal assets that are being unevenly used and
developed, (World Bank, 2010).

Kenya matters regionally and globally. It is the economic powerhouse of East Africa and a
long-standing hub for multilateral diplomacy; its positioning in a turbulent region has
fashioned its profile as an anchor state in African peace and security. Until recently, Kenya's
foreign policy orientation has situated it as a benign regional leader, but pressing
developments in the regional and international environments have edged it towards a more
assertive foreign policy position (Mabera, 2016).

South Africa is a tourist destination with an industry that accounts for a substantial amount of
the country’s revenue. According to the World Travel and Tourism Council, the tourism
industry directly contributed USD 6.936 billion to South African GDP in 2012. The industry
supports 10.3% of jobs in the country. According to Statistics by South Africa’s latest
Tourism and Migration Survey, almost 3.5 million travelers passed through the country’s
port of entry in August 2017. In Kenya, during the period between 2012 and 2013, official
data from Kenya Tourism Board said arrivals totaled 428,585 in 2013 the six months to June
compared to 495,978 visitors in 2013 over the corresponding period. Compared to 2012, the
total arrivals for the January-June 2013 period fell 24 per cent. In 2017 the Kenyan tourism
sector actualized earnings of Ksh120 billion ($1.2 billion) despite the long electioneering
period. This is an improvement from the Ksh99.69 billion ($989 million) earned in 2016,
according to Tourism Cabinet Secretary Najib Balala. In South Africa, according to a report
by WTTC on the travel & tourism economic impact, the total contribution of Travel
& Tourism to GDP was USD31.0bn, 8.9% of GDP in 2017, and is forecast to rise by 2.9%
in 2018, and to rise by 3.5% per annum to ZAR598.6bn (USD44.9bn), 10.1% of GDP in
2028. In 2017 Travel & Tourism directly supported 726,500 jobs (4.5% of total employment). In the same report, the direct contribution of Travel & Tourism to GDP, in Kenya, was $7.69bn in 2017 (9.7% of GDP) and is expected to grow by 5.5% to $8.11.4bn (9.6% of GDP) in 2018. It is forecast to rise by 5.1% pa to $13.383bn by 2028 (9.1% of GDP). These available statistics clearly shows the difference in growth and financial performance in the two countries’ tourism sectors and provides the necessary evidence that support and justify this study.

1.1.1 Organizational Performance

A state is a compulsory political organization with a centralized government that maintains a monopoly on the legitimate use of force within a certain geographical territory. Being the largest entity to engage in business as a unit, a state can be compared to a corporate entity and performance measured along the lines of any other organization or corporation.

Currently there are a variety of definitions attributed to the concept of performance due to its subjective nature (Ion & Criveanu, 2016). Organizational performance can be assessed in various aspects and selection system theory suggests that organizations may compete along different performance dimensions as discussed in this section. Continuous performance is the focus of any organization because only through performance measurement are organizations able to grow and progress (Corina, Liviu, & Roxana, 2011). (Lebans & Euske, 2006), provide a set of definitions to illustrate the concept of organizational performance:

1. Performance is a set of financial and nonfinancial indicators which offer information on the degree of achievement of objectives and results.

2. Performance is dynamic, requiring judgment and interpretation.
3. Performance may be illustrated by using a casual model that describes how current actions may affect future results.

According to Richard (2009), organizational performance comprises three specific areas of a firm’s outcome, that is, financial performance (in terms of profits, return on assets, return on investment, etc.), product market performance (in terms of sales, market share, etc.), and shareholder return. Due to these wide aspects of understanding organizational performance, Hanine, 2003, states that a good performance measurement approach should consider measuring and assessing the three E’s: Economy (procurement, cost element, human resources, quality and quantity, operational level), Efficiency (least costs maximum results, work planning and timelines, rational use of resources), Effectiveness (achievements of results, objectives and goals).

Despite all these dimensions attributed to organizational performance (ranging from profitability, return on asset, gross profit, sales growth, export growth, market share, etc.), performance has integrated both effectiveness related measures that deal with issues like business employee satisfaction and growth and efficiency related measures that relate to the input/output relationship (Maduenyi, Oluremi, Olatunji, & Ajagbe, 2015).

Hodge & Williams (2004) suggests that performance has also been conceptualised using financial and non-financial measures from both perceptual and objective sources. With financial measures one can measure performance through benchmarking analyses and trend analyses (Maduenyi, Oluremi, Olatunji, & Ajagbe, 2015). Venkatraman and Ramunujam (1986), posit that perceptual sources comprise of employee evaluation of organizational
effectiveness and their overall level of satisfaction. Objective measures comprise secondary source of financial measures like return on investment, return on assets and profit growth.

Different researchers have adopted different measures and objectives for organizational performance, but on the other hand others have argued that no single measure is essentially better than the other and that researchers should base its definition on the punitive framework adopted for the study (Barney, 1991).

The variables used in research to represent the overall organizational performance construct can be divided into four different categories as used in empirical research that include accounting measures, operational measures, market based measures and survival measures (Carton, 2004).

According to Carton (2004), accounting measures are those that rely on financial information reported in various financial documents like balance sheets, statement of cash flows and income statements. These can be further categorised into profitability measures, growth measures, cash flow measures, efficiency measures, leverage, and liquidity.

Operational measures indicate an organizational performance on non-financial issues (Carton, 2004). Variables within operational measures include market share, changes in intangible assets such as human resource, customer satisfaction and stakeholder performance (Carton, 2004).

Carton (2004), also states that market based measures of performance incorporate the market value of the organization and variables here will include returns to shareholders, market value added and holding period returns. Computing these variables requires market valuation of the organization and this information is available for public traded companies.
Drucker 1954 proposed that survival is the ultimate measure of long term performance and with those survival measures of performance indicates whether the organization remained in business over a particular period of time.

Market based measures have been hailed as the best possible measure of organizational performance (Copeland, 2000) but it has also been criticized as not being the most accurate measure of organizational performance as it does not apply in a monopoly market (Bromiley & Miller, 1991). There are many arguments in favour of market based measures. Supporting literature on this suggests that the value created by both the execution on existing opportunities, as well as the risk adjusted expected value of future opportunities are possible to measure from a market point of view (Cao & Zhang, 2011). Criticisms for this include; changes in returns, to capital providers, in excess of the weighted average cost of capital of the organization are considered surprises to the market.

1.2 Problem Statement

South Africa seems to outperform Kenya in tourism attraction and as a result reaps more economic benefits associated with tourism despite Kenya having the strategic advantage as a tourism destination. An examination into the factors contributing to success in the tourism sector in South Africa should be understood better through examining the different approaches in policy and operational strategies of both countries.
1.3 Aim

To examine factors that contribute to the success of the tourism sector in South Africa by looking at the overall strategic plan and execution of the country’s tourism agenda. To provide a benchmark for Kenya and other economies wishing to improve their tourism performance by analysing factors that enhance the success story of the tourism sector in South Africa.

1.4 Specific Objectives

The objectives are:

1. To establish the relationship between dynamic capabilities that arise from supply chain collaboration and overall organizational performance.
2. To examine the relationship between dynamic capabilities and organizational performance in tourism performance in Kenya and in South Africa.
3. To examine the effect of marketing on tourism in both South Africa and Kenya.

1.5 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between dynamic capabilities and organizational performance?
2. To what extent does Kenya utilize dynamic capabilities to enhance organizational performance as compared to South Africa?
3. To what extent does marketing affect tourism in Kenya as compared to South Africa?
1.6 Justification

The study aims to provide a measurable framework for benchmarking that Kenya can use as a point of reference to itself against South Africa in order to improve tourism attraction.

1.7 Scope and Limitation

This study sought to investigate the factors that contribute to success in the tourism sector in South Africa and comparing with how Kenya’s tourism sector’s approach and handling of these factors between 2013 and 2017.

1.8 Chapter Summary

Performance measurement tells managers the specific organizational issues that have to be dealt with and suggest strategic actions that should be given priority. Politics is the art and/or science of management of public resources so in a broader sense, performance measurement along state departments is key to the success and sustainability of a state. The focus of this research is supply chain capabilities and their effect on overall performance of the tourism department as an organ of the state; in Kenya as compared to South Africa. Specifically, dynamic capabilities that are essential in a fast changing and highly competitive world and that provide opportunities of competitive advantage will be the centre of discussion. This thesis sought to study the factors that have propelled South Africa to success in its tourism. The thesis studied in comparison how the tourism sector in Kenya is implementing its agenda and how it handles these factors of success and in understanding this, provide Kenya with a measurable benchmark to peg the country’s strategic plan to.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

Tourism remains the backbone of most economies of the world. It provides jobs for citizens of a country as well as earns revenues for governments across the globe (Ramukumba, Mmbengwa, Mwamayi, & Groenewald, 2012). There are various factors that affect tourism and these factors vary from country to country. The external factors that affect the tourism sector can be classified as socio economic, environmental friendliness, marketing initiatives and security. These are factors out of the control of a country. Internal factors are those factors that are within the control of an organization, in this case a country, and can be used to measure and compare performance. In this thesis, dynamic capabilities of an organization were used as the internal factors that affect tourism performance. Tourism performance was measured by looking at the different approaches taken in enhancing these capabilities by the two countries.

The tourism department of a country is an organization on its own. Complete with the various departments as regards corporate organizations; Finance/accounting, marketing and procurement departments, it interacts with suppliers, distributors, consumers and the government like any other organization. Dynamic capabilities is field of study and of enormous interest in the corporate world, as a number of researchers have ascertained its important contribution to the overall performance of a firm (Banchuen, Sadler, & Shee, 2017). By looking at the tourism department as a corporate organ in this respect, it would be therefore
Socio economic factors discussed in this study are accessibility, accommodation and existing amenities. Experts argue that accessibility is the most important factor affecting tourism due to its impact (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008). Effective transport and communication networks attract tourism. Infrastructure in aspiring nations, in tourism, should ensure good roads, modern airports, railway lines and well developed water and sanitation systems in place. Accommodation and catering services should reflect the wide range of classes, giving tourists easy time selecting the most convenient and affordable package of preference (Ramukumba, Mmbengwa, Mwamayi, & Groenewald, 2012). Amenities such as surfing, skiing, safari adventure, fishing and zip lining should be maintained and availed to earn reasonable and sustainable revenue to a government. Besides these, a government should ensure emergency services in each facility.

Environmental conservation is also a major factor that affects the tourism sector as it ensures sustainability of natural attraction sites. Sustainability in tourism encapsulates all the terminology that is commonly used to refer to ethical practice in tourism like responsible tourism, ecotourism, and sustainable tourism (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017). According to The International Ecotourism Society, ecotourism is, ‘Responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people’ (The International Ecotourism Society (TIES), 1990).

In total, Travel & Tourism generated US$7.6 trillion (10.2% of global GDP) and 292 million jobs in 2016, equivalent to 1 in 10 jobs in the global economy, this is despite the security challenge terrorism has globally (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017). The tourism sector has in the recent past accounted for 6.6% of total global exports and almost 30% of total global service exports.
Marketing is key to success in any tourism industry of a country as this informs prospective tourists of attraction sites, affordable accommodation options and measures a government is taking to secure tourists interests (Ramukumba, Mmbengwa, Mwamayi, & Groenewald, 2012). The mandate of the Department of Tourism (DoT), as outlined in the Tourism Act of 2014, is to promote growth and development of the tourism sector; promote quality tourism products and services; provide for the effective domestic and international marketing of South Africa as a tourist destination (Brand South Africa, 2015). A country can have all the attractive sites for tourism, all the amenities and the government in place may have put all the security measures to encourage foreign visitors, but without communication, tourists would not know of these. South Africa seems to understand this fact way better than Kenya and this is evident in the investment in promotion and marketing as this paper seeks to bring out. Marketing is a very important factor in the success of the tourism sector of an economy.

The empirical review will seek to measure how the various internal aspects of a supply chain contribute to organizational performance.

### 2.1 Accessibility and Tourism

According to Ramukumba et al (2012), Accessible tourism is the on-going endeavour to ensure tourist destinations, products and services are accessible to all people, regardless of their physical limitations, disabilities or age. It encompasses publicly and privately owned tourist locations. This suggests that a government, through its tourism department, should continuously improve and ensure that all tourist sites are accessible to both local and foreign tourists. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), 15% of the world’s population (1 billion people) is estimated to live with some form of disability. This population should be incorporated also in implementation of the tourism agenda. UNWTO is convinced that
accessibility for all to tourist facilities, products, and services should be a central part of any responsible and sustainable tourist policy.

South Africa has become more aware of travellers with special requirements. Many tourism establishments have also kept in mind the importance of parking bays, toilet facilities, placing rails and ramps for those who require them.

According to Rogerson (2001), tourism is being placed on the forefront of promoting local economic development (LED) in disadvantaged communities of South Africa. Studies indicate that over the last few decades several countries have looked towards tourism as a means of employment creation and poverty reduction and generally for promoting development and economic growth (Ramukumba, Mmbengwa, Mwamayi, & Groenewald, 2012) this has led the government to focus more on infrastructure that facilitates ease in access to tourist sites throughout the country. This is due to the fact that tourism has grown to become the world’s second largest industry, directly accounting for 3.8% of global growth domestic product in 2009 according to the World Travel and Tourism Council (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2010).

In South Africa, the promotion of tourism as accessible has been identified as a key strategy that has led to economic growth, community development and poverty alleviation. According to Tourism Minister Derek Hanekom, speaking on World Tourism Day, in September 2016, “Accessibility is essential for responsible and sustainable development. It is also an exceptional business opportunity. Universal access, along with affordable access for groups of marginalized people, pensioners, those who have very little disposable income, as well as
the youth, should be prioritized.” This appears to reflect in the recent years, that tourism emerges as an important development option in the post-apartheid South Africa. Success in tourism in South Africa is attributed to the country’s investment in the sector, economically through increasing and easing accessibility and culturally through promoting the African culture. According to the White paper on tourism (2014) the tourism sector is expected to be the leading economic sector in the country by 2020. The South African government is championing local tourism to facilitate its tourism agenda and as Hanekom said, for the country to reach its target of 18 million domestic tourists by 2020 – as set out in their National Tourism Sector Strategy – it would have to work harder to make tourism more affordable and more accessible to all South Africans. As the National Department of Tourism (NDT) says they will be focusing on making more South African attractions universally accessible, in a bid to open tourism to more domestic travelers. It is important to acknowledge that the success of tourism in South Africa is based on the warmth of the people, the attractiveness of the unique attractions, infrastructure, iconic cultural and heritage sites, and the abundance of natural assets.

Kenya is transforming fast. There exist numerous infrastructural developments focusing towards developing the various sectors of the economy. The tourism industry is set to benefit, in terms of accessibility, from these projects. A significant percentage (80%) of Kenya’s transport system is roads; while the remaining percentage consists of rail transport, airlines and sea transport (Kenya Tourism Board, 2016). According to the Ministry of Tourism & Wildlife (2018), Kenya has seen a significant improvement in tourist arrivals as compared to the year 2017 from 1,474,621 tourists in 2017 to 2,025,206 in 2018, a 37.33 percentage increase. The Ministry attributes this improved performance to a number of factors;
improved security, growth in the aviation sector, political stability, investor confidence, revitalized marketing efforts and withdrawal of travel advisories against Kenya by the UK and US amongst other factors that have stimulated the growth (Ministry of Tourism & Wildlife, 2018). Accordingly, only aviation in the transport sector was worth mentioning as one of the contributing factor. Yet aviation, railway and water transport collectively comprise 20% of the countries transport sector (Kenya Tourism Board, 2016). Accessibility to tourist sites is mainly through the road network and the Ministry, through its most recent report, has failed to assess its importance in increasing the number of tourist visits. The road network is the main mode of transport in Kenya and addressing accessibility via aviation without including road transport has little impact on the overall contribution accessibility has on the tourism sector performance.

2.2 Affordability and Tourism

Africa is the backbone of natural wonders, beautiful wildlife and plenty of tourist related activities. One can experience the marvels of the region on an affordable budget, without necessarily spending much. With guidance from travel experts such as Trip advisor and Lonely Planet, Travelstart presents the most budget friendly African destinations to visit. Accordingly, they have ranked Cape Town as the most affordable city to travel to in Africa. According to LonelyPlanet, South Africa ranks 7th amongst top ten of the most pocket friendly destinations of the world; the only African country on the list.

According to CNN travel (2016), Kenyan tourist sites appear three times in the 25 of Africa's most amazing places to visit, South Africa’s Table Mountain is the only site worth mentioning. This is a pointer to the fact that Kenya has more attractive tourist destinations as
compared to South Africa. The difference in actual revenue generated from tourism by the two countries could be attributed to the difference in affordability of tourist amenities, transportation, accommodation and accessibility. It is expected that the country ranked that much by CNN travel, to receive more tourists if all other factors are held to be constant.

What makes South Africa unique as a safari destination is that everything there is priced in the local currency, the South African Rand (ZAR). Most of the other safari destinations in Southern Africa and East Africa are priced in US$ (Brand South Africa, 2015). This makes South Africa one of the best-value safari destinations in Africa that attracts both domestic and international tourists alike. As local currency drops in value against the US$, the UK£ and the €, South Africa becomes more and more affordable to people visiting from the USA, UK and Europe. Growing at three times the world average, tourism has become one of the most important sectors in South Africa following the end of apartheid, creating almost a million jobs and even overtaking gold exports as an earner of foreign currency.

2.3 Environmental Conservation and Tourism

Sustainable tourism is commonly known as ecotourism. Only ecotourism can take care about the environment through sustainable development (The International Ecotourism Society (TIES), 1990). Tourism is causing serious threats to the earth space and to the environment. Sustainable tourism is tourism attempting to make as low impact on the environment and local culture as possible, while helping to generate future employment for local people.

The International Ecotourism Society (TIES) is a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting ecotourism. Founded in 1990, TIES has been on the forefront of the development of ecotourism, providing guidelines and standards, training, technical assistance, and
educational resources. The aim of sustainable tourism is to ensure that development brings a positive experience for local people, tourism companies and the tourists themselves. Sustainable tourism is an adopted practice in successful ecotourism (Choi, Hickerson, & Lee, 2018). Achieving sustainable tourism necessitates impetus, determination and an orderly approach for future actions.

South Africa is a leader in responsible tourism and is a magnet for those who are interested in adventure, wildlife, culture and history (Brand South Africa, 2015). It was named by Conservational International as one of the seventeen mega diverse countries in the world (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017). The South African government is enacting pro-growth travel policies that seek to share benefits more equitably and fosters a talent and business environment necessary to enable Travel & Tourism to achieve sustainable developments (Department of Tourism, 2017). In doing this, the country expects the sector to be supporting over 380 million jobs by the year 2027, as well as continue contributing economically, through rationalizing protection of natural habitats and biodiversity (Brand South Africa, 2015).

According to the Kenya Environmental Policy (2016), the environment and its natural resources are a valuable national asset upon which the country’s sustainable development should be anchored. This is emphasized as the country recognizes its stake in the sustainable management of its own natural resources, those of the region and the world (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2014). The strong focus on environmental issues can therefore be considered a distinct policy feature of Kenya’s Foreign Policy. Kenya has done enough in terms of policy and law surrounding environmental conservation. Over the longer
term, growth of the Travel & Tourism sector is expected to continue to be strong so long as the investment and development takes place in an open and sustainable manner.

2.4 Security and Tourism

In South Africa, there exists the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Immigration Regulations, which is tasked with finding a balance between ease of travel facilitation for tourists and security needs. The committee has since its inception, proposed the Long-term multiple entry visas for frequent business travelers and the use of accredited travel companies to apply for their client’s visas, visa waivers in some cases and expansion of the network of visa facilitation centers. These measures have greatly improved the general security by enabling and managing a database of visitors from traceable as well as recommended locations (Ramukumba, Mmbengwa, Mwamayi, & Groenewald, 2012).

South Africa has a very high level of crime, including rape and murder. The risk of violent crime to visitors travelling to the main tourist destinations is generally low. The South African authorities give high priority to protecting tourists and tourism police are deployed in several large towns (Department of Tourism, 2017).

According to a report by The Ministry of Tourism (2016), Kenya’s position in East Africa as the continent’s most attractive tourist destination has come under threat from other blocs taking advantage of on the region's lengthy business procedures, insecurity and poor infrastructure to boost their competitive edge. The 2013 World Economic Forum (WEF) survey on global tourism and travel competitiveness shows that Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania and Burundi were trailing emerging global tourism giants in sub-Saharan Africa such as Seychelles, Mauritius and South Africa (Department of Tourism, 2013). Kenya,
EAC’s top tourism investment destination, came eighth. The WEF cited insufficient property rights protection, insecurity, lengthy and costly business procedures as well as dilapidated infrastructure as drawbacks.

However, a more recent report by the Ministry of Tourism indicates major improvement in performance of the sector (Ministry of Tourism & Wildlife, 2018). The report acknowledges improved security and political stability among others, as the main contributing factors to the success story.

2.5 Marketing and Tourism

While Kenya is one of the top five tourists’ destinations in Africa and the prices of its international grade hotels are competitive, the performance of its tourism industry has in the recent past, lagged behind other countries on the continent (Department of Tourism, 2013). Kenya received the fifth highest number of tourists to Africa after South Africa, Egypt, Tunisia and Mozambique in that order (Department of Tourism, 2013).

This has pushed the country to make major investments in the tourism sector and more recent studies have indicated massive improvements. According to the Ministry of Tourism & Wildlife (2018), Marketing has greatly contributed to the improved performance. This has been achieved through branding partnerships, digital marketing and global campaigns (Ministry of Tourism & Wildlife, 2018).

International tourism continues to be an important part of The South African economic diplomacy efforts, contributing to job creation and economic growth. Tourist arrivals figures went up by 14.8% in 2016 compared to the same period in 2015 (Department of Tourism, 2017). About R39.3 billion foreign direct spend was achieved during the first months of
2016, which contributed to job creation and continues to sustain the local economy. In Kenya, over the same period, statistics released by the ministry show international arrivals increased by 9.8 per cent to 1.4 million from the previous year’s 1.3 million. Revenues increased to Ksh120 billion ($1.2 billion) an improvement from the Ksh99.69 billion ($989 million) earned in 2016. This information confirms that both South Africa and Kenya remain popular destinations for international tourists to Africa. These figures indicate a sharpened focus on economic diplomacy by the two countries.

In South Africa it is the mandate of the Department of Tourism (DoT), as outlined in the Tourism Act of 2014, to promote growth and development of the tourism sector; promote quality tourism products and services; provide for the effective domestic and international marketing of South Africa as a tourist destination; enhance cooperation and coordination between all spheres of government in developing and managing tourism; and promote the practice of responsible tourism for the benefit of South Africa and for the enjoyment of all its residents and foreign visitors (Department of Tourism, 2017). In Kenya, the mandate lies with the Kenya Tourism Board (KTB).
2.6 Theoretical Framework

A review of World Bank statistics between 2009-2013 show that tourists arrivals in Rwanda increased 24 times as fast as Kenya's, Ethiopia's grew 20 times, Tanzania's 18 times, Uganda's 16 times, South Africa 12 times and Mozambique's nine times as fast (Ramukumba, Mmbengwa, Mwamayi, & Groenewald, 2012). According to World Bank (2013), around 1.4 million tourists visited Kenya. Seven times as many tourists visited South Africa.

Recent statistics show that Kenya has seen improvement in tourist arrivals in 2018 as compared to the year 2017, from 1,474,621 tourists in 2017 to 2,025,206 in 2018, a 37.33 percentage increase. Official tourism figures indicate that South Africa received a total of 4,423,165 tourists between January and May 2018. The tourism sector contributed 2.8% which translates to R130 billion or Kshs. 1.04 trillion to South Africa’s gross domestic product (GDP) in 2017 while in Kenya the sector contributed Kshs. 294.6 billion.

International visitors were responsible for 44% of total tourism spending in 2017, while domestic visitors contributed 56% in South Africa.

The disparities in the two countries can be attributed to the fact that the South African economy is far much bigger than that of Kenya with an economy up to five times larger in terms of GDP (Akama & Kieti, 2003). This makes it possible for South Africa to accommodate more tourists as compared to Kenya. However the difference in tourism earnings cannot be entirely attributed to this economic metric as the literature review suggests that both South Africa and Kenya are fairly investing proportionately the same to
attract tourists. Internal factors that affect performance must therefore be assessed to determine the huge difference in output or revenues generated by the two countries.

2.7 Empirical Framework

2.7.1 Supply Chain Collaboration Capabilities

This research will use aspects of supply chain collaboration to measure performance, specifically, dynamic capabilities as the aspects of supply chain. The government through the tourism ministry utilizes its resources and engages different supply chain partners to deliver services to tourists and citizens alike. By analysing these set of factors, the research aims to bring out the capabilities of supply chain collaboration to extend our understanding of the nature and attributes of supply chain collaboration and how they affect performance in the tourism sector. The following five dimensions of supply chain collaboration of process efficiency, offering flexibility, business synergy, quality, and innovation will be considered in this research as the main capabilities of collaborative measures.

Process efficiency refers to the extent to which an organization’s collaboration process with supply chain partners is cost competitive among primary competitors (Bagchi & Skjott-Larsen, 2005). The process could be information sharing process, joint logistics process, joint product development process, or joint decision making process (Ince & Ozkan, 2015). The benefits of collaboration include cost reductions, uncertainty reduction and revenue enhancement.

Offering flexibility refers to the extent to which an organization’s supply chain linkage supports changes in product or service offerings in response to environmental changes (Fawcett, Fawcett, Watson, & Magnan, 2012). Offering flexibility is based on the ability of
collaborating firms to quickly change process structures or adapt the information sharing process for modifying the features of a product or service (Hudnurkar, Jakhar, & Ratho, 2014). In order to incorporate constantly changing customer preferences in development of new products/services, firms need to be highly integrated with other stakeholders in the supply chain so as to increase responsiveness to changes in market trends (Hassini, Surti, & Searcy, 2012). Supply chain collaboration offers the required flexibility to adapt to changing market demands in real time basis.

Business synergy refers to the extent to which supply chain partners combine complementary and related resources to achieve spill-over benefits (Abreu, Macedo, & Camarinha-Matos, 2009). Ansoff (1988) suggests that synergy can produce a combined return on resources that is greater than the sum of individual parts. This joint effect results from the process of making better use of resources in the supply chain, including physical assets such as manufacturing facilities and invisible assets such as customer knowledge, technological expertise, and organizational culture (Banchuen, Sadler, & Shee, 2017). Through bringing together the individual firms’ resources, collaboration along a chain creates value and enhance performance of the organizations in the chain (Cao & Zhang, 2010).

Quality as a dynamic capability refers to the extent to which an organization with supply chain partners offers quality product by creating higher value for customers (Fynesa, Voss, & deBurca, 2005). The expectation is that firms that respond fast to customer needs with high quality products, innovative design, and excellent after-sales service build customer loyalty, increase market share, and ultimately gain high profits (Jambor, 2010). A responsive and accurate system that relates with customer expectations is provided for in a highly collaborative chain actualizing high performance levels (Cao & Zhang, 2010).
Innovation is the final dynamic capability discussed here and refers to the extent to which an organization works jointly with its supply chain partners in introducing new processes, products, or services (Bagchi & Skjott-Larsen, 2005). Due to shorter product/service life cycles, firms need to innovate frequently and in small increments. Through carefully managing the relationships with suppliers as well as customers, organizations in a highly collaborated chain increase their individual ability to engage in process and product innovation (Jambor, 2010).

As discussed above supply chain collaboration enables organizations to enhance performance through actualizing dynamic capabilities of process efficiency, increased flexibility, providing business synergy, improving product/service quality and encouraging innovation along the chain. All these are considered as the key supply chain capabilities and provide enough reasoning for organizations to take into serious account their impact on performance. Supply chain collaboration must be considered when strategizing to gain competitive advantage and actualize all business synergy.

2.7.2 Supply Chain Collaboration Capabilities on Organizational Performance

Increased process efficiency, positively affect performance of an organization as costs are minimized, timeliness improved and reliability enhanced this assertion is supported by the literature discussed in this section. According to Moon (2015) firms may form strategic partnerships to access and acquire resources through process integration that they may otherwise not have when acting alone. Supply chain collaboration increases efficiency in processes along the supply chain and as a result organizational performance improves as partners utilize resources that they may not necessarily or directly incur costs to acquire (Kang & Moon, 2015). Initial studies on supply chain collaboration have focused more on
process integration and its relationship with overall organizational performance (Simatupang & Sridharan, 2005). Information sharing and collaboration are closely related to the success of collaborative advantage and success of firms (Cao & Zhang, 2011). Information sharing refers to the extent to which critical and proprietary information communicates to one’s supply chain partner, achieved through process integration (Banchuen, Sadler, & Shee, 2017). The purpose of process integration in supply chain collaboration is to increase process efficiency (Kang & Moon, 2015).

By offering flexibility, organization can be guaranteed increased market performance in a business world where the focus has shifted from traditional technical capabilities of products\services to satisfaction of customer expectations (Ince & Ozkan, 2015). Organizational performance, with respect to strategic human resource management, ensures that flexibility measures put in place by management to respond to changes in market demand are successfully implemented by a skilled and dedicated workforce (Mckenna & Beech, 2014). The relationship between organizational performance and flexibility can be further emphasized by literature from Hassni (2012), when he illustrates how responsiveness to market demands in timely fashion demonstrates a highly flexible organization which is possible only if there exists in place a functioning collaborative supply chain.

Business synergy is another advantage enabled when supply chain collaboration is highly functional and its relationship with performance will be examined below with supporting literature. According to Abreu (2009), the spill over benefits generated by the combined efforts of firms in collaborative strategy are in themselves a measure of success of the respective firms and result in increased individual organizational performance. By combining resources, skills and social capital, the collaboration can not only improve individual
organizational performance, but also create something new and valuable altogether (Cao & Zhang, 2011). As long as supply chain partners make decisions in the best economic interest of the supply chain as a whole, and not their own respective interests, then the gain or joint outcome will be expanded as with the effect of spill over effect, thence respective organizational performance improved (Simatupang & Sridharan, 2005).

The purpose of collecting information from customers is to improve on the quality of product/service offered by the concerned organization (Jantti, 2006). The need to improve on quality is to provide better product/service and thereby gain competitive advantage and command a larger market share than the competition. Increased market share is one measure of improved organizational performance. Therefore, this research proposes a possible relationship between organizational performance and provision of quality with supporting literature on the same. It is however important to note that, collection of real-time information to improve on quality can be done efficiently and without additional costs such as research through collaborative measures as previously discussed.

However, it is important to acknowledge that, creativity is the first step of generating ideas and innovation follows so that quality is achieved. For any business to be successful, we need all three. Creativity drives the generation of ideas, and we need these constantly. There exists continuous need reinvent businesses. Albert Einstein knew that great thinkers don't have to take themselves too seriously and that: "Imagination is more important than knowledge."

Innovation is the necessary step to turn these ideas into useful products and services, something organizations can thence present to customers.
Quality, the entire set of tools now known as total quality management or TQM, is the way firms ensure that they know their customers; their needs and expectations, and how they can proceed to meet these needs and exceed their expectations. Quality also helps organizations continuously improve on products and services and continuously reduce the costs of providing them.

Supply chain collaboration ensures flow of information from the customer end to members of the supply chain on a real time basis ensuring that all partners have relevant information on what is required of them to successfully meet customers’ expectations at their point of needs (Cao & Zhang, 2011).

2.8 Chapter Summary

The various external factors that affect tourism have been discussed in this chapter. Supporting literature on what both South Africa and Kenya have done and are continuing to do to ensure that performance in the tourism sector is at its optimum are discussed here with the aim of bringing out what could be cause of the disparities in the output or revenues of both countries. Socio economic factors, environmental concerns, security and marketing have been identified and extensively discussed in this section and do not show significant difference to explain the different revenues generated. The empirical review looks at internal factors and performance measurement is done along the lines of dynamic capabilities; first to establish that indeed dynamic capabilities positively affect overall performance of an organization and secondly to examine how the two countries are taking advantage of these capabilities. The purpose is to provide a measurable framework for performance. By
measuring how the supply chain collaboration capabilities have been utilized by both South Africa and Kenya, the research will provide a measurable and reliable comparison.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

A Case Study Methodology was adopted in order to develop exploratory theories. This was used because of its suitability and previous similar research in related fields adopted the same; case reports, review articles and related studies were used.

The purpose of the study was to establish factors affecting performance in the tourism sector by examining the correlation between supply chain collaboration capabilities and organizational performance in Kenya’s tourism sector as compared to South Africa. Supply chain collaboration has the potential of actualizing capabilities that affect the performance of organizations along the chain. An examination into the effect of these capabilities on the organizational performance in terms of economic output brings out the importance of strategizing on right partnerships in a supply chain if at all the benefits of dynamic capabilities of a collaboration are to be fully realized. The aspects of dynamic capabilities provides measurable variables for organizational performance

The research approach used is both Quantitative and Qualitative: quantitative because the research was concerned measuring relationship between the dynamic variables and organizational performance in the tourism departments of South Africa and Kenya. The qualitative aspect in understands the factors influencing performance in the tourism sector in South Africa and comparing the same with Kenya. Qualitative Research is generally exploratory hence suitable for deriving an understanding of underlying reasons, opinions, and motivations (Alzheimer Europe, 2013). It provides insights into the problem or helps to develop ideas or hypotheses for potential quantitative research.
3.2 Research Design

The study used a descriptive research design to investigate the quantitative data which was collected and analysed and the data used to examine the relationship between Dynamic capabilities and performance in the tourism sectors of South Africa in comparison to Kenya.

3.3 Location of the Study

This research is on the factors influencing high performance in South African tourism as compared to Kenya; hence the research will be based on information in tourism from both countries.

3.4 Target Population

The research will rely on both primary and secondary data. The target population will be international tourists that have frequented both Kenya and South Africa. International tourists will be preferred to minimise bias information when comparing their responses on the two countries.

Journals and articles on tourism as regards Kenya and South Africa will be extensively relied on for secondary data.

3.5 Sampling

In this paper, purposive or deliberate approach was used. This sampling method involves purposive or deliberate selection of particular units of the universe for constituting a sample which represents the universe. When population elements are selected for inclusion in the sample based on the ease of access, it can be called convenience sampling (Kothari, 2004).
The reason for use of this technique is due to the ease of use. Since the target population is not readily available, the researcher’s judgement was used in determining and selecting population items which were considered as relevant to the study.

A homogeneous sampling is a purposive sampling technique that aims to achieve a homogeneous sample; that is, a sample whose units (e.g., people, cases, etc.) share the same (or very similar) characteristics or traits. A homogeneous sample is often chosen when the research question that is being address is specific to the characteristics of the particular group of interest, which is subsequently examined in detail. Since the units of this sample share unique characteristics as tourists interested in both Kenya and South Africa, then this technique was best suited. A sample of 80 tourists was targeted and issued with questionnaires.

3.6 Data Collection

Primary data was collected through the administration of research questionnaires. Prospects were required to state first if they have toured both countries frequently to be qualified for the research.

Secondary data was collected from published reports, research in related fields, specifically, data on supply chain management and dynamic capabilities as these were areas of study considered to remotely interact with tourism.

3.7 Data Analysis

Content analysis was used to analyse the data gathered from personal interviews. According to Moore and McCabe (2005), this is the type of research whereby data gathered is
categorized in themes and sub-themes, so as to enhance comparability. A main advantage of content analysis is that it helps in data collected to be summarized and simplified, while at the same time producing results that may then be measured using quantitative techniques. Moreover, content analysis gives the ability to researchers to structure the qualitative data collected in a way that satisfies the accomplishment of research objectives. However, it’s critical to consider that human error is highly involved in content analysis, since there is the risk for researchers to misinterpret the data gathered, thereby generating false and unreliable conclusions (Krippendorff & Bock, 2008).

3.8 Ethical Consideration

This research work observed integrity through honouring all sources of information and acknowledging the various authors’ contribution to the literature. The research work, to the best of the researcher’s ability ensured no bias as it compared strategic approaches of the two countries under study, that is, Kenya and South Africa.

3.9 Research Quality

This research attempted to fairly present all perspectives. It provided context information suitable for the intended audience. This was been done with a literature review that summarized current knowledge, by referencing relevant documents and websites that offer a comprehensive and balanced overview.
3.10 Validity and Reliability

Reliability and validity is important to any research design, and an important consideration with secondary data is the extent to which it relates to the research question, in other words how reliably it can answer it. One needs to consider the fit very carefully before deciding to proceed. Validity was enhanced by simplifying questions and avoiding vagueness. This was done to minimise different interpretations of data, hence countering the shortcoming of content analysis as the method of choice in analysis.

Research ethics involve requirements on daily work, the protection of dignity of subjects and the publication of the information in the research (Fouka & Mantzorou, 2011). This research has, to the best of the researcher’s ability, observed good work ethic.

To enhance reliability and validity, the researcher relied on a wide range of sources that have information relevant to the study so as to ensure that various sources have come to fairly same conclusions on the subject.

3.11 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the study discussed the methodology that was used to carry out the research. The nature of the research is both quantitative and qualitative. A survey technique was used to administer questionnaires for the purpose of collecting quantitative data. This data was analysed using content analysis which helped in establishing relationships, develop graphical representation of data and predict the behaviour of the dependent variable which in this case was performance in the tourism sector when the independent variable (Dynamic capabilities) changes. Secondary data derived the information on the discussion and comparison between
South Africa’s and Kenya’s performance and provided a clear picture of how the two countries are addressing the tourism docket as regards to the application of dynamic capabilities that arise from collaborative strategies. By analyzing literature on studies done on the tourism, this chapter aimed to bring out what common findings the various researches have come to conclude as the most influential internal factors contributing to performance in the tourism industry of South Africa.
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The study sought to examine the factors that contribute to underperformance in the tourism sector in Kenya by comparing with South Africa. By examining how the two countries utilize supply chain capabilities to enhance performance, the study sought to justify the tourism sector in Kenya as underperforming as compared to South Africa. Statistical data was collected from various established sources and published research work extensively discussed. Qualitative data was collected from the respondents and analysed for insights. Graphs, tables and charts were used to present the quantitative data. The works cited were properly referenced and acknowledged.

4.2 Response rate

From the data collected, out of the 80 questionnaires administered, 52 were filled and returned while 28 were not returned. This represented 65% response rate which was considered sufficient enough to continue with analysis of the data.

Table 4.1 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled and returned</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not returned</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1 Demographic Information

The demographic information considered in this study included the age bracket at which the respondent falls under, the length at which the respondent has been a shareholder and monthly earnings.

4.2.1.1 Age Bracket

The study determined the age bracket at which the respondents fell under and from the figure 4.1, majority (51.9%) ranged above 36 to 45 years, 44.2% ranged above 25 to 36 years and 3.8% ranged above 45 to 55 years. There were no respondents between 18 to 25 years and over 55 years.


4.2.1.2 Tourism History

The study sought to establish the number of years each respondent has been a tourist of the specific countries under investigation; both Kenya and South Africa. From the findings as shown in figure 4.2, 59.6% have been Tourists for above 2 to 4 years, 28.8% had been tourists for above 4 to 8 years, 9.6% had been tourists for less than 2 years, 1.9% have been tourists above 8 to 10 years and none had been a tourist for more than 10 years.

Figure 4.1: Age of respondents

Figure 4.2: Tourism duration
4.2.1.3 Monthly Earnings

The study also sought to look at each respondent’s monthly earnings. From the findings as also shown in figure 4.3, 67.3 % of the respondents earned above Kshs. 50,000 to Kshs. 100,000, 28.8% earned less than Kshs. 50,000 and 3.8% earned over Kshs. 100,000.
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Figure 4. 3 : Monthly earnings

4.3 Presentation of Findings

4.3.1 Perception of Organization Performance by Tourists

The study sought to find out to what extent the respondents (tourists) thought that the Tourism department of one country outperformed the other and met their requirements and results are presented below:
The study found out that 71.15% of the respondents felt that the organizational performance in the South African Tourism department outperformed Kenya’s as regards to meeting customer requirements. 66.7% of those that suggested customer requirements were met to a very great extent thought South Africa outperformed Kenya. 71% of those that felt the organizations had met customer requirements to a great extent hailed South Africa’s performance, 75% of the rest respondents who felt it was to a moderate extent also agreed that South Africa was the better performer, and non (0%) felt that the organizations had met customer requirements to a little or no extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>S.A</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4(66.7%)</td>
<td>2(33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To no extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>27(71%)</td>
<td>11(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6(75%)</td>
<td>2(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37(71.11%)</td>
<td>15(28.89%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Determination of Supply Chain Capabilities with regard to Shareholder ratings on Logistic Service

The study did seek to find out how respondents would relate aspects of quality, innovation speed, business synergy, flexibility and process efficiency with regard to the services the organizations provided.

4.3.2.1 Quality

The study sought to find out how respondents would rate the quality of service provided by either country’s tourism department and results were represented as seen in figure 4.4.
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Figure 4.4: Tourists rating on quality

From the data, a majority (71.2%) of respondents rated the quality service of the tourist department as good; of these, 68% thought South Africa outperforms Kenya; 21.2% thought of the quality as fair; and of these, 83 percent agreed that South Africa was the better
performer. 7.7% thought quality was very good and 73% indicated South Africa outdoes Kenya in performance, while 0% rated quality as bad or worst.

4.3.2.2 Innovation Speed

The study also looked at innovation speed as an aspect that the respondents were to rate and results are shown in figure 4.5.

Figure 4. 5 : Tourists rating on innovation speed

From the collected data, 76.9% of the respondents felt that the aspect of innovation speed was fair; of which 81% thought South Africa to be the better and faster innovators. 15.4% felt it was good; of these 67% ranked South Africa on top of Kenya. 7.7% felt it was bad; both countries got equal percentage on this while none of the respondents felt it was very good or worst.
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4.3.2.3 Business Synergy

The study looked at business synergy as an aspect that the respondents were required to rate and results are shown in figure 4.6.

From the figure, 51.9% of the respondents felt the aspect of business synergy as provided by the two countries was fair; of these, 59% thought South African workforce delivered better because of Business synergy. 46.2% rated it as good; of which 63% ranked South Africa higher than Kenya. 1.9% rated business synergy as very good and no respondent felt it was bad or worse.

Figure 4. 6: Tourists rating on business synergy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.4 Flexibility

The study also did seek to look at flexibility as an aspect that the respondents should rate with regard to service provided by the two countries’ tourism ministries. The results are represented in figure 4.7.
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Figure 4. 7: Tourism rating on flexibility

From the data above, 82.7% of the respondents rated flexibility as fair; of which only 30% suggested Kenya outperformed South Africa 11.5% thought flexibility was rated good; of which 27% thought Kenya outperformed South Africa. 5.8% thought flexibility was bad in both countries and no respondent rated flexibility as neither very good nor worst.
4.3.2.5 Process Efficiency

Respondents were also required to rate how the business and operational processes are efficient in providing their services. The results are represented in figure 4.8.

![Figure 4.8: Tourists rating on process efficiency](image)

From the collected data, 15.4% of the respondents felt the process efficiency of the two countries was very good; of which 76% ranked Kenya lower as compared to South Africa. 28.8% thought it as fair; of which only 23% ranked Kenya higher than South Africa. 53.8% agreed that process efficiency in both countries is good: of these 65% ranked South Africa higher. 1.9% ranked it as bad and no respondent felt it was worst.

4.3.3 Effect of Supply Chain Collaboration Capabilities on Organizational Performance

The study looked at the contribution of specific dynamic collaboration capabilities towards satisfaction of the organization performance with regard to the tourists. The dynamic capabilities consisted of quality, innovation speed, business synergy flexibility and process
efficiency. The study sought to find out to what extent these capabilities contributed towards satisfaction of the organizations performance.

4.3.3.1 Quality

The study looked at what extent did quality contribute to the tourists’ satisfaction of either country’s performance. The results are shown in table 4.3.

**Table 4.3: Effect of Quality towards Organizational Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>S.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2(28.5%)</td>
<td>5(61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To no extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>12(41.3%)</td>
<td>17(59.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4(44.44%)</td>
<td>5(55.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18(40%)</td>
<td>27(60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out from the data that 64.4% who were the majority felt that quality contributed a great extent towards Organizational performance hence their satisfaction; of which 59.7% ranked Kenya lower than South Africa. 20% felt it was to a moderate extent; of which 44.44% ranked Kenya higher than South Africa. 15.6% stated that the quality provided enhanced their satisfaction to a very great extent; of which only 28% ranked Kenya higher than South Africa and 0% to little or no extent.
4.3.3.2 Innovation Speed

The study also looked at the contribution of innovation speed towards Organizational Performance and the results are represented in table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Effect of Innovation Speed towards Organizational Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>S.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To no extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1(33.3%)</td>
<td>2(67.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>16(41%)</td>
<td>23(59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17(37.78%)</td>
<td>28(62.22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data, 86.7% of the respondents felt innovation speed contributed to a moderate extent; of which 41% thought the Kenyan tourism department as the better innovator. 6.7% felt innovation contributed to performance to a great extent; of which a majority (67.7%) thought South Africa is utilizing innovation better than Kenya. 6.7% also felt to a little extent while no respondent felt innovation speed contributed to a very great extent nor to no extent.
4.3.3.3 Business Synergy

The study also looked at Business Synergy as a dynamic capability and sought to look at how tourists perceive its contribution towards Organizational Performance. Results are shown below:

Table 4.5: Effect of Business Synergy towards Organizational Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>S.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To no extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8(44.44%)</td>
<td>10(55.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12(44.44%)</td>
<td>15(55.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20(44.44%)</td>
<td>25(55.56%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data collected, 40% of the respondents felt business synergy had contributed to a great extent towards Organizational performance, 60% to a moderate extent and none of the respondents felt Business Synergy had contributed to a very great extent or to a little extent or even to no extent.
4.3.3.4 Flexibility

The study sought to look at how flexibility has contributed towards the Organizational Performance of the firms and results are represented in table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Effect of Flexibility towards Organizational Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>S.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To no extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>3(37.5%)</td>
<td>5(52.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>12(48.89%)</td>
<td>23(51.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15(33.3%)</td>
<td>30(66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data, the majority who represented 77.8% felt that flexibility had contributed to a moderate extent towards Organizational Performance, 17.8% to a great extent, 4.4% to a little extent and none did feel it was neither to a very great extent nor to no extent. A majority of respondents though South Africa outperforms Kenya due to flexibility in their operations.

4.3.3.5 Process Efficiency

The results representing the contribution of Process Efficiency towards Organizational Performance are shown in table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Effect of Process Efficiency towards Organizational Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>S.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To no extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17 (37.78%)</td>
<td>28 (52.22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data above, 66.7% of the respondents felt process efficiency contributed to a great extent towards Organizational Performance, 11.1% to a very great extent, 20% to a moderate extent, 2.2% to a little extent and none felt Process Efficiency contributed to no extent.

4.4 Chapter Summary

Having captured a response of 65% from the data collected it was considered that the response was adequate enough for analysis and further conclusions ahead. From the level of responses, it could be said as well that the data collected brought about satisfactory results with regard to the respondents (tourists) that were able to give their sincere responses of the questions from the questionnaire.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction

The chapter gives an overall summary of the findings got after data was collected. The first section looks at the summary of research objectives and methodology. The next section briefly discusses the findings of the study with regards to the research objectives as well as recommendations drawn from the conclusions. Lastly, the section will give areas of further research that the paper did not look at.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The underlying purpose of this study was to find out factors that hinder performance in the tourism sector in Kenya by understand factors that enhance organizational performance in the tourism sector of South Africa. Supply chain collaboration capabilities have been discussed in previous studies on corporate organizations and their impact on performance clearly brought out. The study used these capabilities to compare how the two countries under studies have utilize them to have a competitive edge. The main focus of study is tourism sectors of both Kenya and South Africa. The study also had two other objectives which were to determine supply chain capabilities and to assess the effect of supply chain collaboration capabilities on Organizational Performance of tourism ministry in both Kenya and South Africa and more specifically as perceived by the tourists. The study determined Quality, Innovation, Business Synergy, Flexibility and Process Efficiency as the dynamic capabilities to be focused on. With regard to tourists’ perception of the Organizations performance in terms of meeting customer requirements, (71.11%) felt the South African government through its tourism ministry outperform their Kenyan counterparts and had met customer
requirements better and none felt they did not. Majority of the tourists were in agreement of the Organizations meeting customer requirements. With regard to the level of service the organizations provided, most of the tourists felt that both Organizations provided good quality, but South Africa outperforms Kenya, had good business synergy and process efficiency. Innovation and speed of the Organizations were not highly rated by most of the respondents.

A majority of the shareholders felt that supply chain collaboration capabilities contributed to the Organizational Performance of the firms as 45 out of the 52 responded ‘yes’ to that. 64.4% felt quality was to a great extent, 86.7% felt innovation was to a moderate extent, 60% felt business synergy was to a moderate extent, 77.8% felt flexibility was to a moderate extent and 66.7% felt process efficiency was to a great extent. All in all, the respondents felt that the collaboration capabilities had some effect towards Organizational Performance even though Quality and Process Efficiency were ones that most thought had a greater effect than Innovation, Flexibility and Business Synergy. In general, South Africa ranked higher than Kenya in all the aspects of dynamic capabilities.

5.3 Discussion of Findings

5.3.1 Perception of Organization Performance by Tourists

Organizational Performance can be judged by many different constituencies resulting in many different interpretations of “successful performance” (Carton, 2004).

Supply Chain Collaboration has been recognized as a critical role to achieve collaborative advantage and better firm performance (Cao & Zhang, 2011). This study looked at the
contribution supply chain collaboration capabilities have on organizational performance with regard to tourism in Kenya as well as South Africa. Based on the analysis, the study has provided some evidence on the extent to which the tourists feel the respective countries have met their customer requirements which hence also goes down to organizational performance. Understanding customer needs is crucial in the success of any business (Hutchins, 2008)

On that regard, through the analysis, it was found out that majority of the tourists who have visited both countries had felt that the South African Tourism department had met customer requirements to a greater extent than the Kenyan tourism ministry. None of the tourists felt that either of the countries had not met customer requirements. From the respondents 73.1% who were the majority felt that both organizations had met the customer requirements to a great extent and with that it suggests that most of the tourists felt that the organizations are doing what they are supposed to do so as to satisfy their customers.

The nature of organizational performance and its measurement has been a topic for both scholars and practitioners since organizations were first formed. How to determine if the efforts of the organization are being put to their best use and are achieving the desired outcomes is at the heart of several disciplines (Carton, 2004).

**5.3.2 Determination of Supply Chain Capabilities with regard to tourists rating**

From the study, the dynamic capabilities that were looked under included quality, innovation speed, flexibility, process efficiency and business synergy. Respondents were required to give an insight of the ratings of these capabilities with regard to the levels at which their corresponding organizations were offering their services.
From the analysis, quality and process efficiency were regarded by the respondents as the capabilities that were provided to a good extent whereas innovation, flexibility and business synergy were rated as fair by majority of the respondents.

With regards to quality, it was seen that the majority of the respondents that represented 71.2% felt that the level of quality offered was good enough; of these, 60% ranked South Africa higher than Kenya. 53.8% of the respondents felt the process efficiency was good; of which 52.22% felt that Kenya performed poorly as compared to South Africa. 76.9% felt innovation speed was fair, 51.9% felt business synergy was fair and 82.7% felt flexibility was fair.

The results seem to suggest that both the organizations (Tourism ministries) embraced the aspects of dynamic capabilities to some extent despite quality being the most regarded. South Africa seems to be a step ahead in actualizing benefits associated with dynamic capabilities.

Traditional capabilities-performance research, based on RBV, focused on achieving and sustaining competitive advantages by exploiting and utilizing capabilities within a single organization (Chen, 2015). Although this view helps researchers identify the dimensions of firm capabilities and performance at a very detailed level, these studies obviously underestimate the importance of collaboration through supply chain partners, which have great potential to improve firm performance (Chen, 2015).

One of the theoretical contributions of this study is to understand the firm capabilities and performance in the context of Supply Chain Collaboration in governmental and nongovernmental institutions. This is different from previous studies, which conceptualized firm capabilities and performance as one-dimensional constructs.
5.3.2 Effect of Supply Chain Collaboration Capabilities on Organizational Performance

Each group of organizational shareholders will have a different view of Organizational Performance making it incumbent upon a researcher to select a perspective of performance that conforms to the phenomenon of interest (Carton, 2004).

The most difficult problem in developing a generalizable measurement model of performance is finding an indicator, or set of indicators, that reflect a weighted measure of all of the different dimensions of performance (Carton, 2004).

The supply chain collaboration capabilities that were focused in this paper as mentioned before included quality, innovation speed, business synergy, flexibility and process efficiency where the research was looking at their effect towards Organizational Performance of tourism departments.

With regards to quality, majority of the shareholders that represented 64.4% felt it had contributed towards Organizational Performance to a great extent and 15.6% to a very great extent.

When it came to innovation speed, majority that represented 86.7% felt it had contributed towards Organizational Performance to a moderate extent.

With regard to Business Synergy, 60% felt it was to a moderate extent and 40% to a great extent.

When it came to flexibility, the majority of the shareholders that represented 77.8% felt flexibility had contributed to a moderate extent towards Organizational Performance.
With regard to process efficiency, 66.7% of the respondents were in favour that it had contributed a great deal towards Organizational Performance.

From the data, it was established that the dynamic capabilities had some positive effect towards the Organizational Performance of the logistics firms with regard to the tourists; more especially quality and process efficiency.

A paper by Ralf Wilden, 2010 presented a conceptual of dynamic capabilities – organizational performance relationship and it showed that dynamic capabilities have both direct and indirect effects on Organizational Performance: directly via dynamic capability costs and indirectly via the organizational resource base (Wilden, 2010).

In 2015, the relationship between dynamic capabilities and firm performance was determined using organizational competencies as a moderator and the results suggested that source of superior Organizational Performance lies in the relationship between organizational capabilities and organizational competencies (Rehman, 2015).

Dynamic Capabilities facilitate a company in its improved performances, its innovativeness in terms of products and advanced use of technology as well as prepare a firm to survive in the ever changing business environment (Lin, 2012). It can be realised that dynamic capability focuses on the changing needs of both the organization as well as its customers and prepares a firm accordingly to face the challenges encountered due to the changing business environment.

A research carried on dynamic capabilities, marketing capability and organizational performance in 2016 confirmed evidence already presented by other authors that the dynamic
capabilities have influence on organizational performance when mediated by marketing capability (Sergio, Elder, & Giacomini, 2016).

All in all, from past research papers, it has been seen that dynamic capabilities have an effect on Organizational Performance be it direct or indirect.

5.4 Conclusions

Organizational performance is a very broad and encompassing term and when it is put in the context of the supply chain capabilities it needs yet further clarification (Manos, 2007). The complex nature of performance measure adds difficulties in the elements involved in the concept of dynamic capabilities. The literature review undertaken, although not exhaustive, served as a comprehensive base for understanding and developing a framework for performance measure. Part of this overall framework was further explored in the context of the tourism industry in an effort to understand the concept of supply chain collaboration capabilities in a specific context of its effect towards Organizational Performance more specifically towards tourists’ satisfaction. Robinson (1995) examined ten different new venture performance measures to determine which individual measure was the most effective in accurately assessing long-term economic value creation. Robinson found strong support for his hypothesis that return to stockholders provided the most power of the ten measures evaluated. The study conducted revealed that while there is a true need for performance measure, the use of supply chain collaboration capabilities, more especially dynamic capabilities, could affect the overall Organization Performance of a firm positively.
Organizational Performance of the tourism ministries under study can be said to be affected with the different supply chain collaboration capabilities under focus, that is, quality, innovation speed, business synergy, flexibility and process efficiency. Despite some capabilities having more effect towards Organizational Performance than others, all of them are seen to have some effect towards Organizational Performance one way or the other.

5.5 Recommendations

As the study was confined to dynamic capabilities of quality, innovation, flexibility, business synergy and process efficiency, the study recommends that Organizations should make use of dynamic capabilities so as to enhance their Performance as it was found out that by use of these capabilities that come through collaborative strategies, affected the tourists satisfaction positively.

It is further recommended that Organizations should balance the level at which they offer such capabilities in the sense that the Organizations should not focus more on others but strike a balance which may create a more positive reaction towards Organizational Performance. As it was seen from the findings quality and process efficiency took more emphasis than flexibility, business synergy and innovation, it may be because of lack of understanding of technical terms used. A balance should be created.

5.6 Areas of further research

The study confined itself to specific capabilities and so a detailed research to establish other supply chain capabilities should be established and find out their effect towards
Organizational Performance not necessary towards shareholder returns but also towards other measures.

The study also confined itself to the tourism sector and the findings may not be fully applicable in other sectors as a result of the uniqueness of this industry. It is therefore suggested that the study is replicated in other service sectors.

5.7 Chapter Summary

From the research conducted and results from the findings, it can be said that supply chain collaboration capabilities have a positive impact towards Organizational Performance more especially with regards to tourists’ satisfaction. Organizations should continue to give great emphasis towards the use of dynamic capabilities as it will enhance on Organizational Performance. Kenya should take more emphasis in managing its supply chain in the ministries to enhance performance and gain competitive advantage.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE: Questionnaire

Instructions: Kindly respond to the following questions by ticking on the appropriate box (√)

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1) Age Bracket

18-25 [ ]
above 25 to 36 [ ]

Above 36 to 45 [ ]
above 45 to 55 [ ]

Over 55 [ ]

2) How long have you been a Tourist?

Less than 2 years [ ]
above 2 to 4 years [ ]

Above 4 to 8 years [ ]
above 8 to 10 years [ ]

More than 10 years [ ]

3) How much do you earn in a month?

Less than 50,000 [ ]
above 50,000 to 100,000 [ ]

Over 100,000 [ ]
SECTION II: PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

PART B: Perception of Organization by shareholders

4) To what extent would you say South Africa’s Tourism sector service meet customer requirements?

To a very great extent [☐] To a great extent [☐]
To a moderate extent [☐] To a little extent [☐]
To no extent [☐]

5) To what extent would you say Kenya’s Tourism sector service meet customer requirements?

To a very great extent [☐] To a great extent [☐]
To a moderate extent [☐] To a little extent [☐]
To no extent [☐]

6) How would you rate the following aspects of logistics services provided as relates to the Tourism sector in South Africa? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= Worst; 2 Bad; 3= Fair; 4= Good 5= Very Good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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7) How would you rate the following aspects of logistics services provided as relates to the Tourism sector in Kenya? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= Worst; 2 Bad; 3= Fair; 4= Good 5= Very Good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business synergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) To what extent do you think these collaboration capabilities have contributed to your satisfaction of the organizations performance? Where 1= Very great extent; 2 Great extent; 3= Moderate extent; 4= Low Extent and 5= Very Low Extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business synergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION IV: MARKETING AND PERFORMANCE

9) Do you think Marketing of tourism affects performance?
   Yes [ ]    No [ ]

10) How do you rate Marketing of tourism in Kenya?
    To a very great extent [ ]  To a great extent [ ]
    To a moderate extent [ ]  To a little extent [ ]
    To no extent [ ]

11) How do you rate Marketing of tourism in Kenya?
    To a very great extent [ ]  To a great extent [ ]
To a moderate extent [ ] To a little extent [ ]
To no extent [ ]
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