DETERMINATION OF THE INTEGRATION OF CORPORATE VENTURE IN STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IN THE KENYA WILDLIFE SERVICE

BY

NAHASHON KAREITHI GITAHI

A MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (MBA)

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

NOVEMBER 2010

DECLARATION

This Research Project is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University.

Signed…………………………………… Date…………………

NAHASHON KAREITHI GITAHI

D61/72893/2009

This Research Project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor.

Signed………………………………….. Date…………………

Dr. J. M Munyoki
Lecturer, Department of Business Administration,
School of Business,
University of Nairobi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, am grateful to the Almighty God, who has always been there for me throughout my studies. Second, my profound gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr. J. M Munyoki for his insightful guidance that enabled me to successfully complete this pleasant task. Am thankful for his corrections in my error-friendly drafts and guidance in writing this project. I feel greatly indebted to my family, friends and relatives whom I may not name in person but whose financial contributions enabled me to successfully clear the MBA course units and have this paper prepared.

To my fellow MBA students of the 2009 class; thanks for your encouragement. I would not forget to thank my colleagues especially Mkaya, Gitau, Kibichio, Stella Mumbi, Ambuko, Mureithi and Masinde for their wide range of encouragement and support rendered throughout the MBA epoch.

Many thanks also go to the staff of the Kenya Wildlife Service for their positive response during my data collection activity. The absence of such cooperation would have brought the entire process of developing this paper into an instant halt.

Lastly, thanks to any other person that might have contributed in one way or another to the success of this study.

DEDICATION

To my dearest Mum and Family.

ABSTRACT

Recently there has been a growing interest in the use of corporate venturing as a means for corporations to enhance the innovative abilities of their employees and, at the same time, increase corporate success through the creation of new corporate ventures. However, the creation of corporate activity is difficult since it involves radically changing internal organizational behavior patterns.

The objective of this study was to determine the integration of corporate venture in strategic management in the Kenya Wildlife Service. In undertaking the study, employees of the KWS were considered. Data was collected by use of questionnaires reinforced by personal visits and telephone calls. A total of 70 questionnaires were distributed to the employees. Out of these, 53 responded by completing and returning the questionnaires.

Research findings revealed that corporate venture was well integrated with strategic management as was evidenced by the integration of innovation and creativity as one of the objectives in the organization balance score card. From the findings, it was concluded that the major challenge faced in implementing corporate venture at the Kenya wildlife service was limited financial resources for research and development and luck of training on corporate venture.

Arising from the findings, it was recommended that the organization’s management should emphasis and support strong corporate venture by training employees on corporate venturing as a way of creating the organizations wealth and collaborate with the government to obtain funding for Research and Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The development of the field of strategic management within the last two decades has been dramatic and it grows larger every day (Chinowsky and Byrd, 2001). According to Anand and Singh (1997) a significant amount of the empirical studies in strategy were concerned about the scope of the firm and its performance implications. These studies have found that strategy formulation and implementation are intrinsically intertwined, incrementally evolving processes; that intended strategies are often different from realized strategies, and that different organizational contexts are associated with different strategic processes. Previous studies have also recognized the multi-layered nature of the strategic process in organizations: the fact that it involves the interlocking strategic activities of managers at different levels in the organization. However, strategic management generally addresses the question of why some organizations succeed or fail, and it covers the causes for company's success or failure (Porter, 1991).

While the field of strategic management has been developing rapidly relatively little is known, however, about the process through which firms engage in corporate venture. Corporate venture actions are any newly fashioned behaviors through which organization exploit opportunities others have not noticed or aggressively pursued. Novelty, in terms of new resources, customers, markets, or a new combination of the three is the defining characteristic of corporate venture actions. This research purports to extend the theory of strategic management by providing integration with corporate venture.

1.1.1 The Concept of corporate venture

In the private sector the primary purpose of an organization will generally be concerned with the enhancement of shareholder value; in public institutions the purpose is generally concerned with the delivery of service or with the delivery of a beneficial outcome in the public interest. In order to fulfill their purpose, organizations craft strategies that guide them in the competitive environments in which they operate. A business which is serious about competing in fast changing markets with fast changing customers and scarce resources must make things happen – it must innovate. What differentiates entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs is that entrepreneurs create organizations while non-entrepreneurs do not. Corporate venture or entrepreneurship is a form of management which potentially offers the organization a way of combining flexibility and responsiveness of the entrepreneur with the market power and reduced risk of the established organization. It involves developing and communicating original vision, identifying new opportunities for the organization, generating innovative strategic options and creating and offering organization wide perspective.

In some situations the acceptance of change is optional; in corporate environment, though there is no choice; corporations that do not move with the times die. Pre-empting change therefore becomes an essential trait of corporate survival, the key being to develop a culture of innovation and creativity (Davis 2001).

1.1.2 The Concept of strategic management

Strategic management is the conduct of drafting, implementing and evaluating cross-functional decisions that will enable an organization to achieve its long-term objectives. It is the process of specifying the organization's mission, vision and objectives, developing policies and plans often in terms of projects and programs, which are designed to achieve these objectives and then allocating resources to implement the policies and plans, projects and programs.

The basis of strategic management is the notion that strategy creates an alignment between the enterprise's internal strengths and weaknesses on the one hand and its opportunities and threats (SWOT) in its external environment on the other (Andrews, 1987). Schendel and Hofer (1979) identified the following six “major tasks” of strategic management: goal formulation, environmental analysis, formulation, evaluation, implementation and control of strategies. Strategic management deals with how enterprises develop sustainable competitive advantages resulting in the creation of value (Ramachandran *et al*., 2006). Achieving a competitive advantage position and enhancing firm performance relative to their competitors are the main objectives that business organizations in particular should strive to attain. Competitive advantage is a concept that remains as a major research area as far as strategic management is concerned.

1.1.3 The Kenya wildlife service

A state corporation is an enterprise in which the government is the majority shareholder (Ochanda, 2005). A state corporation is an activity of the government, whether central government or local authority involving manufacturing or production of goods or making available a service for a price such activity being managed directly by the government or through an autonomous body with the government having majority shareholding. State corporations are partially or fully government owned and controlled. The established and continuance of a state corporation is a political decision and its operations are controlled at strategic points by a system where the government has a final decision making. State corporations have numerous objectives, more ambiguous and less distinguishable from conclusions. The management of these institutions do not have the freedom to optimize their performance in pursuit of a single objective (Mwangi, 2006).

The Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) is a Uniformed and Disciplined Service established under the provisions of The Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Act, CAP 376 of the Laws of Kenya with a mandate for conservation and management of wildlife. KWS vision is: “To be a world leader in wildlife conservation” and its mission is: “To sustainably conserve and manage Kenya’s wildlife and its habitats in collaboration with other stakeholders for posterity” (KWS, 2010)

KWS controls approximately eight per cent (8%) of the total landmass of the country comprising twenty two (22) terrestrial national parks, four (4) marine national parks, twenty eight (28) terrestrial national reserves, six (6) marine national reserves and five (5) national sanctuaries. Protection of fauna & flora in these areas entails permanent deployment of specialized security surveillance units across the country to combat poaching, banditry attacks and habitat degradation with special attention to conservation and protection of the “Big Five” that attract tourists into the country.

In addition, KWS is responsible for the management and protection of important and critical water catchment areas (Mt. Kenya, Aberdares, Mt. Elgon, Chyulu and Marsabit) and also an additional role of protection and restoration of the Mau forest in collaboration with other national agencies. KWS complements other Forces in the provision of national security services. KWS is a lead agency under Kenya Roads Board (KRB) for development and maintenance of roads. Seventy per cent (70%) of Kenya's Electricity is hydro based mainly from Tana River water of which comes from Mt. Kenya and Aberdare National Parks. The second source is the Turkwell Gorge, which is in Nasolot National Reserve. Geothermal power is from Hells Gate National Park. KWS manages ten (10) marine parks and reserves which are critical breeding grounds and by extension the sustenance of the fishing industry.

The Service's approved workforce establishment is 4,300 and the current total workforce strength is 3,852 staff of which, 2,749 belong to the Armed Wing whose objective is to enforce the Service's mandate as stipulated in the Wildlife Act Cap. 376 and also undertake any other duties as may be assigned by the Government. Conservation is closely linked to economic development particularly where, like in Kenya, it underpins tourism. KWS is a core partner in the government's strategy to formulate and implement strategies for tourism and sustainably exploit natural resources for economic recovery, employment and wealth creation.

Tourism is the second largest contributor to the country's economy and is a leading sector in achieving the goals of the country's economic vision and strategy. The industry's strength is mainly based on Kenya's natural attractions, which include wild game. These wildlife resources managed by KWS are the backbone of the tourism industry in Kenya. KWS accounts for 90% of Safari Tourism and about 75% of total tourist earnings. Tourism industry accounts for 21% of total foreign exchange earnings and 12% of the country's GDP. The contribution of the industry also has multiplier effects in other sectors of the economy such as agriculture, horticulture, transport and communications. Other benefits include the protection of genetic resources.

1.2 The Research Problem

Public entities, including state corporations, are today under more pressure than ever to manage costs and deliver services more efficiently. As operating budgets are scrutinized, public officials search for creative and innovative means of cutting costs, maximizing the productivity of existing staff, and working smarter to serve the public's interests.

Many authors have singled out corporate venture as an organizational process that contributes to firm survival and performance (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Drucker, 1985; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Miller, 1983; Zahra, 1993). In short, these authors argue that entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors are necessary for firms of all sizes to prosper and flourish in competitive environments. As a result of these sentiments, a growing body of literature is evolving to help firms understand the organizational processes that facilitate entrepreneurial behavior (Covin & Slevin, 1991a; Guth & Ginsberg, 1990; Miller, 1983; Sathe, 1988; Zahra, 1991). This stream of research is extremely valuable because a firm's ability to increase its entrepreneurial behavior is largely determined by the compatibility of its management practices with its entrepreneurial ambitions (Murray, 1984). Among the management practices believed to facilitate corporate venture behavior are a firm's strategic management practices (Covin & Slevin, 1991a; Miller, 1983; Murray, 1984; Zahra, 1991). This research is consistent with the general notion that a firm's strategic management practices should be tailored to support its organizational objectives and context (Chakravarthy, 1987; Child, 1972).

In Kenya, Muiruri (2006) studied the extent to which large scale manufacturing companies in Kenya practiced corporate venturing and to determine what motivated corporate venturing by large scale manufacturing companies operating in Kenya. Mucee (2002) studied corporate venturing practices by software Development and distribution firms in Nairobi. They both found out that although corporate venturing was widely practiced there was further need to study its integration with strategic management.

This study therefore is set to determine the integration of corporate venture and strategic management. It will focus on KWS because of its unique settings, with goals of a wider scale encompassing both the organization and the country as a whole, and operations that call for accountability to varied stakeholders, as established by Bavon (1999), Bradley (1979), and Grosh (1991). The study aims to answer the research question, namely: How is corporate venture integrated in strategic management practices at KWS?

1.3 Research Objective

The objective of the study was to determine the integration of corporate venture in strategic management in the KWS.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The study will be important to the three general groups. Entrepreneurs will be able to use the findings and recommendations to develop and improve their strategic management practices. Secondly, scholars, academics and researchers in various aspects of strategic management will benefit from the corporate venture approach in attaining organizations objectives. Lastly, other stakeholders, such as the government and the private sector in Kenya, will also find the results of the research useful.

CHAPTER TWO: LITEREATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In a new competitive landscape, corporate venture strategies are becoming more and more important for both new as well as established enterprises. Due to e.g. increasing environmental dynamics and intensifying global competition, enterprises, regardless of their age or size, are forced to build more corporate venture strategies in order to compete and survive (Hitt, Ireland, & Hoskisson,2001; Meyer, Neck, & Meeks, 2002). These corporate venture strategies are said to be related to better company performance. They aim to build on the identification of opportunities and develop them towards competitive advantages (Hitt, Ireland, Camp, & Sexton, 2002). This is where the fields of corporate venture and strategic management intersect.

Both academic fields are focused on the process of adapting to change and exploiting opportunities. Despite this shared focus, they have developed largely independently of each other (Hitt *et al.*, 2001). Recently, scholars have called for the integration of these two fields (Meyer & Heppard, 2000; McGrath & MacMillan, 2000). The need for integration emerges as strategists, on the one hand, need to use resources in order to exploit opportunities (mostly under uncertain conditions) – and entrepreneurs, on the other hand, need to include a strategic perspective in their planning and actions.

In times of growing uncertainty and increasing speed of change, both new threats and new opportunities emerge (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1998; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). The identification and exploitation of these opportunities is the essence of corporate venturing – whereas the essence of strategic management is in how these opportunities can be transformed into sustainable competitive advantages (Zahra & Dess, 2001; Venkataraman & Sarasvathy, 2001; Kuratko, Ireland, Covin, & Hornsby, 2005). The call for the integration of these two fields is a surprisingly new phenomenon. Both disciplines are concerned with value creation, acknowledging it as a major organizational goal. Corporate venture actions and strategic actions can contribute to value creation independently, but they can contribute even more when they are integrated. In addition to "classical" variables that describe entrepreneurship, such as the characteristics and motivations of entrepreneurs, many authors favour a greater emphasis on organizational and strategic variables (Zahra, 1991; Entrialgo, Fernández, & Vázquez, 2000).

The positive outcomes of such an integration can be observed in real business life, where entrepreneurial enterprises are more inclined to engage in strategic management practices than more established enterprises which are by nature more conservative (Shuman, Shaw, & Sussmann, 1985; Bracker, Keats, & Pearson, 1988; Woo, Cooper, Dunkelberg, Daellenbach, & Dennis, 1989).

2.2 The Concept of corporate venture

Researchers have attempted to explain the key factors that cause some business to grow rapidly, while others remain small or grow very slowly. Most studies have concentrated on the founder – his or her personality, management skills, goals, and so forth. In academic discussions, the question of entrepreneurial skills is related to the debate on whether entrepreneurship can be conceived as something teachable or not. Katz (1991), for example, suggests that, most likely, there are some skills that can be taught and some that cannot. Some theories were developed that entrepreneurs are born. Nevertheless experience has shown that entrepreneurship can be taught, and that a positive environment encourages entrepreneurial thinking, promotes innovation, and leads to a higher degree of social and economic sustainability.

The main assumption that underlies the notion of corporate venture is that it is a behavioral phenomenon and all firms fall along a conceptual continuum that ranges from highly conservative to highly entrepreneurial. Entrepreneurial firms are risk-taking, innovative, and proactive. In contrast, conservative firms are risk-adverse, are less innovative, and adopt a more 'wait and see' posture. Lately corporate venture research seems to focus on two basic dimensions: individual or trait approach and process or behavioral approach, mostly concluding on the outcome – new value creation that fuels economic growth (Maes, 2003; Thoren, 2007).

2.2.1 Entrepreneurship

Scott, Rosa and Klandt (1998) stated, that “so far we have only gathered experiences on various case studies and now there is a need to focus on the basic dimensions and concepts”. The problem of defining “entrepreneur” and establishing the boundaries of entrepreneurship research has not been solved yet. In parallel some confusion still exists regarding the definition of entrepreneurship. Kirzner (1997) came out with a much wider definition and stated that entrepreneurship is about alertly recognizing and exploiting market and understanding these to be opportunities for business Muzyka, de Koning and Churchill (1995) stated that “entrepreneurship is a process that takes place in different environments and circumstances and causes changes in the economy through innovations, which are created by individuals recognizing economic opportunities creating value both to these individuals and societies”. Christensen et al. (1994) explains that entrepreneurship is opportunity driven, with an ability to make rapid commitment to opportunities that arise in a multi-stage decision mode, often using other people’s resources, managing through networks of personal relations, with the expectation that one will be rewarded in direct proportion to the new value created. Matley (2006) noticed that in practice entrepreneurship (corporate venturing or intrapreneurship) is also presented in well-established large and small organizations, being an important element of their organizational and economic development. An entrepreneur is most often defined as someone who is highly responsive to change, who sees opportunities that others may not see, and who mobilizes resources to make new things happen. As Thoren (2007) observed, corporate venturing in established firms is commonly referred to as “new business creation”, “corporate innovation”, “strategic entrepreneurship” or “intrapreneurship”.

An Entrepreneur can be a professional manager, but not every manager can be an entrepreneur”. Whether entrepreneurial tendencies exits at birth or are developed as a person matures, certain traits are usually evident in those who enjoy success. Some researchers describe these basic traits of entrepreneurs: a passion for the business, tenacity despite failure, confidence, self-determination, management of risk, changes and opportunities, a tolerance for ambiguity, initiative and need for achievement, detail-orientation and perfectionism, perception of passing time, creativity, looks at the big picture and other motivating factors. But in scientific literature among most often mentioned specific entrepreneurial traits are the locus of control, the need for achievement, risk taking, the personal value system and age.

Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) distinguished two schools of thought belonging to the trait approach: the great person school and the psychological characteristics school. The great person school is built around snippets of the life story of inspirational individuals such as Henry Ford, J.D. Rockefeller or Enzo Ferrari. Central to this line of thinking is the intuitive ability of “great” individuals to recognize an opportunity and make the appropriate decision, suggesting that they are endowed with certain qualities or traits. The great person school as such is an extreme case of the psychological characteristics school.

As Gartner (1989) noticed, the research findings of this approach provide a psychological profile so full of traits and characteristics that the entrepreneur would have to be a sort of generic “everyman”. Nevertheless the trait approach still remains a very popular view as even the most recent issues of scientific journals contain articles belonging to this approach.

The observed weaknesses of the trait approach have widened the area of entrepreneurship research to the behavioral approach, were entrepreneurship is seen as the process of creating new organizations. The behavioral view stresses the contextual nature of the creating process. The most important point at this approach is that the entrepreneurial organization is seen as an outcome of a complex processes with many influences. Hereby the role of individual boils down to a series of actions or behavior undertaken to enable the creation of the organization.

2.2.2 Corporate Venture

As mentioned above, entrepreneurship has long been seen as a synonym for establishing new small firms as a suitable vehicle for entrepreneurial endeavor Maes (2003) found a parallel strand in literature that was developed stressing the importance of entrepreneurship for and within existing organizations.

A widely accepted label for this branch in entrepreneurship theory aiming at bewildering existing companies with an entrepreneurial spirit is corporate venture. Corporate venture is thought of as rejuvenating and revitalizing existing companies. That is why corporate venturing is brought into practice as a tool for business development, revenue growth, profitability enhancement and pioneering the development of new products, services and processes.

The formation of a new organization or venture is the ultimate aim of entrepreneurship for Gartner (1985; 1989), Kouriloff (2000) and Low (2001) and entrepreneurship ends once the formation process is finished. Gartner's (1989) view support that innovation only serves to increase the ambiguity in what already is a definitional dilemma. Oppositely Miller (1983), Kanter (1985) and Schuler (1986) relate entrepreneurship to innovation explicitly.

As already presented research shows, from the behavioral view corporate venture is accepted as a multidimensional construct, as a nexus of multiple components. Thus the study of corporate venture requires taking into account many various components. However, there seems to be no agreement as to the number of components involved. The minimum and maximum approaches to the number of entrepreneurship components Scholars’ views with regard to the essence or description of the different components differ. For instance, Bruyat and Julien (2001) acknowledge that any organized living body can act as an entrepreneur. Gartner (1985) and Bygrave and Hofer (1991) on the other hand only recognize the individual entrepreneur.

Maes (2003) found that, as far as the number of components is concerned, there seems to be a minimum and a maximum approach. Some researchers represent the minimum approach they see entrepreneurship as the nexus of two components, i.e. the individual and the entrepreneurial process or project. The maximum approach considers entrepreneurship to be the combination of four components, i.e. the individual, the creating process, the organization and the environment. As it can be observed from the minimum and maximum approaches of entrepreneurship, the maximum approach, as Maes (2003) noticed, is the most promising view.

2.3 The concept of strategic management

According to Johnson and Scholes (1999), strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long-term which achieves advantage for the organization through the configuration of resources within a changing environment to achieving the objective of meeting the needs of markets and to fulfill stakeholder expectations. The “birth” of strategic management as an academic field can be traced to the 1960s (Furrer, Thomas, & Goussevskaia, 2007). Chandler□s “Strategy and Structure” (1962) and Ansoff□s “Corporate Strategy” (1965) are among the first seminal publications in this field. In its first decades of existence, strategic management almost solely investigated strategic issues in large, established enterprises (Analoui & Karami, 2003).

The basis of strategic management is the notion that strategy creates an alignment between the enterprise’s internal strengths and weaknesses on the one hand and its opportunities and threats (SWOT) in its external environment on the other (Andrews, 1987). Schendel and Hofer (1979) identified the following six “major tasks” of strategic management: 1) goal formulation, 2) environmental analysis, as well as the 3) formulation, 4) evaluation, 5) implementation and 6) control of strategies. Sandberg (1992) lists an enterprise’s resources, processes, strategy and field of industry as the primary variables of strategic management.

Strategic management deals with how enterprises develop sustainable competitive advantages resulting in the creation of value (Ramachandran et al., 2006). An underlying basis of the Austrian school in strategic management (Schumpeter, 1993 [1934]) is the temporary nature of such competitive advantages. Accordingly, strategic management can be regarded as setting the context for entrepreneurial behaviour, i.e. the exploitation of opportunities (Ireland et al., 2001). The concept of strategy revolves around deliberate attempt by an organization to obtain sustainable long-term advantage in the delivery on expectation of stakeholders. Strategy is the great work of an organization, key to survival or extinction. Strategy is about winning and it is not a plan nor a detailed program of instructions but a unifying theme that gives coherence and direction to the actions and decisions of an individual or an organization that enables it achieve superior performance (WU et al., 2004). Strategy is the determination of the basic long-term goals and objectives of an enterprise and the adoption of courses of action and the allocation of resources necessary for carting out these goals (Chandler, 1962).

Based on the Management Theory it could be observed that the strategic management theories stem mainly from the systems perspective, contingency approach and information technology approach. In light of this background, following David (2005) and Mohd Khairuddin Hashim (2005) among the common strategic management theories noted and applicable are the profit-maximizing and competition-based theory.

The profit-maximizing and competition-based theory, which was based on the notion that business organization main objective is to maximize long term profit and developing sustainable competitive advantage over competitive rivals in the external market place. In order to compete and sustain successfully, locally and globally, businesses must not only excel in their area but also persevere in the long run. Achieving such a "sustainable competitive advantage" status is not an easy task without a proper road map or strategy being outline and put into practice. Competitive advantage is a result from and being associated with a long list of contributing factors. Such factors include operational efficiencies, mergers, acquisitions, levels of diversification, types of diversification, organizational structures, top management team composition and style, human resource management, manipulation of the political and/or social influences intruding upon the market, conformity to various interpretations of socially responsible behaviors, international or cross-cultural activities of expansion and adaptation, and various other organizational and/or industry level phenomena (Ma, 1999a, 1999b; Flint & Van Fleet, 2005; King, 2007b).

As Porter (1991) highlighted, there are four attributes of the proximate environment of a firm that have the greatest influence on its competitive advantage, namely, factor conditions, demand conditions, related & supporting industries, and firm strategy, structure and rivalry. The study by Burden and Proctor (2000) on training and competitive advantage found out that meeting customer needs on time, every time, is a significant route to achieving and sustaining competitive advantage, and training is a tool that organizations should use to succeed at this. Nevertheless, Lin (2003) has further suggested that technology transfer (TT) can be a significant source of competitive advantage for firms in developing countries with limited R&D resources. However, Ma (2004) has further advanced an integrative framework on the determinants of competitive advantage in global competition namely creation & innovation, competition, cooperation and co-option. De Pablos (2006) explained that the competitive advantage of a transnational organization lies to a great extent in its ability to identify and transfer strategic knowledge between its geographically dispersed and diverse locations.

2.4 Factors that influence corporate venturing

It must be assumed that differing conditions within corporations are more or less likely to see innovative behavior beyond that of the induced strategic type. Miller (1983) looked at the entrepreneurial activities of the firm as a whole and correlated a number of macro-level variables such as company type, environment, structure, and decision-making with corporate venture. His general findings were that firm type (i.e. simple, planning, and organic) did moderate the relationship between the firm's entrepreneurial behavior and several of the other variables identified. The main conclusion that can be drawn for the purposes of the current study is that varying conditions within a firm do, in fact, affect entrepreneurial behavior.

Souder (1981) found that the presence of six specific management practices was associated with the positive outcomes in 100 new ventures in 17 organizations. These factors were early identification of intrapreneurs, formal license (or authority to proceed), sponsorship, appropriate location, discretionary powers, and informal influence. While this study made no attempt systematically to measure these factors, it does offer support for their influence.

Fry (1987) and Kanter (1985) also identified a similar set of factors that seem to be associated with successful intrapreneuring. Some of the additional factors that they identify are resource availability (including both time and material), appropriate rewards and treatment of unsuccessful venture champions (a venture champion is defined as one who develops and coordinates a new product or service within the organization).

Bird (1988) also advanced the importance of intentionality for implementing entrepreneurial ideas. Intentionality can best be described as conscious behavior that is directed as intrapreneurial activity. Concomitant with the intentionality of the intrapreneur is the intention of the organization to foster innovative behavior. This can be likened to the expectation in 3M that an individual can 'steal' 15 percent of his or her time to work on an innovative idea (Fry, 1987), or to the notion of tolerated autonomous strategic behavior (Burgleman, 1983).

2.5 A framework for mapping corporate venturing

Several studies have appeared to advance the development of a theory of corporate venturing. Zahra (1991) developed a model of corporate entrepreneurship based on environmental, strategic and organisational variables and empirically tested the model. Hornsby et al. (1993) have proved an interactive model of the decision to act intrapreneurially, which is focused on individual and organisational variables. Covin and Slevin (1991) analysed strategic and structural variables and tested the relationship between intrapreneuring and firm performance. Their model surveys much of the literature on corporate venturing and includes the following variables: entrepreneurial posture, external (environmental and industry measures), internal (structural and cultural measures), and strategic (mission strategy and competitive tactics).

Building on earlier models of strategic management, Guth and Ginsberg (1990) present one model that portrays the theoretical connections that can be drawn from corporate venturing to the other conceptual elements of the field of strategic management. In their model, Guth & Ginsberg (1990) identified five classes into corporate entrepreneurship: (1) environment influences corporate entrepreneurship; (2) Strategic leaders influence corporate entrepreneurship; (3) organisation form/conduct influences corporate entrepreneurship; (4) organizational performance influences corporate entrepreneurship, and (5) Corporate entrepreneurship influences performance.

The impact of major environmental shifts, such as deregulation, can influence changes in strategy, the more dynamic and hostile the environment, the more firms will be entrepreneurial. Both opportunities and threats stem from the potential of the firm and its competitors in an industry to find new combinations of resources that lead to competitive advantage.

The management style of top managers affects the level and performance of new corporate ventures. Managers effectiveness at building coalitions among peers and higher-level managers in support of their entrepreneurial ideas affects the degree of success in their implementation. Entrepreneurial behavior in organisations is critically dependent on the characteristics, values/beliefs, and visions of their strategic leaders. Innovation calls for leadership that is open to change.

Firms pursuing strategies of acquisitive growth have lower levels of Research and development intensity than firms pursuing strategies of internal growth through innovation. Creating new business venture units in larger organisations does not affect the level of sales from new products. Covin and Slevin (1991:13) state that mission strategies based upon building market share are more likely to incorporate entrepreneurial ventures based on innovation.

Successful firms make more radical and more frequent product and process innovations than unsuccessful firms. Organisations which experience performance downturns tend to innovate new practices and change strategic directions only after prolonged decline leads to changes in top management. Innovation and radical change may be precipitated when firms have excess resources that allow them to seize upon opportunities that arise; they also may be induced by crises or severe external threats.

Scale of entry in new product introductions affects performance. Independent, venture-backed start-ups, on average, reach profitability twice as fast and end up twice as profitable as corporate start-ups. Early entry in new-product markets does not affect performance. It is clear that new ventures often take several years to turn into contributors to overall corporate profit performance. Organisational re-creations may often have short-run negative performance consequences.

Six "natural" domains where the intersection between entrepreneurship and strategic management exist have been proposed: 1) Innovations, 2) Networks, 3) Internationalization, 4) Organizational learning, 5) Top management teams and governance, and 6) Growth (Covin & Miles, 1999; Hitt & Ireland, 2000; Ireland *et al.*, 2001).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The study was a Case study; this design is suitable for an in-depth contextual analysis. This is deemed an appropriate design, as the study involves an in-depth investigation of the phenomenon of corporate venture with particular emphasis on the Kenya Wildlife Service. According to Kothari (1990) a case study is a powerful form of qualitative analysis and involves a careful and complete observation of a social unit such as an individual, a family, an institution, a cultural group or the entire community. This study is built on similar grounds.

3.2 Data Collection

The study used both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected using a questionnaire to allow comparison of results among the respondents. Both closed- and open-ended questions were employed to enable the collection of both standardized and supplementary data and also based on a 5 point likert scale. The questionnaires were dropped at the respondent's premises and picked later at a pre-agreed time to allow the respondents adequate time to fill them in. Personal interviews, emails and telephone were used for verification purposes. Secondary data was obtained from the organizations strategic plan and other related documentations including internal memos and minutes of strategic planning meetings.

The respondents were drawn from the one-hundred-and-forty-three (143) top management and middle level managers at KWS. A proportionate stratified sample of 70 senior management staff was used for the study and was divided into four clusters determined by the grade levels they included the Director (1) Deputy Directors (3) Heads of departments (21) and Senior Management (45). Only 53 respondents responded as shown in table 5.3.

Table 3.1 Sample Selection

Cluster (Stratum)	**Grade**	**Population**	**Target Sample**	**Response**
A. Director	1	1	1	1
B. Deputy Directors	2	7	3	2
C. Head of Departments	3	42	21	17
D. Senior management	4	93	45	33
		143	**70**	**53**

3.3 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data collected. This was the most suitable method since most of the data expected from the respondents was quantitative in nature. Descriptions of the research findings were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) and presented using percentages, measures of central tendency (mean and standard deviation) and frequency tables.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The objective of the study was to establish the integration of corporate venture with strategic management at Kenya Wildlife Service. This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data collected pertaining to the stated research objective. A total of 70 questionnaires were distributed to the selected sample. However, only 53 of the target sample population responded bringing the response rate to 76%.

4.2 Demographic information on respondents

This section was meant to solicit personal information about the respondent whereby the respondents were required to indicate their divisions, departments or areas of work, level of management and the number of years they have been with the organization. The findings are as shown in the following tables.

4.2.1 Response Rates

Each Division was required to be represented during the data collection. The response rate per division was noted and the findings are shown in table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Response Rates per Division

Cluster (Stratum)	Grade	Population	Target Sample	Frequency	Response Rate
A. Director	1	1	1	1	100%
B. Deputy Directors	2	7	3	2	28.57
C. Head of Departments	3	42	21	17	80.95
D. Senior management	4	93	45	33	73.33
		143	**70**	**53**	**75.71**

As shown in table 4.1, the target sample was for 70 respondents but only 53 responded and having the following response rates; Director response rate was at 100%, heads of departments with 80.95%, Senior management at 75.56% and Deputy directors at 66.67%. This indicated that all Divisions of KWS were well represented.

The respondents were also requested to indicate their level of management and the findings are shown in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Response Rate per Level of Management

Position	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Head of Division	4	7.5
Head of Department	18	34
Middle level management	31	58.5
Total	**53**	**100.0**

As shown in table 4.2, majority of the respondents were Middle level management with 58.5% while heads of departments represented 34% and head of division were 7.5%.

4.2.2 Length of Service

The respondents were requested to indicate the number of years they have been with the organization and the findings are given in table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Length of Service

	Frequency	**Percent**
Less than 3 year	8	15.1
4-6 years	18	34.0
7-9 years	15	28.3
Over 10 years	12	22.6
Total	**53**	**100.0**

As shown in table 4.3, 34.0% of the respondents had worked for KWS for between 4-6 years, those with less than 3 years with 15.1% and 28.3% had worked for 7-9years.

4.3 Strategic Management in KWS

This section aimed at finding out how strategic management was carried out in KWS and how the respondents had participated in that process as well as involvement of the staff under them in their respective departments.. The findings are as indicated in the tables below.

4.3.1 Responsibility for strategy formulation in KWS

The respondents were requested to indicate who was responsible for formulating strategic plans in KWS. The findings are as shown in table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Responsibility for strategy formulation in KWS

	Frequency	**Percent**
BOT	1	1.9
Director/CEO	16	30.2
Top management	12	22.6
Consultants	4	7.5
Participation of all employees	20	37.7
Total	**53**	**100.0**

As shown in table 4.4, majority indicated that strategic plans were formulated through participation of all employees with 37.7%, while 30.2% of the respondents indicated that the director formulated the strategic plans and 22.6% indicated that top management was responsible for strategic management. From these findings all members of staff had played a role and most of them had taken part in the strategy formulation process through committees or departmental level.

4.3.2 Respondents participation in formulation of any strategy in KWS

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they participated in strategy formulation. 94.3% of the respondents had participated in formulation of strategy in the organization with three non-responses. Respondents were asked to highlight which strategies they were involved in formulating and majority of them mentioned the strategic plans of 2005-2010 and 2008-2012.

4.3.3 Other strategies the respondent had participated in Formulating.

The respondents were requested to indicate which other strategies they had played a role in whether, corporate strategy, annual objectives, Functional strategies or a combination of the strategies. The findings are as shown in table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Which other strategies the respondent had participated in Formulating

	Frequency	**Percent**
Corporate strategy	3	5.9
Annual objectives	3	5.9
Functional strategies	26	51.0
All	10	19.6
Corporate and Annual objectives	4	7.8
Annual objectives and Functional strategies	3	5.9
Corporate strategy and Functional strategies	2	3.9
Total	**51**	**100.0**

As shown in table 4.5, 51.0% of the respondents had participated in formulation of Functional strategies while 19.6% indicated that they had played a role in formulation of all of the three strategies with two non-responses. The rest had been involved in a combination of them.

4.3.4 Whether other staff were sufficiently involved in formulation of strategic plans

The respondents were asked to rate the level of agreement or disagreement on the involvement of other staff in the strategy formulation process in a likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (don't know) and their responses was analyzed through descriptive statistics. The scores "strongly disagree" and "disagree" represented involvement to a "Small Extent" (SE), equivalent to 1 to 2.5 on the continuous Likert scale ($1 \leq SE < 2.5$). The scores of "agree" represented involvement to a "Moderate Extent" (ME). This was equivalent to 2.5 to 3.5 on the Likert scale ($2.5 \leq ME < 3.5$). The score of "strongly agree" represented involvement to a "Large Extent" (LE). This was equivalent to 3.5 to 5.0 on the Likert scale ($3.5 \leq LE < 5.0$). A standard deviation of greater than one (Std. Dev.>1.0) represents a significant difference in the extent to which the reforms have been implemented and vice versa. The findings are as shown in table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Whether other staff were sufficiently involved in formulation of strategic plans

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Response</th><th>Mean</th><th>Standard deviation</th></tr>
<tr><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>11</td><td rowspan="5">3.30I9</td><td rowspan="5">0.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>Agree</td><td>14</td></tr>
<tr><td>Don't Know</td><td>13</td></tr>
<tr><td>Disagree</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

As shown in table 4.6, the responses indicated that other employees were involved to a moderate extent ($2.5 \leq ME < 3.5$) out of a possible 5. Moreover, the degree of involvement does not significantly differ among the respondents as reflected in the standard deviation of less than one (Std. Dev. <1.0).

Respondents were asked to indicate whether the organization had performance targets. The findings indicated that 98.1% were in agreement that the organization had performance objectives and targets with one non response.

4.3.5 Frequency of monitoring and evaluation of strategy

Respondents were required to indicate how often KWS monitored and evaluated its strategic plans using Don't Know, Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Rarely or Continuously. The findings are as shown in table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Frequency of monitoring and evaluation of strategy

Frequency of monitoring and evaluation	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Don't Know	1	1.9
Never	2	3.8
Rarely	5	9.4
Sometimes	13	24.5
Continuously	30	56.6
Non response	2	3.8
Total	**53**	**100.0**

As shown in table 4.7, 56.6% indicated that the organization continuously did the monitoring and evaluation. 24.5% indicated evaluation and monitoring is sometimes done and 9.4% indicated that it is rarely done.

4.3.6 Frequency of Review of strategic plans

Respondents were asked to indicate how often the strategic plans were reviewed. The findings are as shown in table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Frequency of Review of strategic plans

Frequency of Review	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Don't Know	3	5.7
Never	2	3.8
Rarely	11	20.8
Sometimes	14	26.4
Continuously	21	39.6
Non response	2	3.8
Total	**53**	**100.0**

As shown in table 4.8, 39.6% indicated that it was continuously reviewed, 26.4% indicated it was reviewed sometimes and 20.8% indicated rarely was it reviewed while 5.7% didn’t know. The strategic plan 2005-2010 was reviewed three years after implementation.

The respondents were requested to indicate whether the strategic plans were implemented in the organization. All the respondents 100% indicated that KWS had implemented its strategic plans. The respondents identified two strategic plans having been implemented by KWS strategic plans 2005-2010, 2008-2012.

The respondents were asked to indicate if the organization strategic plans were fully executed. According to the research findings, 84.9% of the respondents indicated that the formulated strategies had been fully executed while 15.1% indicated that the strategic plans had not been fully implemented.

The respondents were asked to indicate if the organization had annual objectives, 94.3% indicated that there were annual objectives in place with 5.7% indicating there were none. According to the respondents, the annual objectives were developed through involvement of all divisions, departments and a committee of the Director and the top level managers. Other findings indicated that all employees participated in coming up with them.

Functional strategies often compliment the corporate strategic plan and aids in the implementation process. 96.2% of the respondents indicated that their departments had formulated functional strategies with 3.8% indicating there was none.

Budget allocation is important in any strategic plan so as to fully support its objectives. From the findings of this study 79.2% of the respondents indicated that the budgets were in line with the strategy while 20.8% indicated they were not aligned.

The management of an organization is vital in providing the necessary direction during implementation of a strategy. According to the findings of this study 94.3% of the respondents indicated that the management has been instrumental in providing the required leadership, 3.8% indicated the management was not providing the necessary leadership and one non response.

Organization policies and values promote the effective implementation of strategies. Majority of the respondents (90.6%) believed that the policies followed by the organization were supportive of the strategy implementation, while 7.5% indicated that the policies did not favor strategy implementation and one non-response.

Effective strategy implementation requires skills that will enable the organization achieve its strategic objectives. From the findings of the research 96.2% of the respondents indicated that KWS had the necessary management skills for successful implementation of strategic plans and 3.8% felt the organization lacked the necessary management skills for successful strategy implementation.

Recruitment of new employees with the right experiences and knowledge of strategy implementation enhances achievement of the organization objectives. Most of the respondents (92.5%) were in agreement that there had been recruitment of new employees to enhance strategy implementation and 7.5% disagreed.

Galvanizing organization wide commitment to the strategic plan involves creating a strong results orientation and a spirit of high performance and linking the reward structure to the actual strategic performance. According to the research findings 58.5% indicated that the reward system was not adequate in motivating the staff and was not supportive of strategy implementation process while 39.6% agreed that the reward system was adequate.

4.4 Corporate venture

This section was meant to solicit information from the respondents by identifying factors that influenced corporate venture at KWS.

4.4.1 Indicators of corporate Venture

Respondents were asked to identify the indicators of corporate venture in the organization. A five point Likert scale questions was used to interpret the level of influence ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) within the continuum being 2 for disagree, 3 for neutral and 4 for agree. Mean Scores and Standard deviation were used to analyze the captured data. Mean Scores were used to determine the extent to which each factor contributed to corporate venture on a five point Likert scale Standard deviations were used to determine the varying degrees of the difference in which the factors contributed to corporate venture. The findings are as shown in table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Indicators of corporate Venture

Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Std Dev.
KWS management activity generates trust in employees.	2	3	12	31	5	3.64	0.77
KWS management sees matters also from the employees' point of view.	0	5	15	29	4	3.60	0.59
KWS management encourages and supports the development of new ways of operating.	1	1	6	15	30	4.11	0.87
Senior managers encourage bending rules.	10	28	7	5	3	2.30	1.14
Top management has the will to sponsorship new projects.	1	2	12	33	5	3.74	0.58

Individual risk-takers are often recognized whether eventually successful or not.	4	5	10	31	3	3.45	1.02
Risk-taking is considered a positive attribute.	2	7	15	25	4	3.42	0.90
Small and experimental projects are supported.	12	23	16	1	1	2.17	0.76
Funds are available for projects.	1	4	10	36	2	3.64	0.58
At KWS, individual work methods are valued.	1	1	3	15	33	4.47	0.72
There is additional rewards/compensation for innovations	2	4	10	29	8	3.70	0.91
Innovativeness and creativity are thought of as important at KWS.	1	2	7	35	8	3.96	0.61
Change is seen as an opportunity at KWS.	1	3	5	15	29	4.28	0.98
The employees are encouraged to freely air their opinions.	3	7	16	20	7	3.40	1.13
Suggestions originating from the employees are carried out at KWS.	8	20	13	9	3	2.60	1.24
KWS offers good opportunities for training and education.	1	1	5	12	34	4.45	0.79
Management encourages Research & Development.	1	5	9	27	11	3.79	0.90
Research & Development, product and service improvement continuously carried out.	5	5	34	6	3	2.94	0.82
Research & Development budget is sufficient.	13	30	6	2	2	2.02	0.86
Innovations have contributed in achieving organization goals.	3	6	33	9	2	3.02	0.67
I am eager to present new ideas at my workplace.	1	2	5	17	28	4.30	0.87
My knowhow is varied.	1	1	2	37	12	4.09	0.51
I have sufficient authority to carry out my duties well.	2	3	29	10	9	3.40	0.94
I have responsibility for doing my work well..	1	1	1	14	36	4.57	0.63

According to the findings in table 4.9, the respondents were responsible in doing their work well with a mean of 4.57 and standard deviation of 0.63. KWS valued individual work methods with a mean of 4.47 and a standard deviation of 0.72. It was noted that KWS offered good opportunities for training and education with a mean of 4.45 and standard deviation of 0.79. On the same note KWS did not have sufficient Research & Development budget. This is supported by a mean of 2.02 and a standard deviation of 0.86. Senior managers did not encourage bending of rules with a mean of 2.30 and standard deviation of 1.14. Suggestions originating from employees were not carried out with a mean of 2.60 and standard deviation of 1.24. Therefore the majority of the respondents were aware of the factors that influence corporate venture in the organization.

4.4.2 Characteristics of Successful Venture Managers

Respondents were asked to identify some of the needed characteristics of successful Venture Managers. The findings are as shown in table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Characteristics of Successful Venture Managers

	Frequency	**Percent**
Ability to take calculated risk	21	39.6
Good team Building	19	35.8
Politically sensitive and skillful	7	13.2
Good persuasive skills	6	11.3
Total	**53**	**100**

From the results in table 4.10, 39.6% of the respondents said ability to take calculated risk, 35.8% said good team building, 13.2% said politically sensitive and skillful while 11.3 said good persuasive skills were the essential characteristics of venture managers. This is an indication that successful venture managers should have the ability to take calculated risk and good in team building.

4.4.3 Respondents involvement in new business development

Respondents were asked to state if they were involved in new business development. In this perspective 88.7% of the respondents said they were not involved in new business development while 9.4% were involved. Those involved said the area they were mainly responsible for was in revenue enhancement through adoption of new technologies and software that drove the internal processes in the organization.

Respondents were asked to state if there was a department's budget for innovation and creativity. It was noted that there did not exist a set aside amount of money for creativity and innovation at KWS with a100% of the respondents not being aware of the budget.

4.4.4 Other Factors that influence creativity and innovation

Respondents were asked to state other factors that influenced creativity and innovation. The findings are as shown in table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Other Factors that influence creativity and innovation

	Frequency	**Percent**
Ability of management to accommodate failed innovations	7	13.2
Funding of new ideas	20	37.7
Staff Motivation	15	28.3
Reward system	11	20.8
Total	**53**	**100**

From the results in table 4.11, the most notable factors were funding of new idea at 37.7%, staff motivation at 28.3%, reward system at 20.8% and ability of management to accommodate failed innovations at 13.3 %. It was further noted that various innovations had been achieved and disseminated at KWS among the innovations were in the ICT domain and in marketing.

4.4.6 Ways of mitigating the effects of challenges affecting corporate venture

Challenges do emanate during corporate venture creation, the respondents were asked to identify ways of mitigating such challenges. The respondents suggested various measures which mainly included; need for Financial resources as a key mitigating factor, Training of staff on corporate venture, Managing resistance to change, matching corporate venture to strategy, lobbying for increased funding from the government, enactment of the wildlife bill by parliament, winning the full commitment from all staff and stakeholder support especially donors. Attaining financial stability through setting up an endowment fund, liberation of park entry fee to enable the organization raise sufficient revenue to support its activities, and pursuing cost cutting measures are other means proposed by the respondents. The findings also revealed that respondents suggested need for improved national governance, change of the political arena and minimize political interference to ensure stability favorable for visiting tourists who are the major source of revenue for the organization. According to the respondents the organization should aim at involving more staff in strategy development and align its goals to the national strategy vision 2030.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of findings

The study covered the areas of the strategic management and corporate venture, this summary will focus on these two areas.

From the study, it was established that the organization had a strategic plan. Strategic management was undertaken through the involvement of all staff both in the headquarters and the field. Among the respondents each one of them had played a role in development of either corporate strategy, annual objectives or functional strategies and majority were in agreement that their staff was fully involved in development of strategies. It was evident that the organization monitored and evaluated its strategic plan and was in the process of implementing a reviewed strategic plan 2008-2012.

The finding from this research indicated that KWS had implemented the first successful strategic plan 2005-2010 which 80% had been achieved and was in the process of rolling out the revised strategy 2008-2012. According to the respondents annual objectives were in place which had been developed through strategic meetings and retreats held by management. Departments had also made contributions and the field staff had been co-opted in the process through development of functional strategies to compliment the overall strategic plan. In addition the findings revealed that the budgetary allocation was in tandem with the strategic plan.

The leadership of the Director and top management in involving other employees in strategic management had made them own it and hence successful implementation which was in line with Thompson and Strickland (1989) views that an organization's Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is the most visible and most important strategy manager who bears full responsibility for leading the tasks of formulating and implementing the strategic plans of the organization as a whole.

Recruitment of new employees was done to enhance the implementation of strategic management which shows that a strategy requires putting together a strong management team and recruiting, retaining and training talented employees as needed to maintain skills based competencies.

The study found that Corporate venture in the organization seemed was relatively appreciated in KWS with various factors that influence Corporate venture being addressed and others that promote corporate venture not been addressed.

Among the factors that were well addressed included respondents being responsible in doing their work well, KWS valued individual work methods, KWS offered good opportunities for training and education, change was regarded as an opportunity in KWS and Senior management encouraged and supported the development of new ways of operating. On the same note KWS did not have sufficient R& D budget, senior managers did not encourage bending of rules, suggestions originating from employees and small and experimental projects were not supported. Corporate venture managers were identified as persons with Ability to take calculated risk, good at team Building, require good persuasive skills and are politically sensitive and skillful.

It was also noted from the study that respondents were rarely involved in new business development and no budget had been set aside for innovation and creativity at KWS. The respondents further suggested other factors that could influence creativity and innovation among them were Ability of management to accommodate failed innovations, funding of new ideas, a reward system and staff Motivation.

Respondents suggested ways of mitigating the challenges affecting corporate venture among them were need for Financial resources as a key mitigating factor, Training of staff on corporate venture, Managing resistance to change, matching corporate venture to strategy, lobbying for increased funding from the government and the enactment of the wildlife bill by parliament,

5.2 Conclusion

Based on the above observation it was concluded that corporate venture was well integrated with strategic management as was evidenced by the integration of innovation and creativity as one of the objectives of the organization in the balance score card learning and growth perspective. From the findings, it was concluded that the major challenge faced in implementing corporate venture at the Kenya wildlife service was limited financial resources and luck of training employees on the concept of corporate venturing.

5.3 Limitation of the Study

The study faced a number of limitations. First, some of the respondents were not accessible as they were unwilling to respond to the questionnaire citing too much work while others were out of office on leave and field work. It was also difficult following up some respondents working in the field since their work required lots of movement. Another constraint was lack of seriousness in completing the questionnaire by some respondents as some questionnaires were partly completed. However these limitations did not compromise the findings of the study since the number of respondents who did not fill up their questionnaires was minimal.

5.4 Recommendations with Policy implication

The policy and legislative framework under which KWS operate has not kept pace with corporate venturing. This study found out that Kenya Wildlife Service being a state corporation did not have the sufficient funds to promote corporate venturing since there were no allocated funds for innovation and creativity and the luck of budget allocation for Research and Development. Luck of these funds had a limiting factor for the organization to achieve the organization's strategic objective of promoting corporate venturing.

It is therefore recommended that the organization should solicit for more funds from the Government of Kenya so as to improve its budget for Research and Development as well as promote a culture of innovation and creativity within the organization. The organization's management should emphasis and support strong corporate venture by training employees on corporate venturing as a way of creating the organizations wealth this will enable Kenya Wildlife Service to assume the leadership in corporate venturing

5.5 Recommendations for further research

Corporate venture is a concept that will be useful to any organization as a way as creating extra wealth from its core business function. A study should be carried out to find how organizations can create more wealth by incorporating corporate venture into their strategic plans.

REFERENCES

Analoui, F., & Karami, A.(2003). Strategic Management in Small and Medium Enterprises. International Thomson Learning Publication, London , UK .

Andrews, K.R (1987). The Concept of Corporate Strategy. Irwin, Homewood, IL.

Ansoff, H.I.(1965). Corporate Strategy: An Analytic Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion. McGraw- Hill, New York.

Bird, B.(1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. Academy of Management Review, 13, pp. 442-453.

Brown, S., & Eisenhardt, K.(1998). Competing on the edge: Strategy as structured chaos. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Burgelman, R.A.(1983). Corporate Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management: Insights from a Process. Journal of Management Science, Vol. 29, No. 12, pp. 1349-1364.

Bygrave, W.D., & Hofer, C.W.(1991). Theorizing about Entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, No 16(2), p.13–22.

Chandler, A.D. (1962). Strategy and Structure. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cooper, D.R., & Emory, C.W.(1995). Business Research Methods (5th ed.) Chicago: Erwin.

Covin, J.G., & Slevin, D.P.(1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 7-25.

Cunningham, J.B., & Lischeron. J.(1991). Defining entrepreneurship. Journal of Small Business Management.

David, F.R. (2005). Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases. Prentice Hall, Pearson Education International.

De Pablos, P.O. (2006). Transnational corporations and strategic challenges: An analysis of knowledge flows and competitive advantage. The Learning Organization, Vol. 13 No. 6, 2006, pp. 544-559.

Drucker, P.F. (1985). The Discipline of Innovation. Harvard Business Review (May/June), 67-72.

Fry, A. (1987). The Post It-Note: An intrapreneurial success. SAM Advanced Management Journal, pp. 4-9.

Gartner, W.B. (1985). A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation. Academy of Management Review, 10(4), pp. 696-706.

Guth, W., & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest Editors Introduction: Corporate Entrepreneurship. Strategic Management Journal, 11, 297-308.

Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., & Hoskisson, R.E. (2001). Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization, 4th ed. Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing Company.

Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., Camp, S.M., & Sexton, D.L. (2002). Integrating entrepreneurship and strategic management actions to create firm wealth. The Academy of Management Executive, 15(1): 49-63.

Hornsby, J.S. et al. (1993). An Interactive Model of the Corporate Entrepreneurship Process. Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 29-37;

Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (1999). Exploring Corporate Strategy: Text and cases (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Kanter, R. (1985). Supporting Innovation and Venture Development in Established Companies. Journal of Business Venturing, No 1(1), p. 47–60.

Katz, J.A. (1991). The institution and infrastructure of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory Practice. 15(3): 85-102

Kirzner, I. (1997). Entrepreneurial Discovery and the Competitive Market Process: an Austrian Approach. Journal of Economic Literature, No 1(35), p. 60–85.

Kothari, C.R. (1990). Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques 2nd Ed, New age international publishers.

Kuratko D.F., Montagno, R.V., & Hornsby, J.S. (1990). Developing an Intrapreneurial Assessment Instrument for an Effective Corporate Entrepreneurial Environment. Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 11.

Kuratko, D.F., Ireland, R.D., & Hornsby, S. (2001). The Power of Entrepreneurial Actions: Insights from Corporate Entrepreneurship. Academy of Management Executive 15(4), 60-71.

KWS. (2010). Kenya Wildlife overview. Retrieved from http://www.kws.org

Lin, B.W. (2003). Technology transfer as technological learning: a source of competitive advantage for firms with limited R&D resources. R&D Management, 33, 3, 2003. 327-341.

Lumpkin, G.T., & Dess, G.G. (1996), Clarifying entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. Academy of Management Review, 21910: 135-172

Ma, H. (2004). Toward global competitive advantage: Creation, competition, cooperation and co-option. Management Decision, Vol. 42 No. 7, pp. 907-924.

Maes, J. (2003). The Search for Corporate Entrepreneurship: a Clarification of the Concept and its Measures. Working paper.

McGrath, R., & MacMillan, I. (2000). The Entrepreneurial Mindset. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.

Meyer, G.D., & Heppard, K. A. (2000). Entrepreneurship As Strategy: Competing on the Entrepreneurial Edge. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Miller, D. (1983). The Correlates of Entrepreneurship in Three Types of Firms. Management Science, Vol. 29, No. 7, 770-791., 97-106.

Mintzberg, H., and Quinn, B.J. (1991). The Strategy process, Concepts, Contexts, cases, 2nd ed. Prentice Hall.

Mohd, K.H. (2005). Strategic Management. Thomson Learning, Singapore.

Mucee, K. (2002). A survey of corporate venturing practices by software Development and distribution firms in Nairobi: Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.

Muiruri, F.N. (2006). A survey of corporate venturing in large scale manufacturing Companies in Kenya. Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.

Murray, J.A. (1984). A concept of entrepreneurial strategy. Strategic Management Journal, 5(1), pp. 1-13.

Muzyka, D., De Koning A., & Churchill N. (1995). On Transformation and Adaptation: Building the Entrepreneurial Corporation. European Management Journal, No 4(13), p. 346–362

Mwangi, K. (2006). The application of Balance Score Card in implementation of strategy at KRA. Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.

Ochanda, R.A. (2005).Challenges of strategy implementation at Kenya Industrial Estates Limited. Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.

Porter, M.E. (1981). The contributions of industrial organization to strategic management. Academy of Management Review, 6(4), pp. 609-620.

Porter, M.E. (1991). Towards a dynamic theory of strategy. Strategic Management Journal. 12(8): 95-117.

Sandberg, W.R. (1992). The determinants of new venture performance: Strategy, industry structure, and entrepreneur. University of Georgia.

Sathe, V. (1988). Fostering Entrepreneurship in the Large, Diversified Firm. Organizational Dynamics, 18, 2, 20-32.

Schendel, D. & Hofer, C.W. (1979). Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts, West, St. Paul, MN.

Schumpeter, J. (1934). The Theory of Economic Development. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press.

Souder, W. (1981). Encouraging entrepreneurship in large corporations. Research Management, pp. 18-22.

Thompson, A. & Strickland, A. (1989). Strategy Formulation and Implementation: Tasks of the General Manager, 4th ed. Irwin

Thoren, K. (2007). Corporate Entrepreneurship as a Business Development Strategy. Doctoral Thesis. Stockholm, Sweden.

Venkataraman, S. (2000). Progress in research on corporate venturing. State of the Art of Entrepreneurship Research, pp. 487 – 519.

Zahra, S.A. (1993). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour: A critique and extension. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 16, 5-21.

Zahra, S.A. (1996). Governance, Ownership, and Corporate Entrepreneurship: Moderating Impact of Industry Technological Opportunities. Management Journal, Vol. 39, No. 6, 1713-1735.

Appendices

Appendix I

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire seeks to establish the integration of corporate venture with strategic management at KWS. The information obtained will be treated in utmost confidence and used for only academic purposes. Your assistance in completing this questionnaire will be highly appreciated.

The questionnaire is in three parts, A and B and C.

Part A consists of questions aimed at obtaining background information about yourself and KWS. Part B seeks information on the strategic management practices in KWS. Part C seeks information on the corporate venture practices in KWS.

Date______________ **Questionnaire No._______________**

PART A: RESPONDENT'S PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Please state your Division/Department/Area………………………………………

2. What level of management are you?
   a) Executive [ ]
   b) Head of Division [ ]
   c) Head of Department [ ]
   d) Middle level management [ ]
   Other (please specify)……………………………………………………

3. How long have you been with the Kenya Wildlife Service?
   a) Less than 3 year [ ]
   b) 4-6 years [ ]
   c) 7-9 years [ ]

d) Over 10 years [ ]

PART B: STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

4. Who is responsible for formulating strategic plans in KWS?
   - a) BOT [ ]
   - b) Director/CEO [ ]
   - c) Top management [ ]
   - d) Consultants [ ]
   - e) Participation of all employees [ ]

   Other (specify)………………………………………………………………

5. Have you participated in formulation of any strategy in KWS? Yes [ ] No [ ]
6. Please name the strategic plans you played a role in formulation…………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

7. Which other strategy/strategies have you played a role in the formulation/development?
   - a) Corporate strategy [ ]
   - b) Annual objectives [ ]
   - c) Functional strategies [ ]
   - d) None [ ]

   Others (specify)…………………………………………………………

8. In your opinion do you feel you and other staff were sufficiently involved in the strategy formulation process? Please rate the level of your agreement or disagreement in a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 represent strongly disagree, 2 disagree,3 agree, 4 strongly agree and 5 don't know.
   - a) Strongly disagree [ ]
   - b) Disagree [ ]
   - c) Agree [ ]
   - d) Strongly agree [ ]
   - e) Don't know [ ]
9. Does KWS have performance objectives/targets? Yes [ ] No [ ]
10. Does KWS monitor and evaluate it strategic plan? Yes [ ] No [ ]

11. If the answer to 10 above is yes, how often?

a) Never [ ]

b) Rarely [ ]

c) Sometimes [ ]

d) Continuously [ ]

e) Don't Know [ ]

Others specify)……………………………………………………………………

12. Does KWS review its strategic plan? Yes [ ] No [ ]

13. If the answer to 12 above if yes please specify how often?

a) Never [ ]

b) Rarely [ ]

c) Sometimes [ ]

d) Continuously [ ]

e) Don't Know [ ]

Others (specify)……………………………………………………………………

14. Has KWS implemented its strategic plans? Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. Which strategic plans have been implemented by the organization?........................

....

16. Were these strategic plans fully executed? Yes [ ] No [ ]

17. Does the organization have annual objectives? Yes [ ] No [ ]

18. If yes how were they developed?..

....

19. Does your department have functional strategies? Yes [ ] No [ ]

20. Are your departmental operational plans aligned to the corporate strategies?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

21. Is your departmental budgetary allocation aligned to the strategic plan?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

22. Do you think the BOT, Director and Top Management of KWS have been instrumental in providing leadership to ensure successful strategy implementation? Yes [ ] No [ ]

23. Do you think the policies followed by the organization are supportive of the strategy implementation? Yes [ ] No [ ]
24. Do you think KWS has the necessary skills that ensure successful implementation of the strategy? Yes [ ] No [ ]
25. Has there been new employee recruitment to enhance strategy implementation?

    Yes [ ]   No [ ]
26. In your opinion has the staff/employee reward system been adequate in motivating staff and supportive of the strategy implementation process?

    Yes [ ]   No [ ]

PART C: CORPORATE VENTURE

On a scale of 1 - 5 (where 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 =Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree). Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following as indicators of corporate venturing. Please tick a rank number on the right

		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
27	Does KWS management activity generate trust in employees?					
28	Does KWS management see matters also from the employees' point of view?					
29	Does KWS management encourage and support the development of new ways of operating?					
30	Senior managers encourage bending rules?					
31	Top management has the will to sponsorship new projects.					
32	Are Individual risk-takers often recognized whether eventually successful or not?					
33	Is a 'Risk-taker' considered a positive attribute?					
34	Small and experimental projects are supported?					
35	Are funds available for projects?					
36	At KWS, individual work methods are valued?					
37	Is there additional rewards/compensation for innovations?					

38	Innovativeness and creativity are thought of as important at KWS?					
39	Change is seen as an opportunity at KWS?					
40	The employees are encouraged to freely air their opinions?					
41	Suggestions originating from the employees are carried out at KWS					
42	KWS offers good opportunities for training and education?					
43	Does the management encourage R& D development?					
44	Is R&D, product and service improvement continuously carried out?					
45	Is the R& D budget sufficient?					
46	Have innovations contributed in achieving organization goals?					
47	I can easily get help in my work?					
48	I am eager to present new ideas at my workplace?					
49	My knowhow is varied?					
50	I have sufficient authority to carry out my duties well?					
51	I have responsibility for doing my work as well as possible?					

52. What of the following do you consider as attributes/ characteristics of successful venture managers (Tick [ ] for all that apply)

    a. Ability to take calculated risk [ ]
    b. Not necessarily the new venture idea generators [ ]
    c. Not successful managers of existing departments [ ]
    d. Good at team building [ ]
    e. Politically sensitive and skillful [ ]
    f. Good at persuasive skills [ ]

53. Are you in charge of new business development in KWS? Yes [ ] No [ ]

    If Yes please list some of new business development tasks you are responsible for?

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

54. What is your department’s budget that has been set aside for Innovation and Creativity?..

55. Please indicate any other factors that can influence creativity/innovation at KWS………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………

56. Describe the innovations (Technical or Non-Technical) achieved and disseminated in KWS.
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

57. What do you suggest as the way forward for mitigating the effects of the challenges affecting Corporate Venture at KWS?
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TREASURED ASSISTANCE

Appendix II

INTRODUCTORY LETTER

University of Nairobi
School of Business
P. O. Box 30197
NAIROBI

29th September 2010

Dear Respondent,

RE: MANAGEMENT RESEARCH ON DETERMINATION OF THE INTEGRATION OF CORPORATE VENTURE IN STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IN THE KENYA WILDLIFE SERVICE.

I am a postgraduate student undertaking a Master of Business Administration degree at the School of Business, University of Nairobi. As part of fulfilling the degree requirements, I am conducting a management research project entitled **"Determination of the integration of corporate venture in strategic management in the Kenya Wildlife service."**

You have been selected to form part of this study. I, therefore, request you to assist me in the collection of research data by filling out the accompanying questionnaire. My supervisor and I wish to assure you that the information you provide will be used exclusively for academic purposes and will be treated with the strictest confidentiality. A copy of the research project report will be made available to you upon request.

Your cooperation will be highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Nahashon Gitahi	**Dr J. M Munyoki**
Student	**Supervisor**