**STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES IN SMALL AND MEDIUM SCALE CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES IN FCT ABUJA**

**OLUBAJO, Oluseun Olukemi and OLAWUYI, Babatunde James**

*Department of Building, Federal University of Technology Minna,*

Corresponding author: [builderolubajo@gmail.com](mailto:builderolubajo@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

Small and medium scale construction companies’ account for the bulk of Nigeria’s construction industry and the impact of this sector on the growth of the national economy is seminal. The practise of strategic management in small and medium scale companies is low, however this does not imply that these firms lack intent or initiatives to grow and compete. It is on this grounds that this study seeks to examine the initiatives of small and medium construction companies and their performance in the Federal Capital Territory Abuja. The objectives are to examine the competitive strategies adopted by Small and Medium Construction Companies, to evaluate the dynamics involved in initiating and implementing strategic intentions and to determine its relationships with their performance. The study adopted a survey design approach using questionnaire to gathering data from 20 supply chain participants involved in 50 construction projects sites. The study data was analysed using descriptive statistics, mean item score and correlation test. Findings revealed that differentiation strategy is the most highly adopted competitive strategy by small and medium construction companies and the formation of strategic alliances improves the delivery of business objectives as a supply chain strategy. A competent the work force is essential for the success of any organisation and a significant correlation exist between the strategic management initiatives of small and medium and organizational performance. The study recommends the harmonisation of company efforts in small and medium scale organizations in line with strategic objectives for improved performance and growth of developing economies.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Nigeria is a low income country in spite of its huge amount of crude oil sales and exports (World Bank 2010; Jeffrey, 2005).Rewane (2016) reported that its current economic condition is not impressive with low growth rates in need of new innovative policies. Crosthwaite (2000) stated that the construction industry has the potential of stimulating positive economic growth, and strategic management can aid companies in construction to win more customers, develop relationships and have the competitive advantage (Foster *et al*, 2016). Small and medium scale construction companies’ (SMCC) constitute the bulk of the construction industry and provides a major source of employment in Nigeria (Ofori, 2009). The practise of strategic managements in Nigerian construction companies has been an activity of low patronage in small and medium firms, however this does not imply that these firms lack the initiatives or capacity to compete and grow: on the contrast its adoption in large scale companies has been fully documented (Monday, Akinola, Ologbenla and Aladeraji, 2015). It is on this basis, that this study seeks to evaluate the initiatives of strategic management in small and medium scale construction companies FCT Abuja with a view to improve the strategic management practise.

Premised on the above, the research seeks to answer the following questions; are there competitive strategies predominantly adopted by small and medium scale construction companies? What supply chain strategies principally deployed by small scale construction companies in project delivery? What are the dynamics involved in implementing strategic management initiatives? The Specific objectives of the study are; to evaluate the competitive strategies adopted of by small and medium scale construction companies,to examine the dynamics of strategic initiativesin organization and todetermine the supply chain strategies deployed in project delivery.

**COMPETITIVE STRATEGY**

Three different strategies were identified by Foster *et al* (2016) as the basis for competition in construction industry namely: the cost strategy, the focus strategy and the differentiation strategy. The author went further to describe the cost strategy as a ‘‘generic strategy that focuses on reducing cost’’; a differentiation strategy as a ‘‘generic strategy that emphasizes on providing special value to customers in a way that it is difficult for competitors to replicate’’ and focus strategy as a ‘‘strategy that emphasizes on selecting its customers or market’’. Competition in the construction industry is no longer between one organization and another but rather by their supply chains (Tommelein, Ballard and Kaminsky 2009).

**SUPPLY CHAIN STRATEGY**

Supply chains refers to ‘‘the structure put in place for suppliers, contractors, clients and representatives of the client to work together in harmony using information in order to fabricate components, transport materials, secure plants and equipment, install temporary works, engage labour and harness resources for construction’’ (Hatmoko and Scott, 2010). A supply chain strategy determines the procurement pattern of raw materials, transportation of these materials from companies to facilities and operations that construct the product for the clients (Kachiru 2009) and is described as a strategic decision which determines the structure and configuration of supply over the next several years.The failure of small and medium scale companies in implementing preset strategic goals could be attributed to a lack of strategic fit and has been attributed to the inconsistencies between the competitive strategy and the supply chain strategy (Iyagba & Ojuola 2004; Kachiru 2009).

Telsang (2007), described four supply chain strategies namely; strategic partnership, outsourcing, value density and buyer-supplier relationship. Charter, Kielkiewicz-Young, Young and Hughes (2001) also mentioned key management approaches to supply chain management which include outsourcing of procurement processes, collaborative planning and partnerships between customers and suppliers.

**Strategic Alliances/Partnership**

Telsang (2007) described strategic partnerships as a strategy that builds a close relationship between suppliers and buyers: this relationship is a formal alliance between two commercial enterprises usually formalized by one or more business contracts but falls short of forming a legal partnership or a corporate affiliate relationship. Yi Wei (2007) viewed strategic partnerships as strategic alliances that offers businesses the chance to join forces for a mutually beneficial opportunity and sustained competitive advantage. This alliance according to Isoraite (2009) is an agreement between two or more organizations to cooperate in a specific business activity so that each organization can benefit from the strengths of the other and gain competitive advantage. It involves the sharing of knowledge and expertise between partners as well as reduction of risk and cost in areas such as relationships with suppliers and development of new products and technologies.

**Outsourcing**

The concept of outsourcing came from the terminology “outside resourcing”, meaning to get resources from outside using external sources for business development, (Troacă and Bodislav, 2012)*.* Outsourcing refers to a strategic decision to transfer one or more of an organization’s activities to a third-party specialist (Browne and Allen, 2001), and focus on its competencies. Competencies are mostly activities that the organization can perform more effectively than its competitors and which are of importance to customers. It is advisable that all non-core activities be outsourced to third party service providers. Core competencies are activities and skills in which the organization has long-term competitive advantage (Tompkins, Simonson, Tompkins & Upchurch, 2005). The phenomenon of outsourcing generally refers to procurement of materials and services inputs by a firm from a source outside. In this context, outsourcing can be both internal and international, (Troacă & Bodislav, 2012)*.* (Wilcocks, Fitzgerald, 1993) identified various classification of outsourcing, based on several criteria’s: The proportion of outsourcing: total, selective, partial. Outsourcing can be applied in: human resources, project development management, and service management. The customers, some vendors - a client or several vendors - more customers. The period of outsourcing can be on long term or short term. Location of the supplier is local, international (offshore) and regional (near shore) closer to the customer.

**Just – In – Time**

The practice of supplying goods only as at when they are required has been referred to as Just in Time. Van Weele, (2002) Opined that to decrease waste, the simple idea of Just in Time is that all materials and products must become available when they are needed. It is a demand driven inventory control philosophy which views production as a system in which all operations, including the delivery of materials needed for production, occur just at the time they are needed. With JIT, the stock levels for raw materials, work in progress and finished products and accordingly, the operating costs can be kept to a minimum.

**Buyer – Supplier Relationship**

Several terms have been used in the literature to label the arrangement between buyer and suppliers such as “transaction” (Williamson, 1981; Winch, 2001), “interaction” (Håkansson, 1982) and “relationship” (Harland, 1996). The type of buyer-supplier relationships ranges from arm’s length transactional relationships where two parties engage in a transaction isolated in time, to collaborative relationships which span over extended periods reaching beyond the specific transaction, i.e. for more than one project (Anderson and Narus, 1991; Sako, 1992).Telsang (2007) described a buyer –supplier relationship as relationships where buyers are involved in the operations of their suppliers directly through operational audits and open costing procedures or indirectly through training of workers of suppliers. The buyer provides a benchmark regarding performance of suppliers with the best practices available. The buyer can therefore devote his effort to building better and stronger relationships with suppliers, (Behdani, 2013).

**Dynamics in Implementing Strategic Management Initiatives**

The adoption of a clear strategic perspective by an organizations is one of the factors affecting its performance (Muhammad *et al*, 2011). Strategic initiatives was defined in a Project Management Institute sponsored study (Economist Intelligence Unit 2013) is a set of actions undertaken to sustain the execution of a strategy or simply put strategic initiatives are the ways that organizations turn visions into results and are divided into three distinct elements namely; strategic intent, delivery of benefits to key stakeholders and the transformation of the organization.

*Core competencies: ‘‘*Some strategic management researchers are advocating the importance of dynamic core competencies or the understanding of firms’ market positions from a dynamic theoretical perspective’’ (Masood, Farooqui, & Aziz, 2009).

*Policy Development: ‘‘*There is broad agreement that a strategic approach to human resource management (HRM) involves designing and implementing a set of internally consistent policies and practices that ensure a firm’s human capital contributes to the achievement of its business objectives’’ (Baired and Meshoulam, 1988 (as cited in (Masood, Farooqui, & Aziz, 2009))

*Learning: ‘‘*Tacit-to-tacit conversion (socialization) takes place when tacit knowledge within one individual is shared with another through training, whereas explicit-to-explicit conversion (combination) takes place when an individual combines discrete pieces of explicit knowledge into a new whole. Tacit-to-explicit conversion (externalization) takes place when an individual is able to articulate the foundations of his or her tacit knowledge, whereas explicit-to-tacit conversion (internalization) takes place when new explicit knowledge is shared throughout the firm and other members begin to use it to broaden, extend, and reframe their own tacit knowledge. Strategic planning, effective administration and communication together with effective knowledge management, can contribute to minimize risk, whilst also carefully incorporating the employee voice into the decision-making’’ (Raiden, Dainty, & Neale, 2004).

*Finance: ‘‘*Unlike other economic sectors such as the manufacturing industry where demand may be determined almost immediately, this is not usually the case in the construction industry, which enjoys two distinct advantages. Firstly, the long gestation in building projects means that contracts, which may be completed two to three years later. The gestation in construction is primarily dependent upon the size and complexity of the building project. The larger and more complex the project, the longer its gestation. Nevertheless, the scenario assumes that the financial crisis has not affected the liquidity of the developer-owner that can still finance the project through to completion. Although the construction sector is vital to the achievement of national socio-economic development goals of providing employment, shelter and infrastructure, it can be a significant source of negative impacts on the physical environment’’ (Hasan, 2006)

*Market & Competition: ‘‘*A good market analysis will have an economy review, which is very helpful in understanding where your current market is and where it is going, an organization that institutes a strategic management perspective will be setting its own direction and path through the changing waters of the market ’’(Chinowsky & Meghann, 2001). Competition becomes more cut-throat, firms go out of business and a gradual decline in performance sets in as the most talented and enterprising individuals and firms make a step change into a new kind of work. Various metrics have been considered in literature in measuring organizational performance namely: cost, quality, delivery, profitability and reliability (Schoenherr and Swink, 2012).

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design to achieve the research aim. The survey was carried out using structured questionnaires with the requisite data collected. A pilot study was initially conducted to identify construction companies in FCT, and total of 25 participants in construction companies were selected out of which 20 responded. This comprises of Directors, Management staff, Company staff, Workman, Supervisors, Divisional heads, Casual staff and Contract staff***.*** The Federal Capital Territory Abuja was chosen as the study area for the research due to the numerous ongoing building and civil engineering construction projects. A purposive sampling technique was used and the population were building and civil engineering projects in the FCT. The specific objectives of the study are; to examine the competitive and supply chain strategies adopted by small and medium scale construction companies; the adoption of various competitive and supply chain strategies was measured using a 5 point likert scale namely: 5 = Very Often, 4 = Often, 3 = Sometimes, 2 = Rarely,1 = Never and analysed with mean item score and ranked.The dynamics involved in implementing strategic initiativesby organization were also measured using a 5 point Likert scale namely: 5 = Very Significant, 4 = Significant, 3 = Moderately Significant, 2 = Less Significant, 1 = Not Significant also analysed with mean item score and ranked. The relationship between the levels of implementation and the organizational performancewas examined using spearman rank correlation.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The qualification and experience of respondents in the studied areas are presented in Table 1.0

Table 1.0: Respondents Characteristics

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics** | **Parameters** | **Value** | **%** |
|  | Management Staff | 2 | 10 |
| Organizational | Company Staff | 5 | 25 |
| Role | Casual Staff | 3 | 15 |
|  | Supervisors | 3 | 15 |
|  | Divisional Head | 2 | 10 |
|  | Executive Director | 5 | 25 |
|  | M.Sc. | 9 | 45 |
| Highest | B.Sc. | 4 | 20 |
| Qualification | HND | 7 | 35 |
|  | Design | 2 | 10 |
| Core | Construction | 9 | 45 |
| Competences | Consultancy | 3 | 15 |
|  | Specialized services | 6 | 30 |
|  | 1 – 5 | 3 | 15 |
| Experience in | 6 – 10 | 12 | 60 |
| Industry | 11 – 15 | 2 | 10 |
|  | 16 – 20 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 20 – Above | 2 | 10 |
|  | 1 – 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Experience in | 6 – 10 | 11 | 55 |
| Organization | 11 – 15 | 2 | 10 |
|  | 16 – 20 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 20 – Above | 1 | 5 |
| Source: Survey | *2017* | **20** | **100** |

Table 1.0 shows that 25% of the respondents were executive directors and company staff, 15% were casual staff and supervisors, while 10% were management staff and divisional heads. The characteristics of respondent’s organizations in FCT are presented in Table 2.0

Table 2.0: Organizational Characteristics

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics** | **Parameters** | **Value** | **%** |
|  | < 2 Years | 2 | 10 |
| Period Since | 2 – 4 Years | 3 | 15 |
| Established | 4 – 8 Years | 4 | 20 |
|  | 8 – 12 Years | 2 | 10 |
|  | Above 12 Years | 9 | 45 |
|  | 0 - 9 | 6 | 30 |
| Organizational | 10 – 49 | 5 | 25 |
| Size | 50 – 199 | 2 | 10 |
|  | Above 200 | 7 | 35 |
|  | Top Mgt. | 6 | 30 |
| Hierarchy in | Middle Mgt. | 13 | 65 |
| Organization | Bottom Mgt. | 1 | 5 |
|  | External | - | - |
| Type of | Functional | 14 | 70 |
| Organizational | Divisional | 4 | 20 |
| Structure | Matrix | 2 | 10 |
|  |  | **20** | **100** |

**Source:** *Field survey, 2017*

Table 2.0 shows that 45% of the Organizations have been established more than 12 years ago, while 10% were established both between 8-12 years ago and less than 2 years ago. 30% have organizational size above 200 workers, whereas 10% possess an organizational size with workers 50 – 199 .65% of the workers belong to the Top level management and 5% belong to the bottom level management.70% of the organizations have a functional organizational structure, while 10% have a matrix organizational structure. The results reveals that executive officers and company staff are the majority of respondents with at least 6 -10 years working experience, the results further reveal that small and medium scale construction companies constitute a bulk of the respondent’s organization with more than 4 years’ experience majorly involved in construction works . The results also reveals that middle level managers form the bulk of the respondents in organizations with mostly functional organizational structure.

**Extent in the Adoption of Competitive and Supply Chain Strategy**

The level of compliance of organizations with various competitive strategies in the F.C.T Abuja are presented in Table 3.0. Also the level of compliance of organizations with various supply chain strategies are presented in Table 3.0.

Table 3.0: Extent in the Adoption of competitive and supply chain strategies

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Items** | **Never** | **Rarely** | **Sometimes** | **Often** | **Very Often** | **Sum** | **N** | **MIS** | **Rank** |
| **Competitive Strategy** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost Strategy | 1 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 66 | 20 | 3.3 | 2nd |
| Differention Strategy | - | 3 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 67 | 20 | 3.4 | 1st |
| Focus Strategy | - | 4 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 62 | 20 | 3.1 | 3rd |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Supply Chain Strategy** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outsourcing to Several Contractors (a) | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 69 | 20 | 3.5 | 5th |
| Outsourcing to Single Contractor (b) | 5 | 10 | 5 | - | - | 40 | 20 | 2.0 | 4th |
| Long term Relationship with Construction Firms(c) | - | 2 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 72 | 20 | 3.6 | 1st |
| Long term Relationship with Several Suppliers (d) | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 64 | 20 | 3.2 | 9th |
| Long term Relationship to a Single Supplier (e) | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 64 | 20 | 3.2 | 9th |
| Formal Alliance with other Construction Firms (f) | - | 2 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 70 | 20 | 3.5 | 3rd |
| Formal Alliance with Several Suppliers (g) | - | 1 | 12 | 2 | 5 | 71 | 20 | 3.6 | 1st |
| Formal Alliance to a Single Supplier (h) | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 71 | 20 | 3.6 | 1st |
| Warehousing before Use (i) | - | 6 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 66 | 20 | 3.3 | 7th |
| Purchase of Materials when the need arises(j) | - | 4 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 67 | 20 | 3.4 | 6th |
| Actively engage Suppliers in Planning (k) | - | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 65 | 20 | 3.3 | 7th |

**Source:** *Field survey, 2017*

***Supply chain strategy:***

*\* Outsourcing\*: a and b*

*\*Buyer Supplier Relationship\*: c, d and e.*

*\*Strategic Alliance/Partnership\*: f, g and h*

*\*Just in Time \*: i, j and k*

Table 3.0 shows that the differentiation strategy ranks first with an MIS value of 3.4 as the most adopted competitive strategy by organizations in the F.C.T Abuja to business and the functional strategy as the least most adopted strategy with an MIS value of 3.1 . This confirms that most small and medium scale construction companies adopt a unique market approach when competing in the construction market. The results further revealed that most construction companies adopted strategic alliances or partnerships as their supply chain strategy in project delivery as formal relationships with suppliers ranked 1st  with an MIS value of 3.6 and buyer supplier relationships were least as long term relationships ranked 9th with an MIS value of 3.2. This results also confirms that most small and medium companies form strategic alliances with partner companies or suppliers in order to be able to deliver their services.

**Dynamics in implementing Strategic Management Initiatives**

The dynamics that interplay in implementing strategic initiatives by construction companies in the F.C.T Abuja is presented below in Table 4.0.

Table 4.0 : Dynamics in Implementing Strategic Management Initiatives

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. M. I.** | **N.S** | **L.S** | **M.S** | **S** | **V.S** | **Sum** | **MIS** | **Decision** |
| Organizational Policies | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 73 | 3.7 | Significant |
| Policy Development | - | 2 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 73 | 3.7 | Significant |
| Devotion of Financial resources | - | 1 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 77 | 3.9 | Significant |
| Financial Capacity | - | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 73 | 3.7 | Significant |
| Workers Motivation | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 65 | 3.3 | Moderately Sig. |
| Organizational Structure | - | 2 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 70 | 3.5 | Significant |
| Governance Model | - | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 72 | 3.6 | Significant |
| Organizational Changes | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 66 | 3.3 | Moderately sig. |
| Competency in the Work force | - | 1 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 89 | 4.5 | Very sig. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Organizational Performance** | **V.P** | **P** | **F** | **G** | **V.G** | **Sum** | **MIS** | **Decision** |
| Customer Satisfaction | 1 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 67 | 3.4 | Fair |
| Construction Delivery Speed | - | 1 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 82 | 4.1 | Good |
| Quality | - | 2 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 75 | 3.8 | Good |
| Profitability | - | - | 2 | 8 | 10 | 88 | 4.4 | Good |
| Strategic Fit | - | 1 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 76 | 3.8 | Good |

***\*N.S = Not Significant, L.S. = Less Significant, M.S. = Moderately Significant, S = Significant,***

***V.S= Very Significant\* \*V.P = Very poor, P. = Poor, F. = Fair, G = Good, V.G= Very good\****

The results from table 4.0 reveals that the competency of the work force in an organization is very significant in implementing the organization strategic initiatives ranking highest with a MIS value of 4.5, the skills and expertise of an organizational work force is central in implementing organizations strategic management initiatives, this also goes to say that the kind of employees recruited into the organizations workforce will affect their realization of their strategic plans. Followed by the devotion of financial resources as having significant influence of the pace at which strategic initiatives are implemented with an MIS value of 3.9. Motivation of the workforce and openness to change were observed to have moderate significance on the organizations ability to implement their strategic initiatives with the least MIS value of 3.3.

**Correlation between Strategic Management Initiatives and Performance**

The correlation between the levels of strategic management initiatives and performance of organizations is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Correlation between Initiatives in Strategic Management & Performance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable Correlated** | **N** | **P-Value** | **Decision** |
| **Customer Satisfaction and** |  |  |  |
| Organizational Policies | 20 | 0.89 | Accept |
| Policy Development | 20 | 0.89 | Accept |
| Devotion of Financial resources | 20 | 0.92 | Accept |
| Financial Capacity | 20 | 0.89 | Accept |
| Workers Motivation | 20 | 0.91 | Accept |
| Suitability of Organizational Structure | 20 | 0.90 | Accept |
| Governance Model | 20 | 0.88 | Accept |
| Organizational Changes | 20 | 0.93 | Accept |
| Competency in the Work force | 20 | 0.80 | Accept |
| **Customer Delivery speed and** |  |  |  |
| Organizational Policies | 20 | 0.88 | Accept |
| Policy Development | 20 | 0.85 | Accept |
| Devotion of Financial resources | 20 | 0.88 | Accept |
| Financial Capacity | 20 | 0.87 | Accept |
| Workers Motivation | 20 | 0.92 | Accept |
| Organizational Structure | 20 | 0.85 | Accept |
| Governance Model | 20 | 0.87 | Accept |
| Organizational Changes | 20 | 0.94 | Accept |
| Competency in the Work force | 20 | 0.86 | Accept |
| **Quality and** |  |  |  |
| Organizational Policies | 20 | 0.85 | Accept |
| Policy Development | 20 | 0.90 | Accept |
| Devotion of Financial resources | 20 | 0.85 | Accept |
| Financial Capacity | 20 | 0.90 | Accept |
| Workers Motivation | 20 | 0.92 | Accept |
| Organizational Structure | 20 | 0.90 | Accept |
| Governance Model | 20 | 0.89 | Accept |
| Organizational Changes | 20 | 0.91 | Accept |
| Competency in the Work force | 20 | 0.90 | Accept |
| **Profitability and** |  |  |  |
| Organizational Policies | 20 | 0.83 | Accept |
| Policy Development | 20 | 0.86 | Accept |
| Devotion of Financial resources | 20 | 0.81 | Accept |
| Financial Capacity | 20 | 0.87 | Accept |
| Workers Motivation | 20 | 0.89 | Accept |
| Organizational Structure | 20 | 0.93 | Accept |
| Governance Model | 20 | 0.82 | Accept |
| Organizational Changes | 20 | 0.90 | Accept |
| Competency in the Work force | 20 | 0.88 | Accept |

The p-values for the correlation test between the levels in implementation of strategic management initiatives against the customer satisfaction revealed that organizational policies ( 0.89) ,policy development (0.89), Devotion of financial resources ( 0.92) , financial capacity ( 0.89) , workers motivation ( 0.91) ,suitability of organizational structure ( 0.90),Governance model (0.88) ,openness to organizational change ( 0.93), competence of the workforce(0.80) are greater than 0.05 :.The result implies that the level in implementation of strategic management initiatives is significantly correlated to customer satisfaction.

The p-values for the correlation test between the levels in implementation of strategic management initiatives against the construction delivery revealed that organizational policies ( 0.88) ,policy development (0.85), Devotion of financial resources ( 0.88) , financial capacity ( 0.87) , workers motivation ( 0.92) ,suitability of organizational structure ( 0.85),Governance model (0.87) ,openness to organizational change ( 0.94), competence of the workforce(0.86) are greater than 0.05 : the result implies that the level in implementation of strategic management initiatives is significantly correlated to construction delivery speed.

The p-values for the correlation test between the levels in implementation of strategic management initiatives against the quality revealed that organizational policies ( 0.85) ,policy development (0.90), Devotion of financial resources ( 0.85) , financial capacity ( 0.90) , workers motivation ( 0.92) ,suitability of organizational structure ( 0.90),Governance model (0.89) ,openness to organizational change ( 0.91), competence of the workforce(0.90) are greater than 0.05 : the result implies that the level in implementation of strategic management initiatives is significantly correlated to quality.

The p-values for the correlation test between the levels in implementation of strategic management initiatives against the profitability revealed that organizational policies ( 0.83) ,policy development (0.86), Devotion of financial resources ( 0.81) , financial capacity ( 0.87) , workers motivation ( 0.89) ,suitability of organizational structure ( 0.93),Governance model (0.82) ,openness to organizational change ( 0.895), competence of the workforce(0.88) are greater than 0.05 : the result implies that the level in implementation of strategic management initiatives is significantly correlated to profitability.

**CONCLUSION**

The study reveals that the differentiation strategy is the most adopted competitive strategy by small and medium scale construction companies in the Federal Capital Territory. The study further revealed that having a competent work force is key in the implementation of strategic goals of the organization. Strategic alliance was revealed to be the most predominant supply chain strategies deployed by small and medium scale companies in project delivery. The study further reveals that levels in implementing strategic management initiatives is significantly impacts on the performance of the organization. What about the study implication as well as the limitations?
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