
Relevance of Strategic Planning Process, Organizational Ambidexterity Organizational Capabilities and Decision-Making Style Hotels Performance

MAHMOUD MUSTAFA MAHMOUD ALHAWAMDEH

Supervisors By Prof.Dr.Lawrence Emeagwali, Faculty Of Business And Economics, Department Business Management, Girne American University, Kyrenia North Cyprus.

Abstract: In the uncertain environment in the tourism sector especially in Arab Middle East countries, Jordan has been affected by many internal factors such as economic crisis which has threatened the political instability and external factors such as wars in neighboring countries. In order to adapt with these shift in the hotel's sector, they should integrate strategic planning (SP) to the organization of its processes in order to make a better projection for the future. The aim of this research is to elucidate the "black box" connecting strategic planning process and organizational ambidexterity via establishing possible intervening factors. In order to guarantee a significant degree of planning practices, only three, four, and five-star hotels were targeted for data collection for the research. Data were collected from employees of 3 stars and 4 star hotels. IBM SPSS and AMOS software were used to interpret and summarize the data collected as well as to determine the effects of moderation-mediation, hence descriptive statistical techniques was employed to determine the frequency, percentage, means and standard deviation of the respondents. The findings revealed that hotel performance matters. The result also revealed that strategic planning amongst others enhance hotel performance and organization that utilize these constructs have a clear purpose and focus which drive them to optimum productivity.

Keywords: organizational ambidexterity, organizational capabilities, decision making style, strategic planning process, hotel performance

INTRODUCTION

In the continuous turbulence and uncertain environment in the tourism sector especially in Arab Middle East countries, Jordan has been affected by many internal factors such as economic crisis which has threatened the political instability and external factors such as wars in neighboring countries (Aldehayyat, 2011). In order to adapt with these shift in the hotel's sector, they should integrate strategic planning (SP) to the organization of its processes in order to make a better projection for the future (Chon & Olsen, 1990). SP process is a vital instrument for private and government institutes in the turbulent, unstable and competitive environments, especially in the tourism and hospitality sector (Chon & Olsen, 1990; Liu, Siguaw, & Enz, 2008; Phillips & Moutinho, 2014). Strategic planning is the main tool for survival and success of tourist destinations (Liu et al., 2008).

As a result, business environments are affected by several different internal and external environmental factors. Organizations attempting to ignore the role of environmental uncertainty which in turn can create trouble for themselves and putting them at a competitive disadvantage (Wang, Chen, & Chen, 2012). However, as the tourism sector around the world especially in Arab Middle East countries is become very challenging due to the different business environmental changes. Hence, the need for developing and implementing strategic planning in the changing environment of the hotel's sector becomes very important. According to Phillips & Moutinho, 2014 the tourism setting is prone to changes, which renders it hard to execute strategic planning (p. 110). Regarding the shifting environment, this is not restricted to tourism, and the majority of firms operate in such conditions, thus giving a rational reason for tourism firms to implement business or strategic planning to assist managers to foresee and proactively respond to regular shifts in the environment (Elbanna & Elsharnouby, 2018, p. 1017).

Research Problem

The purpose for the current study is to examine a compilation model of strategic planning in the hotels sector. The research also aims to help bridge the gaps in the strategic management texts by investigating the mediation effects of style of decision-making and organizational capabilities in the connection between the process of strategic planning and organizational ambidexterity (exploration and exploitation learning). It also aims to examine the mediation effects of organizational ambidexterity and the link between the strategic planning

process and hotel performance. The input of intervening functions of organizational capabilities and style of decision-making in elucidation of the missing straight relationship between strategic planning and organizational ambidexterity is another opportunity for additional research (Posch & Garaus, 2019). This may point to the fact that firms may benefit from strategic planning from a “learn as you plan” perspective, since any strategic planning and execution process would possibly give rise to learning capabilities of organizational members generally and decision-makers in particular which will lead to superior hotels performance (Posch & Garaus, 2019; Elbanna & Elsharnouby, 2018).

Furthermore, evaluating the regulatory effects of three antecedents of environmental uncertainty (market uncertainty, technological uncertainty, and competitive uncertainty) and leaders' innovation orientation (Posch & Garaus, 2019) in the proposed research model (Figure 1).

This research also, re-emphasizing the significance of combining planning and execution, the planning model of Dibrell et al. (2014) which combines both planning and implementation mechanisms as proposed in this research requires more interest from researchers, as plans that are carefully devised will only result to better performance if an organization is able to execute the plan successfully (Posch and Garaus, 2019; Elbanna & Fadol, 2016).

Research Questions

- What are the impacts of process of strategic planning on organizational ambidexterity and hotels performance in the Jordanian hotel industry?
- Does hotels performance matter?
- Do decision-making style and organizational capabilities affect the relation between the process of strategic planning and organizational ambidexterity indirectly in the hotel industry in Jordan?
- Are there any impacts that can be linked back to the leaders' innovation orientation on the association between strategic planning process and organizational ambidexterity?
- Does environmental uncertainty help to clarify when the relationship among the study constructs are becoming stronger or weaker?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Tourism and Hotel in Jordan

Jordan is thought about as one of the key touristic destinations among the countries of the world. This is largely as a result of its multi-touristic sites, in addition to the diverse tourism product that is it obtainable (Al-Tahi, 2002).

Tourism and travel alone contributed 19.8% to Jordan's GDP (% of GDP). Although Jordan's contribution to travel and tourism GDP (% of GDP) ebbed and flowed significantly in the last few years, it seems to fall through the period of 2000 to 2029 capping at 19.8 % in 2019.

Tourism in is considered as a key sector in Jordan; as it not only contribute to the infrastructural and natural beautification of the country but also to the economic growth of Jordan. Though of tourism and travel contribution to the gross domestic product (GDP) of Jordan has dwindled in the least 10 years, travel and tourism contribute about 19.8% of the GDP of Jordan.

Tourism is considered to be among of the most significant sectors that provide resources of hard currency for the treasury, corporations that render hotel services are regarded as the most important companies in this sector. Generally, this sector requires larger creation, promotion and utilization of the stable and strategic location of Jordan, due to the unbalanced political conditions of the bordering countries. As a result, Jordan will be the preferred tourist location for many tourists in the area (Awad, 2009; Bariscil, 2017).

Strategic Planning Process

(Perera & Peiró, 2012) defined Strategic planning as “the systematic process whereby an organization creates a document indicating the way it plans to progress from its current situation to the desired future situation”. According to Swayne, Duncan, and Ginter (2006), “strategic planning is a set of processes, which help in identifying the future desired by the organization and to developing guidelines for making the decisions leading to such a future”. Strategic planning combines associated activities, policies and main objectives in a single organization as a whole. If a strategy is founded on the competence and the inadequacies within the venture can predict environment changes, and can assist in allocating resources of the enterprise in a valuable and unique manner (Mintzberg, Quinn, & Ghoshal, 1998).

Running the strategic planning is among the most efficient strategies for achieving success in any organization. Strategic planning is also among the commonest managerial practices in organizations that provide healthcare services, to a large extent, as research papers that have not been assessed. Result-based management appears to be certain in such organizations to carry out research on such conventional praxis (Kaissi, Begun, and Welson, 2008).

Thriving strategic planning requires creating the plan in correct way, as well as suitable execution, precise and prompt assessment of the outcomes, perhaps by means of the Strategic Control System (SCS). The Strategic Control System entails tracing strategies to achievement, spotting the changes or problems in essential strategies and modifications. “Senior manager must constantly ask himself/herself whether the organization is moving in the right direction or not, and if the assumptions about the intended major trends and changes in the environment are correct. Such questions need to set the strategic controls” (Pearce & Robinson, 2007).

Indication of strategic planning in low-income and middle-income countries (LMICs) is extremely little (El-Jardali, Jamal, Abdallah, & Kassak, 2007). Compared to their high-income counterparts, healthcare setting in LMIC is further dynamic, challenging and complex (Mills, Brugha, Hanson, & McPake, 2002) in areas with generally more inadequate resources. The need for strategic planning in such countries should therefore be implicit to a better extent. Saleh et al. (2013) in their study on ‘strategic planning processes and their relation to the financial performance of hospitals in Lebanon’ evaluated six scopes including having a plan, plan development, plan implementation, responsibility of planning activities, governing board involvement, and physicians’ involvement as components of the strategic planning process. Kaissi et al. (2008) in a comparative study among hospitals in Texas showed that eighty-seven percent of the hospitals had a strategic plan. They concluded that “three scopes including having a strategic plan, assigning the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for the plan, and involving the board are positively associated with financial performance”.

Organizational Ambidexterity and Firms’ Performance

The most salient question attended to by the experimental study is probably if organizational ambidexterity is, linked to firm performance as suggested by the root theory. The predominance of evidence here reveals a lucid model: ambidexterity has been demonstrated to be positively related to sales expansion (Geerts, Blindenbach-Driessen and Gemmel, 2010), firm survival (Piao, 2010), innovation (Tushman et al., 2010; Yang & Atuahene-Gima, 2007), market assessment as measured by Tobin’s Q (Goosen, Bazzazian & Phelps, 2012), and subjective ratings of performance (Burton, O’Reilly & Bidwell, 2012). These researches have recorded the impacts of ambidexterity at the business division, firm, individual level, as well as project. Though, under certain conditions organizational ambidexterity may be inefficient and duplicative (Ebben & Johnson, 2005).

The experimental fact indicates that in conditions of technology and market improbability; it characteristically impacts the performance of firms positively (Tarba et al., in O’Reilly, 2013). Many striking aspects exist to this body of research. Firstly, regardless of employing different approaches of ambidexterity, various degrees of analysis, samples from differing firms, and a variety of result factors, a great deal of results connect ambidexterity to performance. Also, even though a number of the pioneer researches relied on anecdotal evidence or case studies (Markides & Charitou, 2004) several of the recent researches employ big samples having longitudinal statistics and recorded the impacts of ambidexterity through time.

A recent research by Geerts, Blindenbach-Driessen, and Gemmel (2012) For instance, studied over five hundred firms for a four-year period and noted that “ambidexterity had a positive effect on firm growth. Importantly, they also showed differences in how ambidexterity differs between manufacturing and service firms”. Goosen, Bazzazian, & Phelps (2012) as well sample five hundred firms for a period of ten years and concluded that “companies that have higher technological capabilities profited more from ambidexterity”. Caspin-Wagner along with her team evaluated six hundred and five technology firms and noted an “inverted U-shaped” association between companies’ financial performance and ambidexterity (Caspin-Wagner, et al., 2012), this result agreed with another large data study conducted by Uotila, Maula, Keil and Shaker (2008).

Furthermore, other works on the backgrounds of ambidexterity have revealed that it is classically more useful in situations of environmental vagueness (Goosen, et al., 2012; Uotila, et al., 2008), with increased competitiveness (Geerts, et al., 2010; Caspin-Wagner et al., 2012), when an industry possess better resources (Goosen et al., 2012), as well as for bigger companies (Zhiang, et al., 2007; Yu and Khessina, 2012).

Generally, the listed studies indicated three findings. Firstly, ambidexterity is correlated with organization performance positively. Also, the impacts of ambidexterity may be dependent on the firm’s environment conditions, with ambidexterity having more value in conditions of instability and when adequate resources are accessible, which is frequently the case with larger firms rather than their smaller counterparts. Lastly, as proposed by March (1991), “the evidence is that either the under- or over-use of ambidexterity comes at a cost” (Benner & Tushman, 2002; Wang & Li, 2008). Uotila et al, (2008) For instance, found that “eighty percent of the companies in their sample under-emphasized exploration and over-emphasized exploitation”.

While many studies documented “no impact of ambidexterity on performance”, (Ebben and Johnson, 2005), some noted impacts only in certain situations, the general conclusion seems lucid: “under specific environments, organizational ambidexterity seems to be positively correlated with increased firm innovation, higher survival and better financial performance rates”.

Decision Making Style

Decision-making has been regarded as a significant factor in multifaceted social environments such as organizations workplace, improving organizational competence as well as workplace satisfaction (Ceschi, 2017). As a result, methods such as the model of organizational preference (Cohen et al., 1972), strategic decision-making (Eisenhardt and Zbaracki, 1992) and naturalistic decision-making (Pliske and Klein, 2003) have been devised according to the assessment of the responsibility of the organizations on decision makers. Really, conventional studies in the sphere of decision-making have typically centered on the research's internal validity and thus, are often conducted in tentative setting. The hub of organizational researches is frequently based on psychometric tools analyzing 'individual differences' through the use of 'within-person' studies, whereas decision-making studies extensively employ experiments (Dalal et al., 2010). Nevertheless, investigation has been gaining escalating approval for individual differences in processes of decision-making as well as styles of decision-making, the precursor variables that may forecast valid decision-making, and the prognostic soundness of balanced reaction (Parker and Fischhoff, 2005; Bruine de Bruin et al., 2007; Appelt et al., 2011; Weller & Tikir, 2011; Weller et al., 2015). Miller and Byrnes (2001) for example, created a self-account system to evaluate personal differences in "decision-making competency," which can be typified as the propensity to be self-synchronized and use meta-cognitive methods to evaluate preference options as well as understand decisions. Studies concerning objective methods of decision-making competence have supported this definition (Parker and Fischhoff, 2005; Bruine de Bruin et al., 2007; Stanovich et al., 2008).

For several years, developmental researchers and theorists have focused on cognitive development (Moshman 2011). Piaget is among the leading theorist of cognitive development. Piaget projected a four-phase viewpoint on cognitive development; which are, the preoperational sensorimotor, formal operations and concrete operations phases (Shaffer and Kipp, 2014). According to Swartz et al. (2008), "the fourth phase of formal operations is normally reached during adolescence, and is synonymous with abstract thinking, logical reasoning and problem-solving skills which are important in making decisions". Steinberg (2007) stated that "conceptions of cognition and thoughts during the formal operations phase view adolescent thinking as involving hypothetical alternatives and solutions considered important for adaptive decision making". Adaptive decision making may be viewed as a process, in which a person or practices thinking about every possible theoretical option; as well as the conceptual results of each option (Steinberg 2007). According to Shaffer and Kipp (2014), "the formal operations phase in cognitive development during adolescence is different from cognitive development in childhood". Decision making is, therefore, of importance when considering cognition during development.

Toward an Understanding of Decision Making Styles

Decision making is regular practice, since there is a steady necessity to bargain the best line of action for a variety of circumstances. Decision-making process is however, usually demanding (Janis and Mann, 1977; Bruine de Bruin et al., 2007; Salo and Allwood, 2011). Different individuals tend to follow different processes in decision-making (Galotti et al. 2006; Riaz, Riaz and Batool, 2012; Williams and Esmail 2014). Such approaches or processes are referred to as decision making styles (Janis and Mann 1977; Scott and Bruce 1995; Leykin and DeRubeis 2010).

Usually, decision making styles vary in the way in which people obtain information regarding the decision they want to make, and in the manner in which they think about the likely options in tackling the situation they want to make a decision about (Saidur Rahaman, 2014). Also decision-making styles have been regarded as the differences that are seen between people in how they process the information they gather as well as the likely options (Albert and Steinberg 2011; Scott and Bruce 1995). Some styles of decision-making have been listed when people make serious decisions (Phillips and Ogeil 2011). Janis and Mann (1977) have projected four styles of decision-making, namely, 'vigilance, hypervigilance', and 'defensive avoidance', which is divided into 'procrastination' and 'buck-passing' (Brown, Adballah & Ng, 2011; Cenkseven-O'nder, 2012). These decision-making styles vary on the basis of the belief that there is adequate time to seek other solutions. Also, they vary in their method to a careful, autonomous search for options. Limited search for options could be because of transferring the role to others to make a decision or as a result of procrastinating the practice of making a decision.

Other researchers have listed other styles of decision-making. Harren (1979) listed three styles, which are intuitive, dependent and rational decision making styles (Tinsley et al. 2002). Harren's proposed styles was supplemented by Scott and Bruce (1995) by including spontaneous and avoidant decision making styles (Curs,eu and Schruijer, 2012; Riaz, Riaz & Batool, 2012). These styles of decision-making cut across methods where there was a systematic assessment of the obtainable options to making decision, based solely on intuition and feelings. Also, these styles of decision making cut across autonomous decision making to dependent processes. Johnson (1978) proposed making decisions styles that were based on two factors, namely: the way information was sourced, and the process of analyzing information. The four proposed decision making styles, namely, spontaneous-internal, spontaneous-external, systematic-internal and systematic-external were

determined by this (Hardin and Leong 2004; Tinsley et al. 2002). Apart from the style of making decision, decision making process also take accomplishing decision making situation into consideration. Also, the process of decision-making considers exploring and resolving conflicting decision making situations. Simon (1956) proposed the 'maximizing' and 'satisfying' decision making styles (Parker et al., 2007). The satisfying style is viewed as one in which an option is chosen, which would be suitable to resolve the situation in which a decision needs to be made. However, the maximizing style, involves choosing an option that exceeds meeting the situation, and produce more result (Parker et al., 2007). A newer approach to decision-making styles has been put forward by Leykin and DeRubeis (2010), they listed nine styles that encompassed the different approaches to decision making in its widest sense, these include: confident, respected, dependent, spontaneous, vigilant, brooding, avoidant, anxious and intuitive decision making styles. These styles take some of the earlier proposed decision making styles into account.

Organizational Capabilities

The hub of the firm's internal growth theory is organizational capability, which considers the development of firm from the viewpoint of internal facets. This theory proposed that endogenous variables like knowledge and ability are the most important variables in firm's growth and they decide its extent and capacity (Li, Cai and Wang, 2011). Many researchers have defined organizational capacity as "the ability to anticipate and influence change; make informed, intelligent decisions about policy; develop programmes to implement policy; attract and absorb resources; manage resources and evaluate current activities to guide future action", whereas some defined it as "strategic ability" (Ke & Jin, 2010). Generally, organizational capability means the aptitude to realize strategic goals by engaging resources to run daily activities; it refers to the sum of different managerial abilities, and it as well mirrors the development and maturity of the organization, it influences the competence of carrying out a sequence of coordinated functions directly and can be termed a "problem-solving capability". The organizational capabilities developed in the strategic method are the organizational functions, skills and resources developed inside the enterprise to adapt to shifts in the outside setting; organizational capabilities can only be built inside the firm and symbolize the endogenous foundation of the firm's competitive advantage and the origin of heterogeneity (Argyres, 2011). Related research also revealed that "the organizational capability as well as its 'segmentation ability' can advance performance as well as competence". Making use of a survey based on questionnaire and discussions with close to one hundred firms, He confirmed that "knowledge-management ability had a direct positive effect on organizational competence", Wang (2008) developed a catalog structure of organizational capability of business banks; he then concluded that all organizational capacity indices affected competence. Alegre & Chiva (2008) assessed the method through which ability to learn influenced product improvement performance, they defined organizational learning ability as traversing five areas namely interaction with the external environment, experimentation, risk-taking, dialogue and participatory decision-making. Hsu & Fang (2009) also established that "human capital and relational capital could improve the performance of new product development through organizational learning ability". Chuang et al. (2015) established that "human resource capacity, internal customer satisfaction and commitment had a positive impact on organizational efficiency, and decomposed human resource capacity into training, salary and teamwork". Furthermore, according to a study conducted by Akgün, Keskin & Byrne (2009), the financial and market performance on an organization is affected by its development and capabilities (the emotional ability) through its innovation.

Hotels Performance

The ability of a firm to exist and function for a long time is closely associated with the success it attains. Hofer and Schendel (1978) defined performance as "the time test of any strategy". According to Chakravarthy (1986), "performance improvement is at the heart of strategic management". Thus, it is not shocking that a lot of research works have tried to explain what performance truly means, emphasizing the need to mutually take into account many scopes (Walker and Ruekert, 1987), to combine non-financial and financial steps (Eccles, 1991), to take into account the value generated, to widen the study scope to include the chief business stakeholders (Kaplan and Norton, 1996) as well as to find the factors of performance (Capon et al., 1990). Several authors, including Chen (2007), Evans (2005) and Pan (2005) established that the central practical contributions to the issue of performance have centered primarily, on the industrial segment and, then, on some sectors in the service division like retail, insurance and banks but have derelict the tourism and travel aspect, with little exceptions. However, from the 1990s till date, several researches have applied the issue performance to the sector of hotel and hospitality (Okumus, 2002). Some elements of hotel businesses (Mia and Patiar, 2001; Winata and Mia, 2005) and, particularly, the existence of three different business items characterized by a high intangibility (rooms), the occurrence of a material asset (food and beverage) and the typical characteristics of a retail business (stores), especially, make this industry a captivating field of research, jointly with the accelerated

growth previously attained by the sector, rising competition (Harris and Brander Brown, 1998) and the presence of a high spatial concentration (destinations) (Enright and Newton, 2004).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to guarantee a significant degree of planning practices, only target three, four, and five-star hotels were targeted for data collection for the research. The population for the study comprised one hundred and forty-nine (149) hotels from the capital city of Jordan, Amman (Jordanian Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities website). Eradicating hotels that did not measure up to the inclusion standards (that is, fewer than three stars) this dropped the sample size from one hundred and forty-nine (149) to seventy-one (71) hotels.

Data Collection

The questionnaire was first developed in English Language, then, since most of Jordanians citizen primary language is Arabic Language, the researcher followed (Perrewe et al., 2002) suggestions to back-translate it. In addition, a preface (pilot) study was carried out to ascertain if the questionnaire will have vagueness or not as well as if respondents will easily understand and properly respond to the questions.

The hotels sector establishments were communicated to obtain permission to take part in the study. On the basis of the sampling calculator proposal 400 samples is sufficient, nevertheless, the researcher distributed five hundred (500) questionnaires in order to raise reliability and this was also done online to the confidential and responses anonymous, which in turn reduce social desirability bias. This process is used by researchers to lessen the threat of common method bias as established by (Podsakoff et al., 2012).

Data Analysis

IBM SPSS and AMOS software were used to interpret and summarize the data collected as well as to determine the effects of moderation-mediation, hence descriptive statistical techniques was employed to determine the frequency, percentage, means and standard deviation of the respondents. Considering the nature of the proposed research model created for this dissertation (Figure 1), a structural equation modeling (SEM) technique was used, and AMOS version 24 was utilized for data analyses.

SEM was selected as a result of the nature of the research model, the moderating-mediating effects. One of the major reason's SEM was chosen is that of its rigorous nature compared to conventional hierarchical regression analysis (Hair et al., 2010).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

462 (92.4%) of the 500 questionnaires administered were duly completed and returned, while the remaining 38 (7.6%) were not. Thus the researcher utilized the 462 appropriately completed questionnaires for this study. The outcome of the collected data were represented in charts, frequency distribution tables and analyzed by utilizing IBM SPSS Statistics and IBM-SPSS Amos 26.0; and the obtained result discussed. The structural equation modeling technique was used in this study to assess the assumed relationships between the variables.

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

This study exploited the Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) which is an "IBM SPSS Statistics module" and as reported by Barnidge & Zuniga (2017), "Amos was designed for the analysis of covariance structure models, including structural equation modeling (SEM), path analysis, and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). It is commonly compared to other statistical applications designed for similar purposes, including Mplus and LISREL".

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was utilized because it deals with a number of equations and with simple or multiple linear regression concurrently which fits well our model and data analysis requirements.

Three important fits (SEM Model fit types) are considered for this model – absolute model fit, incremental model fit and Parsimonious fit.

Absolute Model Fit

Here, values considered are the chi-square value, (X^2) which was 28.748; the probability value (p-value) is greater than the 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) not validating absolute fit; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) is 0.026. This is valid as RMSEA should be less than 0.08; Goodness of fit index (GFI) is 0.987, thus needs to be considered.

Incremental Fit

Here, four (4) important values are considered – Adjusted Goodness Fit Index (AGFI), Comparative fit index (CFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI) and Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) whose values should be more than 0.9. As seen in table 1b & c (Appendix 1), AFGI = 0.973 CFI = 0.953, NFI = 0.839 and TLI = 0.923.

Parsimonious Fit

Parsimonious fit is minimum discrepancy that is, chi-square/degree of freedom (χ^2/df). Chi-square (χ^2) = 28.748, degrees of freedom [df] = 22. The Parsimonious fit is chi-square/Degree of Freedom (χ^2/df) = 1.31. PClose = 0.955, thus, signifying that the proposed “structural model” fits the data since all the values were close to the expected values.

RMSEA

| Model | RMSEA | LO 90 | HI 90 | PCLOSE |
|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Default model | .026 | .000 | .049 | .955 |
| Independence model | .093 | .079 | .107 | .000 |

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

| | | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P | Label |
|------------------|-----------|----------|------|-------|------|-------|
| HotelPerformance | <--- SPP | .779 | .269 | 2.901 | .004 | |
| HotelPerformance | <--- OA | -.018 | .029 | -.615 | .538 | |
| HotelPerformance | <--- OC | .125 | .030 | 4.219 | *** | |
| HotelPerformance | <--- DcMS | .067 | .029 | 2.323 | .020 | |
| HotelPerformance | <--- EU | .993 | .217 | 4.570 | *** | |

KEY: SPP – Strategic Planning; OA – Organizational ambidexterity; Process; OC - Organizational Capabilities; DMS - Decision Making Style; EU – Environmental Uncertainty.

Everything in the table above (regression weight) is statistically significant but there is no statistical significance between organizational ambidexterity and hotel performance, as the p-value (0.538) is greater than 0.05. Strategic planning process play a significant role in hotel performance in Jordan as the p-value (0.004) is less than 0.05. This is obvious as strategic planning is designed to assist both profit and non-profit organizations effectively respond to the new circumstances in the business world. The result of this table also revealed that the organizational capabilities play a significant role in hotel performance, as the p-value is than 0.05. Also these results are also reflected by the Critical Ratio (C.R) in the SEM as the estimated path parameter of strategic planning process and hotel performance (2.901) and organizational capabilities (4.219) are significant as they are greater than ± 1.96 . The estimated path parameter (C.R) of decision making style and environmental uncertainty are 2.323 and 4.570 respectively; coupled with their p-values which is below 0.05. The statistical insignificance between organizational ambidexterity and hotel performance is observed in the critical ration being -0.615 which is less than than the standard value of ± 1.96 .

| Correlations | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | | | EnvUnc | SPP | OrgAmb | Organizational capabilities | DcMS |
| Spearman's rho | Environmental uncertainty (EnvUnc) | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .025 | .012 | .191** | -.094* |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .591 | .798 | .000 | .043 |
| | | N | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 |
| | Strategic Planning Process (SPP) | Correlation Coefficient | .025 | 1.000 | .153** | .045 | .153** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .591 | . | .001 | .329 | .001 |
| | | N | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 |
| | Organizational Ambidexterity (OrgAmb) | Correlation Coefficient | .012 | .153** | 1.000 | -.028 | .078 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .798 | .001 | . | .550 | .096 |
| | | N | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 |
| | Organizational capabilities | Correlation Coefficient | .191** | .045 | -.028 | 1.000 | .045 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .329 | .550 | . | .332 |
| | | N | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 |
| | Decision-making style (DcMS) | Correlation Coefficient | -.094* | .153** | .078 | .045 | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .043 | .001 | .096 | .332 | . |
| | | N | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |
| *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |

From the table above, there is a very weak correlation (very weak positive relationship) between environmental uncertainty and strategic planning process (0.25). Since the sig value is greater than 0.05, there is no strong enough evidence to suggest that there is a relationship between environmental uncertainty and strategic planning process.

There is a very weak positive relationship between environmental uncertainty and organizational ambidexterity (0.12). There is no strong evidence to confirm that there is a relation between environmental uncertainty and organizational ambidexterity as their p-value is greater than 0.05 ($p = 0.798$). The correlation between environmental uncertainty and organizational capabilities (0.191) is a weak one, though there is enough evidence to suggest that there is a relationship between since the sig-value is less than 0.05 ($p = 0.00$). There is a weak positive relationship between environmental uncertainty and decision making style (-0.094). the p-value (0.043) confirms it.

Strategic planning process has a weak positive relationship with organizational ambidexterity (0.153) and the p-value is less than 0.01 (0.001) confirming a strong enough evidence to suggest such a relationship. There is little to no correlation between strategic planning process and organizational capabilities (0.045); the p-value (0.329) suggests no correlation between them. There is a weak positive relationship between strategic planning process and decision making style (0.153) and the p-value is less than 0.01 (0.001) confirming a strong enough evidence for such a relationship.

There is a very weak negative correlation between organizational ambidexterity and organizational capabilities (-0.028) and the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.550) confirming a not enough evidence to suggest such a relationship. Also, very weak positive correlation exists between organizational ambidexterity and decision making style; the p-value, 0.096, of which is greater than 0.05 suggests no significant relationship between them.

There is a very weak positive correlation between organizational capabilities and decision making style (0.045) with a p-value of 0.332 which confirm a not enough evidence for relationship between these variables.

CONCLUSION

The study has shown that hotel performance matters a lot, since the survival and the continuous existence of any firm, company or organization is dependent largely on how efficient and satisfactory their previous performance is. The study also revealed that Strategic Planning Process, Organizational Ambidexterity, Organizational Capabilities and Decision-Making Style are important tools as they are directly linked to performance. Hence the study concludes that Strategic Planning Process, Organizational Ambidexterity, Organizational Capabilities and Decision-Making Style are highly relevant to hotel performance. Running an effective strategic planning process will help to improve hotel performance and achieve greater success. Also, the study has shown that organizational ambidexterity affects firms' growth positively, especially in environment with high level of uncertainty; hence, it is a relevant tool to hotel performance particularly in a country like Jordan. Since decision-making is a regular activity in any organization, and the decision-making style adopted by a firm is associated with the success of the firm, the study concluded that decision making style is relevant to hotel performance. Finally, the study has shown that organizational capability is very relevant to hotel performance as it represent the hob of any firm's internal growth.

REFERENCES

1. Akgün, A.E., Keskin, H. & Byrne, J. (2009). Organizational emotional capability, product and process innovation, and firm performance: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 26:103–30.
2. Albert, D., & Steinberg, L. (2011). Judgment and Decision Making in Adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1): 211–224.
3. Aldehayyat, J. S. (2011). Organisational characteristics and the practice of strategic planning in Jordanian hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 192-199.

4. Alegre, J. & Chiva, R. (2008). Assessing the impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: an empirical test. *Technovation*, 28:315–326.
5. Alsarayreh, M. N. (2018). Technology and Marketing Tourism and Hotels in Jordan. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*. 4:213-220. 10.20469/ijhss.4.10003-5.
6. Al-Tahi. (2002). Community concept of marketing in the tourism industry. In *First Forum Marketing in the Arab World (Reality and development prospects)*, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates.
7. Appelt, K. C., Milch, K. F., Handgraaf, M. J. & Weber, E. U. (2011). The decision making individual differences inventory and guidelines for the study of individual differences in judgment and decision-making research. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 6:252–262.
8. Argyres, N. (2011). Using organizational economics to study organizational capability development and strategy. *Organization Science*, 22:1138–43. 10.1287/orsc.1100.0625
9. Awad, A. (2009). *Computer Skills and Applications*. Oman: Arab Community Library.
10. Benner, M. J. & Tushman, M. L. (2002). Process Management and Technological Innovation: A Longitudinal Study of the Photography and Paint Industries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 676-706.
11. Brown, J., Adballah, S. S. & Ng, R. (2011). Decision making styles East and West: Is it time to move beyond cross-cultural research? *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 3(12): 452–459.
12. Bruine de Bruin, W. (2005). Save the last dance for me: unwanted serial position effects in jury evaluations. *Acta Psychol. (Amst.)* 118 245–260.
13. Bruine de Bruin, W. Parker, A. M. & Fischhoff, B. (2007). Individual differences in adult decision making competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(5): 938–956.
14. Bruine de Bruin, W., Parker, A. M. & Fischhoff, B. (2007). Individual differences in adult decision-making competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92:938–956.
15. Burton, M. D., O'Reilly, C. A. & Bidwell, M. (2012). Management systems for exploration and exploitation: The micro-foundations of organizational ambidexterity. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management, Boston, August, 2012.
16. Capon, N., Farley, J. and Hoenig, S. (1990), "Determinants of financial performance: a meta-analysis", *Management Science*, 36(10):1143-59.
17. Cenksseven-O" nder, F. (2012). The influence of decision making styles on early adolescents' life satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(9): 1523–1536.
18. Ceschi, A., Demerouti, E., Sartori, R. & Weller, J. (2017). Decision-Making Processes in the Workplace: How Exhaustion, Lack of Resources and Job Demands Impair Them and Affect Performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8:313. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00313>
19. Chakravarthy, B. (1986), "Measuring strategic performance", *Strategic Management Journal*, 7 (5): 437-458.
20. Chen, C.F. (2007), "Applying the stochastic frontier approach to measure hotel managerial efficiency in Taiwan", *Tourism Management*, 28 (3): 696-702.
21. Chon, K. S., & Olsen, M. D. (1990). Applying the strategic management process in the management of tourism organizations. *Tourism Management*, 11(3), 206-213.
22. Chuang H-M, Liu M-J, Chen Y-S. (2015). The effects of human resource capability and internal customer satisfaction on organizational effectiveness. *Int J Distrib Sens Netw*, 11:835194 10.1155/2015/835194
23. Cohen, M. D., March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A Garbage can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1–25. 10.2307/2392088 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
24. Curs_eu, P. L., & Schruijer, S. G. L. (2012). Decision styles and rationality: An analysis of the predictive validity of the General Decision making Style Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 72(6): 1053–1062.
25. Dalal, R. S., Bonaccio, S., Highhouse, S., Ilgen, D. R., Mohammed, S. & Slaughter, J. E. (2010). What if industrial–organizational psychology decided to take workplace decisions seriously? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3:386–405.
26. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources Model of Burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 499–512.
27. Ebben, J. J. & Johnson, A. C. (2005). Efficiency, flexibility, or both? Evidence linking strategy to performance in small firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 1249-1259.
28. Eccles, R.G. (1991), "The performance measurement manifesto", *Harvard Business Review*, 69: 131-137.
29. Eisenhardt, K. M. & Zbaracki, M. J. (1992). Strategic Decision Making. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13:17–37. 10.1002/smj.4250130904 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

30. Elbanna, S., & Elsharnouby, T. H. (2018). Revisiting the relationship between formal planning process and planning effectiveness: Do organizational capabilities and decision-making style matter? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(2): 1016-1034.
31. Elbanna, S., & Fadol, Y. (2016). An Analysis of the Comprehensive Implementation of Strategic Plans in Emerging Economies: The United Arab Emirates as a Case Study. *European Management Review*, 13(2), 75-89.
32. El-Jardali, F., Jamal, D., Abdallah, A. & Kassak, K. (2007). Human resources for health planning and management in the Eastern Mediterranean region: facts, gaps and forward thinking for research and policy. *Human Resources for Health*. 5(1):9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1478-4491-5-9>. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
33. Enright, M.J. & Newton, J. (2004), "Tourism destination competitiveness: a quantitative approach", *Tourism Management*, 25 (6):777-788.
34. Evans, N. (2005), "A resource-based view of outsourcing and its implications for organizational performance in the hotel sector", *Tourism Management*, 26 (5): 707-721.
35. Galotti, K. M., Ciner, E., Altenbaumer, H. E., Geerts, H. J., Rupp, A. & Woulfe, J. (2006). Decision making styles in a real-life decision: Choosing a college major. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 629–639.
36. Geerts, A., Blindenbach-Driessen, F. & Gemmel, P. (2010). Achieving a balance between exploration and exploitation in service firms: A Longitudinal study. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management.
37. Goosen, M. C., Bazzazian, N. & Phelps, C. (2012). Consistently capricious: The performance effects of simultaneous and sequential ambidexterity. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management.
38. Hardin, E. E. & Leong, F. T. L. (2004). Decision making theories and career assessment: A psychometric evaluation of the decision making inventory. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 12(1): 51–64.
39. Harren, V. A. (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14: 119–133.
40. Harris, P.J. & Brander, B. J. (1998), "Research and development in hospitality accounting and finance management", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 17 (3):161-181.
41. Hofer, C.W. & Schendel, D. (1978), *Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts*, West, St Paul, MN.
42. Hsu, Y-H. & Fang, W. (2009). Intellectual capital and new product development performance: the mediating role of organizational learning capability. *Technol Forecast Soc Change*, 76:664–677.
43. Janis, I. L. & Mann, L. (1977). *Decision making: A psychological analysis of conflict, choice and commitment*. New York: The Free Press
44. Johnson, R. H. (1978). Individual styles of decision making: A theoretical model for counseling. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 56: 530–536.
45. Kaissi, A. A., Begun, J. W. & Welson, T. (2008). Strategic planning processes and hospital financial performance. *Journal of Healthcare Management*. 53(3):197–208. [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
46. Kaplan, R.S. & Norton, D.P. (1996), *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
47. Ke, X. & Jin, X. (2010). Empirical research on enterprise organizational capability evaluation system based on AHP. 2010 International Conference on Future Information Technology and Management Engineering, 2010: 256–60.
48. Kharabsheh, K. S. & Aldahamsheh, M. M. (2011). Tourism promotion through the internet (websites): (Jordan as a case study). *Asian Social Science*, 7(6):125. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v7n6p125>
49. Leykin, Y. & DeRubeis, R. J. (2010). Decision making styles and depressive symptomatology: Development of the Decision Styles Questionnaire. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5(7):506–515.
50. Li, J, Cai, W. & Wang, Y. (2011). Summary of Research on Enterprise Growth Theory. *Journal of Xiangtan University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 35:19–24.
51. Liu, Z., Siguaw, J. A., & Enz, C. A. (2008). Using tourist travel habits and preferences to assess strategic destination positioning: The case of Costa Rica. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 49(3), 258-281.
52. March, J. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2: 71-87.
53. Mia, L. & Patiar, A. (2001), "The use of management accounting systems in hotels: an exploratory study", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21(1): 235-257.
54. Miller, D. C. & Byrnes, J. P. (2001). Adolescents' decision making in social situations a self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 22:237–256.
55. Miller, D. C. & Byrnes, J. P. (2001). Adolescents' decision making in social situations A self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 22: 237–256. 10.1016/S0193-3973(01)00082-X

56. Mills, A., Brugha, R., Hanson, K. & McPake, B. (2002). What can be done about the private health sector in low-income countries? *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 80(4):325–330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0042-96862002000400012>. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
57. Mintzberg H, Quinn J. B, Ghoshal S. (1998). *The Strategy Process*. Revised European edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1998. [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
58. Moshman, D. (2011). *Adolescent rationality and development: Cognition, morality, and identity*. New York: Psychology Press.
59. Okumus, F. (2002), “Can hospitality researchers contribute to the strategic management literature?” *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 21(2): 105-110.
60. Pan, C. (2005), “Market structure and profitability in the international tourist industry”, *Tourism Management*, 26 (6):845-50.
61. Parker, A. M. & Fischhoff B. (2005). Decision-making competence: external validation through an individual-differences approach. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 18: 1–27.
62. Parker, A. M., Bruine de Bruin, W., & Fischhoff, B. (2007). Maximizes versus satisficers: Decision making styles, competence, and outcomes. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 2(6), 342–350.
63. Pearce J. A, Robinson R. B. Irwin (2007). *Strategic management: Formulation, implementation, and control*. The University of Oklahoma; 2007. [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
64. Perrewé, P. L., Hochwarter, W. A., Rossi, A. M., Wallace, A., Maignan, I., Castro, S. L., ... & Wan, P. (2002). Are work stress relationships universal? A nine-region examination of role stressors, general self-efficacy, and burnout. *Journal of International Management*, 8(2), 163-187.
65. Phillips, J. G. & Ogeil, R. P. (2011). Decisional styles and risk of problem drinking or gambling. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51: 521–526.
66. Phillips, P., & Moutinho, L. (2014). Critical review of strategic planning research in hospitality and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48, 96-120.
67. Piao, M. (2010). Thriving in the new: Implication of exploration on organizational longevity. *Journal of Management*, 36: 1529-1554.
68. Pliske, R. & Klein, G. (2003). “The naturalistic decision-making perspective,” in *Emerging Perspectives on Judgment and Decision Research* eds Schneider, S. L., Shanteau, J. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press;). [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
69. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63:539-569.
70. Posch, A., & Garaus, C. (2019). Boon or curse? A contingent view on the relationship between strategic planning and organizational ambidexterity. *Long range planning*.
71. Riaz, M. N., Riaz, M. A., & Batool, N. (2012). Personality types as predictors of decision making styles. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 22(2): 99–114
72. Saidur Rahaman, H. M. (2014). Personality and decision making styles of university students. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 40(1), 138–144.
73. Saleh, S., Kaissi, A., Semaan, A., Natafji, N. M. (2013). Strategic planning processes and financial performance among hospitals in Lebanon. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*. 28:34–45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2128>.
74. Salo, I., & Allwood, C. M. (2011). Decision making styles, stress and gender among investigators. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 34(1): 97–119.
75. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55: 818–831.
76. Stanovich, K. E., Toplak, M. E. & West, R. F. (2008). The development of rational thought: a taxonomy of heuristics and biases. *Adv. Child Dev. Behav.* 36 251–285. [10.1016/S0065-2407\(08\)00006-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2407(08)00006-2)
77. Swayne, L. E., Duncan, W. J., Ginter, P. M. & Malden, M. A. (2006). *Strategic Management of Health Care Organizations*. Blackwell Publishing; 2006. [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
78. Tinsley, H. E. A., Tinsley, D. J., & Rushing, J. (2002). Psychological type, decision making style, and reactions to structured career interventions. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 10(2): 258–280.
79. Tushman, M. L., Smith, W. K., Wood, R., Westerman, G. & O'Reilly, C. A. (2010). Organizational designs and innovation streams. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19: 1331-1366.
80. Uotila, Juha, Maula, Markku and Keil, Thomas and Zhara, Shaker A. (2008). Exploration, exploitation and firm performance: An analysis of S&P 500 corporations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30: 221-231.
81. Walker, O.C. & Ruekert, R.W. (1987), “Marketing’s role in the implementation of business strategies: a critical review and conceptual framework”, *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (3):15-33.

82. Wang, C. H., Chen, K. Y., & Chen, S. C. (2012). Total quality management, market orientation and hotel performance: The moderating effects of external environmental factors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 119-129.
83. Wang, H. & Li, J. (2008). Untangling the effects of overexploration and overexploitation on organizational performance: The moderating role of organizational dynamism. *Journal of Management*, 34: 925-951.
84. Wang, J.T. (2008). *Organizational Change of China's Commercial Banks: A Study on factors. Capability and Efficiency: Hohai University, 2008.*
85. Weller, J. A. & Tikir, A. (2011). Predicting domain-specific risk taking with the HEXACO personality structure. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 24:180–201.
86. Weller, J. A., Moholy, M., Bossard, E. & Levin, I. P. (2015). Preadolescent decision-making competence predicts interpersonal strengths and difficulties: a 2-year prospective study. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 28: 76–88.
87. Williams, U. & Esmail, S. (2014). Association of different identity styles with sexual experience and decision-making among Canadian youth. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 23(1):49–58.
88. Winata, L. & Mia, L. (2005), "Information technology and the performance effect of managers' participation in budgeting: evidence from the hotel industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 24(1): 21-39.
89. Wood, R. & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56: 407–415.
90. Yang, H. & Atuahene-Gima, K. (2007). Ambidexterity in product innovation management: The direct and contingent effects on firm performance. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management.
91. Yu, G.J. & Khessina, O. (2012). The role of exploration in firm survival in the worldwide optical library market, 1990-1998. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management.
92. Zhiang, Lin, Yang, Haibin and Demirkan, Irem (2007). The performance consequences of ambidexterity in strategic alliance formations: Empirical investigation and computational theorizing. *Management Science*, 53: 1645-1658.