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Abstract
There is scant literature on strategic decision making and firm performance and more so among construction firms. Therefore, the main objective of this study was to evaluate the influence of strategic decision making practices (specifically, advocacy and dialogic decision making) on performance of construction firms in Nakuru town. Survey research design was adopted. The study targeted the 936 management and supervisory staff of 312 construction firms that are duly registered and active in Nakuru town out of which 65 respondents were selected randomly. The study used self-administered questionnaires to collect data. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics with the aid of SPSS. The study found that strategic decision making practices influenced performance of construction firms significantly. Also, dialogic decision making practices were found to significantly influence the said performance. However, the study found that advocacy decision making practices did not significantly influence performance. The study concluded that construction firms in Nakuru town used advocacy decision making where the firm pushed through with a decision regardless of the outcome. Dialogic decision making practices ensured that proposals are scrutinized by all decision makers. The study recommended that where construction firms use advocacy decision making where a single option is selected, the option should be analyzed by all decision makers and stakeholders in order to assess its viability.

Keywords: Advocacy decision making practices, construction firms, dialogic decision making practices, firm performance, strategic decision making practices
INTRODUCTION

The competitive advantage of an organization in a global economy depends primarily on the quality of the decisions made by the management of these organizations in relation to their development. The increasing complexity, turbulence and uncertainty of the environment require different and greater knowledge (Batley & Daly, 2006). Increased consumer demands require new solutions, knowledge and enhanced decision making.

Due to increasing competition, the organization is required to constantly revise its product and service mix and managerial methods to increase productivity (Batley & Daly, 2006). Modern conditions of dynamic competition, sophisticated information technology, knowledge economy, market globalization, have changed the relation to importance of decision making in organizations. Evidently then, strategic decision making will play a critical role in the performance of the organization. Of course, financial, technological, and other material resources are undoubtedly also critical to the organization’s success in any competitive market.

According to a report published by Price-Waterhouse Coopers (2013), world construction markets are at a tipping point already with 52% of all construction activity in emerging markets today. This is expected to increase to 63% by 2025, with China and India contributing most to growth in emerging markets. China overtook the US to become the world's largest construction market in 2010, and is expected to increase its global share from 18% today to 26% in 2025, despite an expected slowdown. A report published by EC Harris Research (2013), states that the UK construction industry has turned around to become one of the fastest growing sectors in the economy. It further elaborates that the changes in the international economy are creating new opportunities for Britain.

From a regional forefront, a report published by Deloitte, titled ‘African Construction Trends Report 2013’ states that East Africa is fast becoming a leading African region and a strategic hub of continental growth. Though historically one of the world’s poorest and least developed regions, it is fast tracking infrastructure development with countries such as Ethiopia having shown annual growth of over 10% per annum in recent years (Deloitte, 2013). The report further expounds the East African region is turning the heads of investors, construction firms and multi-national corporations. As aggressive development gains momentum, investors will rely on local governments to develop basic infrastructure such as rail, roads, healthcare facilities, housing, real estate and retail space.

Closer to home, data from the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics shows that the construction industry in Kenya emerged among the top performing sectors in the period alongside financial services and transport and communication. The sector grew by 10.7% compared to the dismal performance of 0.3% in the same period in 2010 and contributed
Sh12.6 billion to the GDP in the period supported by massive road infrastructure projects currently in progress across the country (KNBS, 2011).

Being “important, in terms of the actions taken, there sources committed, or the precedents set” (Shubladze, Mgebrishvili &Tsotskola, 2008). Eisenhardt (1989) suggests they involve strategic positioning; have high stakes; involve many of the firm’s functions; and considered representative of the process by which major decisions are made at the firm. Eisenhardt and Zbaracki (1992) add that strategic decisions are “those in frequent decisions made by the top leaders of an organization that critically affect organizational health and survival”.

Characteristically, strategic decisions are long term, highly unstructured, complex, and inherently risky and have great impact on the future of the organization. Strategic decisions are those important decisions that typically require a large amount of organizational resources, and firm’s environment consideration. In decisions, top management usually plays a central role, in making the decisions (Hofer & Schendel, 2008). These decisions influence organizational direction, administration, and structure (Christensen et al., 2002). Since decision not only affects the organization in which they are taken but also the society (Colignon & Cray, 2000), it is not surprising that decision-making process has been heavily researched (Amason, 2006). One stream of these researches has focused on the decision-making process and factors influencing the process. (Van Bruggen et al., 2008).

Decision-making is so important that none of the managerial functions can be performed without it (Trewatha & Newport, 2012). They argued that for management purpose, decisions are obviously required in planning, organizing, actuating and controlling. Plunkett and Attner (2004) suggested that, decision-making is an important part of managers’ job. A manager makes decisions constantly while performing managerial functions. But none of his activities is more important than making wise decision (Newman & Warren, 2007).

**Statement of the Problem**

Decisions can be costly or beneficial depending on the approach to the decision-making process used and the quality of the decisions made. The gravity of decision-making increases as one moves up the organization hierarchy. While the impact of erroneous decision making at the lower levels of the firm are at times costly, the situation could be more pronounced even catastrophic when the erroneous decision were made at a higher managerial level in the firm. In other words, the propagation of error made at the higher levels of management is more severe than at the lower levels of the firm. This then underscores the need to enhance decision making practices at the firm. Whereas most definitions of a decision practices start with the detection of
a problem, it is important to adopt a broader definition of the decision context, encompassing elements that exist and evolve even when the situation does not present exceptional events. However, for most organizations, the decision making practices are problem oriented rather than objective or goal oriented. This puts them in a reactive situation rather than proactive which often and limits the time and resources needed to solve the problems and also stifles strategic operations. Therefore, most decision making approaches adopted by firms lack this strategic element. However, there is scant literature on strategic decision making practices and firm performance and more so among construction firms. Consequently, not much has been done to evaluate the influence of strategic decision making practices on performance of construction firms which usually operate on limited resources and fixed timelines to achieve their objectives.

**General Research Objective**

The general objective of the study was to evaluate the influence of strategic decision making practices on performance of construction firms in Nakuru town, Kenya.

**Specific Research Objectives**

i. To examine how advocacy decision making practices influence performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

ii. To examine the influence of dialogic decision making practices on performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

**Research Hypotheses**

\( H_{01} \): Advocacy decision making practices do not significantly influence performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

\( H_{02} \): Dialogic decision making practices do not significantly influence performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

**THEORETICAL REVIEW**

The study was guided by two theories which include theory of planned behaviour and strategic choice theory.

**Theory of Planned Behavior**

TRA originally assumed that most behaviours of interest are those where the person has the resources, skills and opportunities to engage in their desired action. However, recognizing that this is often not the case, Ajzen (1988) proposed an extension of TRA – the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). This added a further dimension to TRA – that of perceived control over the
intended behaviour. Perceived behavioral control is influenced by internal factors (skills, ability, information, emotions) and external factors (opportunity to engage in the behaviour and the extent to which performing the behaviour depends on the cooperation of others). A person’s perceived behavioral control reflects his/her beliefs about factors that may inhibit or promote the performance of the behaviour. Perceived behavioral control is posited to have a causal influence on intentions, but actual behavioral control also has a direct influence on behaviour. Meta-analyses of studies applying TPB conclude that it accounts for considerable proportions of the variance in intentions across a range of behaviours (39-41 per cent) and a somewhat lower proportion of variance in behaviour (27-34 per cent) (Armitage & Connor, 2001; de Wit & Stroebe, 2004). TRA and TPB have been applied to a wide range of decisions about behaviours (for example, dealing in stocks and shares, smoking initiation, shoplifting, condom use, oral contraception, participation in exercise).

In line with the theory of planned behavior, managers of construction firms can employ perceived behavioral control which is influenced by internal factors such as skills, ability, information, emotions, and external factors like opportunity to engage in the behaviour and the extent to which performing the behaviour depends on the cooperation of others in analyzing views of stakeholders during decision making. The foregoing is bound to enable them come up with decisions that would optimally be beneficial to the firm’s performance.

**Strategic Choice Theory**

Strategic Choice Theory was developed when industrial relations in the U.S. were changing rapidly. Because most of the popular theories at that time were generated during periods of relative stability in U.S. industrial relations practice and consequently are overly static, they have difficulty explaining behavior when the basic parameters of the system appear to be changing. For example, Dunlop’s systems model was widely accepted in 1960’s and 1970’s. But there are some anomalies in the model. First, the model could not foresee the declines of union membership after that time. Rather conventional models assume that labor unions were a permanent participant in their employment relationships. Second, conventional models assume that there is a consensus ideology. But based on the models, we could not tell whether or not managerial values, strategies, and behavior in industrial relations were changed. Third, the traditional industrial relations models treat management as reacting to union demands, pressures, and initiatives. But there were many managerial initiatives and changes that affected the transformation in U.S. industrial relations and they have occurred within management. Therefore, they added a more dynamic component to industrial relations theory by developing the concept of strategy, or strategic choice. Then they tried to demonstrate that industrial
relations practices and outcomes are shaped by the interactions of environmental forces, union leaders, workers, and public policy decision makers (Kochan et al., 1984).

Strategic Choice Theory starts with consideration of relevant forces in the external environment that affects employment relationships. Changing external environment induce employers to make adjustment in their competitive business strategies. In making these adjustments, the range of options considered are filtered and constrained so as to be consistent with the values, beliefs, and philosophies engrained in the mind of key decision-makers. As choice are also embedded in particular historical and institutional structures, the range of feasible options available at any given time is partially constrained by the outcomes of previous organizational decisions and the current distribution of power within the firm and between it and any unions, government agencies, or other external organizations it deals with. Thus, industrial relations processes and outcomes are determined by a continuously evolving interaction of environmental pressures and organizational responses (Khakheli & Morchiladze, 2015). The relative importance of either the environment or the parties' responses can vary over time. Therefore, labor- or product market changes do not have independent effect or operate in a unique or deterministic fashion. Then, choice and discretion on the part of labor, management, and government affect the course and structure of industrial relations systems. Moreover, history plays an extremely important role in shaping the range of feasible strategic adaptations.

A three-tier framework helps identify an important development that existing industrial relations systems theory does not specifically address: the apparent inconsistencies and internal contradictions in strategies and practices occurring at different levels of industrial relations within firms. First, this framework recognizes the inter-relationships among activities at the different levels of the system and helps explain the origins of any prevailing internal contradictions or inconsistencies among three levels. Second, this framework considers the effects that various strategic decisions exert on the different actors in the system. The three-tier framework encourages analysis of the roles that labor, management, and government play in each other's domain and activities. The Strategic choice theory can be used guide the study in understanding how decisions made by the top management of construction firms are translated to strategy at all levels especially the shop level where they are executed.

EMPirical REVIEW
This section puts into perspective a review of past empirical studies on strategic decision making practices and performance particularly in construction firms. In particular, past studies on advocacy decision making practices and dialogic decision making practices in context of organizational performance are reviewed.
Advocacy Decision Making Practices and Organizational Performance

Advocacy decision making is where participants approach decision making as an event and a contest (Dumler & Skinner, 2007). Advocacy tends to be a closed process that focuses on a single alternative. Characteristics of the advocacy approach include: Hard “selling” of a project; Trying to win the case (like an attorney); No alternatives offered; instead a ‘go’ or ‘no go’ decision on one option is forced; Arguing the positives of the solution while downplaying the negatives; Making a compelling case and winning approval. The pitfalls of the advocacy approach are many and include: Reliance on one option precludes the chance to explore multiple solution alternatives; Disagreements can grow fractious and even antagonistic; Personalities and egos come into play and differences are resolved through battles of will and behind-the-scenes maneuvering; Each decision will inevitably produce winners and losers; The losers, to the extent they can, will continue fighting the decision long into the execution phase. This increases decision cycle time – the total time from the point a decision process begins to the time where the final decision is not only made, but fully executed and the benefits realized. The advocacy approach produces interpersonal conflict, which manifests itself in personal friction, rivalries and clashing personalities (Ehrgott, 2011).

The devil's advocacy decision-making technique is where an individual is allowed to become the critic in the proposed decision, that is, to contest a decision with the aim of bringing out its merits before it is adopted. The devil's advocate role is to ensure that the company does not make an expensive mistake and uncover any potential flaws with the options. According to Mui (2014), the devil’s advocacy, a technique for improving the quality of group decisions, introduces conflict into the decision-making process. The role of the devil's advocate is to cause discussion on the alternatives and point out any flaws or risks. For example, a design team is in total agreement that all choices will be amazing. The devil's advocate has provided a summary of the choices pointing out all of the issues. The service that the devil's advocate will provide will lead to a high-quality decision (Payne et al., 2003). The devil's advocate technique will also help eliminate any potential future issues or problems.

Janis suggests that this concept is an antidote for groupthink. Earlier, we noted that groupthink results in inhibitions and premature conformity to group norms. Devil's advocacy can nullify these and other group's phenomena to which group members are subjected. After a planning group has developed alternative solutions to a problem, the plan is given to one or more staff members, with instructions to find fault with it (Ehrgott, 2011). If the plan withstands the scrutiny of the devil's advocates, it can be presumed to be free of the effects of groupthink and thus viable (Corey, 2011). This procedure helps organizations avoid costly mistakes in decision making by identifying potential pitfalls in advance (Crosier & Schwenk, 2010). For
example, a construction design team proposes certain ideas about a forthcoming project that are quite convincing, although the design team agrees that the ideas are really cool, the devil's advocate points out the risks involved in each. This technique helps prevent groupthink and increases the chance of a high-quality decision. The biggest strength to using the devil's advocate technique is the ability to prevent groupthink, which is where members try to eliminate discord and agree on a decision even though it might not be the best alternative.

There are many potential disadvantages to group decision-making. Groups are generally slower to arrive at decisions than individuals, so sometimes it is difficult to utilize them in situations where decisions must be made very quickly. One of the most often cited problems is groupthink. Irving Janis, in his 1972 book Victims of Groupthink, defined the phenomenon as the "deterioration of mental efficiency, reality testing, and moral judgment resulting from in-group pressure." Groupthink occurs when individuals in a group feel pressure to conform to what seems to be the dominant view in the group (Corey, 2011). Dissenting views of the majority opinion are suppressed and alternative courses of action are not fully explored.

Research suggests that certain characteristics of groups contribute to groupthink. In the first place, if the group does not have an agreed upon process for developing and evaluating alternatives, it is possible that an incomplete set of alternatives will be considered and that different courses of action will not be fully explored. Many of the formal decision-making processes (e.g., nominal group technique and brain-storming) are designed, in part, to reduce the potential for groupthink by ensuring that group members offer and consider a large number of decision alternatives (Crosier & Schwenk, 2010). Secondly, if a powerful leader dominates the group, other group members may quickly conform to the dominant view. Additionally, if the group is under stress and/or time pressure, groupthink may occur. Finally, studies suggest that highly cohesive groups are more susceptible to groupthink. Group polarization is another potential disadvantage of group decision-making. This is the tendency of the group to converge on more extreme solutions to a problem. The "risky shift" phenomenon is an example of polarization; it occurs when the group decision is a riskier one than any of the group members would have made individually (Corey, 2011). This may result because individuals in a group sometimes do not feel as much responsibility and accountability for the actions of the group as they would if they were making the decision alone.

Although devil’s advocacy can be used as a critiquing technique after alternative solutions to a problem have been developed, it can also be used during the early stages of the decision-making process. For example, during a decision-making session one member could be assigned the role of devil’s advocate, expressing as many objections to each alternative solution to a problem as possible (Schweiger & Finger, 1984). Furthermore, it is a good idea to
rotate the job of devil’s advocate so that no single person or group develops a strictly negative reputation. Moreover, periodic devil’s advocacy role-playing is a good training technique for developing analytical and communication skills, as well as emotional intelligence (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2010). Other methods used by organizations to prevent groupthink include rotating in new group members, inviting attendance by outsiders, and announcing a temporary delay before the final decision is made to give organization members one last chance to identify and express their reservations (Newstrom, 2011). Numerous organizations use some form of devil’s advocacy (Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2011). Mui (2014) points out that it is important to commit to an explicit process rather than hope that tough questions will spontaneously emerge, and that has to be done at the beginning. Everyone has to agree on when a devil’s advocate will be involved, whether insiders or outsiders will play the role, and how the role will play out. If the organization waits until it is in the heat of a moment, when a critical decision is being made on a real, live innovation program, everyone will have chosen sides. Those who want the idea to proceed will resist a devil’s advocate, for fear it will slow or kill the project. Those who oppose the idea will insist on a devil’s advocate. Both sides will try to tilt the playing field in their favor. The only way to get everyone on board is to set the rules before anyone knows whether they’re for or against a particular project. The processes have to be specified in detail, too. As things stand, many companies like the theory of devil’s advocacy but never implement it.

**Dialogic Decision Making Practices and Organizational Performance**

Dialogic decision making or inquiry is a very open process designed to generate multiple alternatives, foster the exchange of ideas and produce a well-tested solution. Successful leaders know the preferred way to manage important decisions are the inquiry approach. Groups that employ the inquiry method consider a variety of options and work together to discover the best solution. While people naturally continue to have their own interests, the goal is not to persuade the group to adopt a given point-of-view, but instead to come to agreement on the best course of action (Postmes, Spears & Cihangir, 2001). Rather than suppressing dissension, an inquiry process encourages critical thinking.

Characteristics of the inquiry approach include: Framing decision objectives to create multiple solution possibilities; Making assumptions visible; Generating multiple alternatives; Evaluating each feasible alternative using appropriate analytical tools; Collaborating with others to work through differences of ideas, concepts and assumptions; Finding the best solution. The clear advantage of the inquiry approach is that it produces decisions of higher quality – decisions that not only advance the company’s objectives but also are reached in a timely
manner and can be implemented effectively. However, this approach requires a commitment from the leader and a discipline for managing the process (Krapohl, 2009).

There are several “indicators” that leaders can assess to determine if they are on the right track: Multiple alternatives – when many alternatives are considered, teams engage in more critical analysis and thought; Assumption testing – any method which makes assumptions visible is a superior approach. It helps the team confirm or challenge the assumptions, and act accordingly; Well defined criteria – this makes competing concepts, arguments and alternatives much easier to judge objectively; Dissent and debate – an inquiry based process facilitates cognitive conflict, where the goal is to express differences openly and challenge underlying assumptions, introduce new ideas and explore alternatives; Perceived fairness - this is the “procedural justice” in the decision process (Krapohl, 2009). If team members believe their views were listened to and considered – that they had an opportunity to influence the final decision, and that the process was fair, they are far more willing to commit to the outcome even if their views did not prevail.

While inquiry is an ideal, it is seldom met in practice. It is extremely difficult for individuals to discuss ideas or issues without expressing their opinions. A more realistic and effective technique for arriving at a decision is one that balances advocacy with inquiry. Group members leave their personal agendas behind and enter the meeting with the intention of acting as unbiased participants (Hendrickse, 2008). They may advocate for a position they feel strongly about, but they also inquire into other viewpoints and consider alternatives (Brown, 2004). They understand that the goal is to find the best solution for the group as a whole, even if it means that some individuals in the group might be negatively impacted by the decision. Generally, in well-balanced sessions, people share information freely and consider multiple alternatives.

**Performance of Organizations**

Rana, Arfan and Majid (2012) carried out a study on the impact of manager decision making styles on organizational performance in Pakistan. Study also investigated the moderating role of emotional intelligence on the relationship among decision making styles and organizational performance. Data was collected on random sampling basis from 187 banking sector employees. The findings of the study revealed that employee’s different decision making styles influenced organizational performance differently. The major findings of the study were that rational and dependent decision making styles have high positive impact on organizational performance while avoidant decision making styles has negative impact on organizational
performance. Study further determines that emotional intelligence moderates the relationship among decision making styles and organizational performance.

A study by Al Shra’ah (2015) found that organizational learning determines how a firm acquires, assimilates and exploits internal and external knowledge. The results of study also explained that the flexible and integrative DM styles facilitate the organizational learning through: The generation of new knowledge achieved through participation in decision making processes; The accumulation of knowledge gained through involvement and implementation of decisions; Participation in decision making processes prepares the transferring of new developments in science and technology; Participation in decision making processes improves leadership styles and capacities; The flexible and integrative DM styles facilitate horizontal and/or vertical forms of interaction among leaders in organizations through decision making processes. This means that an organizational learning is improving and building up through these two styles; Decision making is a tool of training of future leaders. Accordingly, the leaders' mentality is the strategic approach of survive and growth; and Organizational culture as a framework of learning processes forms the decision making styles. The study also explained that the decisive and hierarchic DM styles positively affect the organizational learning. However, these two styles decelerate the improvement of organizational learning. The decisive and hierarchic DM styles constrain the continuous improvement and innovation.

A study by Eisenfuhr (2011) indicated that decision speed is positively related to firm's performance. Khakheli and Morchiladze (2015) found that firm’s performance is negatively related to the extent of politicization of the decision-making process. In their study of organizational performance, Papadakis et al. (1998) suggested that return on asset is positively related to the extent of rationality/comprehensiveness and hierarchical decentralization in the decision-making process. This is in line with the results presented by Khakheli and Morchiladze (2015), who suggested that in high velocity environments, the greater the delegation the better the performance of the firm and also with that of Dean and Sharfman (1996) who found a positive relationship between decision-making effectiveness and the extent of rationality in the decision-making process but at the same time contradicts with some literature that found a negative relationship between firm’s performance and the extent of comprehensiveness in the decision-making process in unstable environment.

Organization slack, defined as a cushion of resources, helps organizations cope with environmental changes and unexpected events. In my literature review I could not find any empirical study relating slack to strategic decision-making process except the work of Sharfman and Dean (1997) that concluded a positive relationship between slack and flexibility in strategic
decision-making process and Nooraie (2007) who found positive relationship between organizational slack and the level of rationality in the strategic decision-making process.

**Conceptual Framework**
The study conceptualized in a conceptual framework is presented in a schematic interpretation explaining the relationship between the study variables. Figure 1 shows the perceived relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

```
Advocacy Decision Making Practices
- Individual decisions
- Group decisions
- Decision making team
- Independent decision making

Dialogic Decision Making Practices
- Consultation
- Viable alternatives
- Free thinking
- Decision making approaches

Independent Variables

Organizational Performance
- Service delivery
- Efficiency
- Profitability
- Performance evaluation

Dependent Variable
```

Figure 1 shows the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. In this study, certain variables describing the strategic decision making practices constituted the independent variables. The independent variables included advocacy decision making practices and dialogic decision making practices. Organizational performance was the dependent variable. It was presumed that the stated decision making practices influence performance of construction firms.
METHODOLOGY

Research Design
This research study employed descriptive survey design. According to Kombo and Tromp (2006) the major purpose of descriptive research is to describe the state of affairs as it exists. It is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. A survey design involves asking a large group of respondents’ questions about a particular issue (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). This design was chosen for the study because it is an effective method of collecting descriptive data regarding characteristic of a sample of population, current practices, conditions or needs over a wide area. The design was also appropriate because it enabled assessing the opinions and attitude on events of people and procedures. Therefore it was used to obtain from as many respondents as possible in the study area.

Target Population
The target population refers to members of a real or hypothetical people to whom a researcher wishes to generalize the results of the study (Gall, Borg & Gall, 2003). The target population of this study, therefore, comprised of management staff of construction firms in Kenya. The study (accessible) population which refers to the population that a researcher can access and is a subset of the target population constitutes the 936 management staff of 312 construction firms that are duly registered and active in Nakuru town. According to the County Government of Nakuru Register (2015), there were 312 such registered construction firms by the time the study was conducted.

Sample Size
A sample is a smaller group obtained from the accessible population and each member has equal chance of being selected to be a sample. It is also a finite part of a statistical population about the whole (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). The sample size was calculated using the formula by Nassiuma (2008) as follows.

\[ n = \frac{Nc^2}{c^2 + (N - 1)e^2} \]

Where,
\( n \) = sample size, \( N \) = population size, \( C \) = coefficient of variation (21≤C≤30%), and \( e \) = error margin (2≤e≤5%). In this study \( C \) was taken as 25%, \( e \) to be 3% and \( N = 936 \).
Therefore, fitting this into the formula:

\[
\begin{align*}
n &= 936 \times 0.25^2 \\
&= 0.25^2 + (936 - 1) \times 0.03^2 \\
n &= 64.71 \\
n &= 65 \text{ respondents}
\end{align*}
\]

The right sample size obtained from the above formula was thus 65 respondents.

**Sampling Technique**

The study used stratified random sampling method to sample the management and general staff of the construction firms in Nakuru town. The stratified sample not only represented the overall population, but also key subgroups of the population. The study population was stratified as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management staff</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Staff</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>936</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Instrument**

The study used primary data which were collected directly from the respondents using self-administered questionnaires. Questionnaire contained closed ended questions. It has quite a number of advantages which include: confidentiality; time saving; and reduced interviewer bias. Questionnaires also have the advantages of low cost, easy access, physical touch to widely dispersed samples (Fowler, 1993) and also the fact that the results are quantifiable. However, the use of questionnaires requires careful preparation as it could easily confuse the respondents, or discourage them, or simply fail to capture important information needed in the study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). This enabled the researcher to reduce both researcher and respondent biases.

**Pilot Testing**

The researcher administered the questionnaires to the actual respondents after pilot testing them for correctness and accuracy on 10 non-participatory respondent sample. Piloting was done amongst the management and supervisory staff of construction firms in Naivashatown.
Instrument Validity
Validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on the results. It is a measure of how well a test measures what it is supposed to measure. It is concerned with the accurate representation of the variables under study. It is influenced by systematic error in data. The study adopted content validity to show whether the test items represent the constructs and contents that the instrument is designed to measure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). In order to ensure that all the items used in the questionnaires are consistent and valid, the instruments were subjected to scrutiny and review by the assigned university supervisor. The items were rephrased and modified to avoid ambiguity before being used for data collection.

Instrument Reliability
Reliability is the measure of the consistency of the results from the tests of the instruments. It is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. Internal consistency method was employed by the study to check the reliability of the research instruments. This was done by calculating the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for all the variables of the study. According to Cronbach and Azuma (1962) a value of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient above 0.7 shows high internal consistency and thus deemed acceptable for study purposes. All the four study variables namely advocacy decision making practices, dialogic decision making practices, decision analysis practices and performance returned alpha coefficients greater than 0.7 and were as such considered reliable.

Data Collection Procedure
Both for legal and ethical considerations, the researcher will obtain a permit before embarking on the actual study. Permission to conduct this research will be obtained from the relevant authorities and targeted construction firms in advance. Care will be taken to ensure that the data is scored correctly, and systematic observations made. Primary data will be collected mainly utilizing quantitative and qualitative methods to obtain in depth information of the study variables. Every respondent will be approached through the management separately and handed the questionnaires to fill in his own time. The questionnaires will then be collected at a later date specified to the respondents.

Data Processing and Analysis
After retrieving the questionnaires from the respondents, the questionnaires will first be sorted and the data in them edited and then coded before being entered into the computer software, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24 for analysis. The data will then be
analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. The descriptive statistics which involves the use of frequencies and percentages will be used in the analysis to provide the basic characteristics of the data and central tendencies will be in form of meanwhile variation will be determined using standard deviation. Inferential statistics involving the use of correlation and multiple regression models will be used to determine the nature of the relationship between the variables. The following multiple regression model will be adopted.

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon \]

Where:

- \( Y \) represents Performance
- \( X_1 \) represents Advocacy Decision Making Practices
- \( X_2 \) represents Dialogic Decision Making Practices
- \( \beta_1, \beta_2 \) represents Regression Coefficients of Independent Variables
- \( \varepsilon \) represents Estimated Error of the Regression Model

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Response Rate**

The study involved a sample of 65 management and supervisory staff working with construction firms in Nakuru town. This implied that a total of 65 questionnaires were issued to the aforementioned respondents. Sixty-four questionnaires were filled and collected from the respondents. This was equivalent to 98.5% response rate. The very high response rate where only one respondent failed to return the filled questionnaire was founded on the fact that the questionnaires were administered by the researcher in person and explained to the respondents the importance of their participating in the study.

**Descriptive Analysis**

The descriptive findings in this section are presented in form of means and standard deviations. This is due to the fact that the data collected was categorical and on a Likert scale. The scale used had the values 1 to 5 representing level of agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The findings relate to advocacy decision making practices, dialogic decision making practices, decision analysis practices and performance of construction firms.

*Advocacy Decision Making Practices and Performance of Construction Firms*

The sampled managers and supervisors were asked to opine on issues regarding advocacy decision making practices in their respective firms. The results are displayed in Table 2.
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Advocacy Decision Making Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of our firm’s decisions are made by individuals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of our firm’s decisions are made using a group of selected persons</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a tendency of pushing through with a decision in our firm regardless of the outcome</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We often assign one member of the decision making team the role of criticizing every decision in order to assess its merits</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We try to encourage more independence in groups as opposed to group thinking</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-makers are voluntarily selected</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All decisions in our firm are made with the consent of all stakeholders</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study observed that respondents were in agreement (mean ≈ 4.00; Std Dev ≈ 1.000) that most of the firm’s decisions were made by individuals and also by a group of selected persons. Furthermore, respondents agreed (mean = 3.98; Std Dev = 1.120) that decision makers had a tendency of pushing through with decisions in the firms regardless of the outcome. It was also agreed (mean = 3.98; Std Dev = 0.968) that decision makers assigned one member of the decision making team the role of criticizing every decision in order to assess its merits. In addition, respondents concurred (mean ≈ 4.00; Std Dev ≈ 1.000) that decision makers were voluntarily selected and that all decisions in the firm were made with the consent of all stakeholders.

Respondents were also in agreement (mean = 3.91; Std Dev = 1.080) that independence of groups in decision making was encouraged as opposed to group thinking.

**Dialogic Decision Making Practices and Performance of construction firms**

In addition, the study assessed the respondents’ views concerning dialogic decision making practices in construction firms that they worked with. Table 3 shows the relevant findings.
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Dialogic Decision Making Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We often present proposals for a major decision in our firm and let every</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision maker go through it first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions in our firm are made after extensive consultation within</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We ensure that for every decision there is a viable alternative</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We encourage free thinking in decision making at the firm</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We often seek to balance our inquiry approach with other decision making</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of all parties in the organization are equally factored in decision</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers' opinions override views of other employees in decision making</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of the study as shown in Table 3 indicated that respondents strongly admitted (mean = 4.50; Std Dev = 0.617) that decision makers present proposals for major decisions in the firm and let every decision maker go through it first. It was also observed that respondents concurred (mean ≈ 4.00; Std Dev < 1.000) that decision makers ensured that for every decision there was a viable alternative and that the decision makers sought to balance the inquiry approach with other decision making approaches in the firm. In addition, respondents were in concurrence (mean = 4.09; Std Dev = 1.109) that free thinking in decision making in construction firms was encouraged. Furthermore, it was agreed (mean ≈ 4.00; Std Dev > 1.000) that strategic decisions in construction firms were made after extensive consultation within the organization and that opinions of all parties in the organization were equally factored in decision making. Respondents were, however, not sure (mean = 3.14; Std Dev = 1.468) whether managers’ opinions overrode views of other employees in decision making. It is evident that construction firms in Nakuru town largely made decisions based on dialogue between the concerned decision makers and stakeholders as supported by the respondents. This was perhaps because of inclusiveness of all concerned stakeholders in decision making.

**Performance of construction firms**

Respondents further gave their views on performance of construction firms that they worked with. Their opinions are summarized in Table 4.
Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Performance of Construction Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are experiencing better service delivery as a result of training in</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our efficiencies have improved as a result of our decision making</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have been able to predict performance well ahead of time and make</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all necessary contingency arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our analysis have enabled us to avoid making costly mistakes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our ventures are more profitable nowadays compared to the past due to</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhanced decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are able to measure and track performance easily</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our firm has been recording increased return on investment</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our firm has been recording increased return on assets</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to performance of construction firms and as shown in Table 4, respondents strongly concurred (mean ≈ 5.00; Std Dev< 1.000) that the firms have been experiencing better service delivery as a result of training in decision making and that they have been recording increased return on investment. Respondents were also in agreement (mean ≈ 4.00; Std Dev> 1.000) that construction firms were able to predict performance well ahead of time and make all necessary contingency arrangements, and that the firms were also able to easily measure and track performance.

The study participants, furthermore, admitted (mean ≈ 4.00; Std Dev< 1.000) that the firms’ efficiencies have improved as a result of decision making approaches and that those firms have been recording increased return on assets. It was also concurred (mean = 4.56; Std Dev = 0.639) that decision makers’ analyses have enabled the firm to avoid making costly mistakes. In addition, respondents admitted (mean = 4.37; Std Dev = 1.000) that the firms’ ventures were more presently profitable compared to the past due to enhanced decision making. It was observed that construction firms in Nakuru town have registered improved efficiency, service delivery and overall performance in the recent past. This could be attributed to quality decisions and strategies implemented by the construction firms.
Relationship between Advocacy Decision Making Practices and Performance

The study evaluated the relationship between advocacy decision making practices and performance of construction firms in Nakuru town. The relationship is indicated in Table 5 and further explained.

Table 5: Correlation between Advocacy Decision Making Practices and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Decision Making Practices</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.505**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The relationship between advocacy decision making and performance of construction firms was found to be positive, moderately strong and statistically significant (r = 0.505; p < 0.01) at 0.01 significance level. The results were interpreted to mean that the more the construction firms embraced advocacy decision making practices the greater their performance could be enhanced. It was observed that focusing on a single viable option carefully scrutinized by a decision maker during decision making process, followed by its implementation enhanced performance of construction firms.

Relationship between Dialogic Decision Making Practices and Performance

The construct of dialogic decision making practices was correlated against performance of construction firms in order to assess the direction, strength and significance of the relationship between the two study variables.

Table 5: Correlation between Dialogic Decision Making Practices and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogic Decision Making Practices</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.738**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the findings indicated in Table 5, it was noted that there existed a positive, moderately strong and statistically significant relationship between dialogic decision making and
performance of construction firms in Nakuru town ($r = 0.738; p < 0.01$). This meant that as construction firms adopted more dialogic decision making practices the greater the likelihood that the performance of those firms could be improved. Decisions made through extensive dialogue with all stakeholders, free thinking, weighing up of alternatives or options in the construction firms was noted to enhance the performance of the firms. Dialogic decision making was observed to be fundamental in the performance of the firms.

Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was employed in this section to determine the extent to which the various decision making practices under study (advocacy decision making practices, dialogic decision making practices and decision analysis practices) influenced performance of construction firms in Nakuru town, Kenya. The study examined the influence of strategic decision making practices, as characterized by advocacy decision making practices, dialogic decision making practices, decision analysis practices, on performance of construction firms by using multiple regression analysis. The results of the study as depicted in Tables 6, 7 and 8 are in form of correlation (R), coefficient of determination ($r^2$), analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression coefficients respectively.

Table 6: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.805^a</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.32940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Advocacy Decision Making Practices, Dialogic Decision Making Practices

As indicated in Table 6, the relationship between strategic decision making practices and performance of construction firms was found to be positive and strong ($R = 0.805$). This implied that as construction firms embraced more strategic decision making practices their performance was likely to be improved.

It was also noted that 63.1% variation in performance of construction firms (as indicated by $r^2= 0.631$) could be explained by strategic decision making practices. These results emphasized the importance of strategic decision making practices in performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.
According to the findings illustrated in Table 7, ANOVA results, the association between strategic decision making practices and performance of construction firms was observed to be positive and statistically significant (F = 36.851; p < 0.01). This implied that strategic decision making practices (advocacy decision making practices and dialogic decision making practices) were crucial to performance of construction firms.

The findings illustrated in Table 8 are in tandem with the following regression model.

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon \]

The above model is explained as follows.

\[ Y = 0.933 + 0.052X_1 + 0.374X_2 \]

The results captured by the model above imply that increasing advocacy decision making practices and dialogic decision making practices by 0.052 unit and 0.374 unit respectively while holding other factors (0.933) constant would result in an increase of performance of construction firms.
firms in Nakuru town by a single unit. The regression coefficient results shown in Table 8 further revealed that the influence of strategic decision making practices on performance of construction firms was positive and statistically significant \( t = 2.450; p < 0.05 \). Particularly, the influence of dialogic decision making practices on performance of construction firms was established to be significant \( t = 4.379; p < 0.05 \). Therefore, the second null hypothesis was rejected. Advocacy decision making practices, however, did not significantly influence performance of construction firms \( t = 0.554; p > 0.05 \). As such, the first null hypothesis failed to be rejected. It was observed that dialogic decision making practices were the most crucial elements of strategic decision making practices in as far as performance of construction firms in Nakuru town were concerned.

Hypotheses Testing

**Testing the First Null Hypothesis (H\(_{01}\))**

i. \( H_{01}: \) Advocacy decision making practices do not significantly influence performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

ii. \( H_{a}: \) Advocacy decision making practices significantly influence performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

iii. Hypothesis test results = \( (t = 0.554; p > 0.05) \).

iv. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected

**Testing the Second Null Hypothesis (H\(_{02}\))**

i. \( H_{02}: \) Dialogic decision making practices do not significantly influence performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

ii. \( H_{a}: \) Dialogic decision making practices significantly influence performance of construction firms in Nakuru town

iii. Hypothesis test results = \( (t = 4.379; p < 0.05) \).

iv. The null hypothesis was rejected

**Summary**

The study found that most of the construction firms’ decisions were made by individuals and also by a group of selected persons. It was also agreed that decision makers had a tendency of pushing through with a decision in the firm regardless of the outcome. Furthermore, respondents the study revealed that decision makers assigned one member of the decision making team the role of criticizing every decision in order to assess its merits. In addition, it was found that decision makers were voluntarily selected and that all decisions in the firm were
made with the consent of all stakeholders. It was further revealed that independence of groups in decision making was encouraged as opposed to group thinking. The relationship between advocacy decision making and performance of construction firms was positive, moderately strong and statistically significant.

It was strongly admitted that decision makers presented proposals for a major decision in the firm and let every decision maker go through it first. The study also observed that decision makers ensured that for every decision there was a viable alternative and that the decision makers sought to balance the inquiry approach with other decision making approaches in the firm. In addition, it was noted that free thinking in decision making in the firm was encouraged. Furthermore, it was agreed that strategic decisions in the firm were made after extensive consultation within the organization and that opinions of all parties in the organization were equally factored in decision making. It was not clear whether or not managers’ opinions overrode views of other employees in decision making. Further analysis indicated that there existed a positive, moderately strong and statistically significant relationship between dialogic decision making and performance of construction firms in Nakuru town.

CONCLUSIONS
The study concluded that construction firms in Nakuru town used advocacy decision making where firms pushed through with a decision regardless of the outcome. Advocacy decision making practices can be dangerous to a firm especially where alternatives are not sought or where a decision made by one person is accepted without proper critical analysis. The findings concurred with the observation by Dumler and Skinner (2007) that advocacy tends to be a closed process that focuses on a single alternative. The authors further observed that advocacy decision making practices are associated with personalities and egos coming into play and differences being resolved through battles of will and behind-the-scenes maneuvering. However, the study inferred that advocacy decision making enhanced performance of construction firms in Nakuru town though the influence was largely inconsiderable.

Dialogic decision making practices ensure that proposals are scrutinized by all decision makers, there are adequate and viable options to every decision made and that there are adequate consultations with concerned stakeholders before the final decision is made. The foregoing findings are in agreement with Brown’s (2004) assertion that individuals may advocate for a position they feel strongly about, but they also inquire into other viewpoints and consider alternatives. Construction firms in Nakuru town were noted to largely use dialogic decision making. The study inferred that dialogic decision making practices significantly influenced performance of construction firms in Nakuru town. It therefore becomes important for the firms
to strengthen their dialogic decisions making process in order to yield quality decisions that improve performance of the firms.

RECOMMENDATIONS
There are a number of recommendations that were put forward in respect of strategic decision making strategies and performance of construction firms. Firms are driven forward by the decisions and strategies adopted. The decisions can determine performance or even growth of the firms. It is recommended that where construction firms use advocacy decision making where a single option is selected, the option should be analyzed by all decision makers and stakeholders in order to assess its viability. Decisions and strategies made should be based on their sustainability, competitiveness and productivity.

Construction firms and other firms in general are advised to consider the opinions of all interested parties prior to arriving at decisions that are bound to have strategic effects on the operations of those firms. The foregoing is likely to avoid conflict among stakeholders and in particularly the implementers of decisions made and also the parties that are targeted to be impacted by those decisions. Dialogic decision making practices are important in mitigating any kind of resistant from sections of implementers of strategic decisions.

LIMITATIONS
The study was prone to a number of challenges. There are many registered construction firms in Nakuru town which operated briefcase business which implies that they did not have physical premises. This translated to increased difficulties in accessing the management staff working with these firms. To this effect, the researcher delimited the study to only the active construction firms with physical workstations. Moreover, some of the targeted respondents were skeptical to participate in the study. Relative to this challenge, they were assured that the study was for academic purpose and that the findings of the study would be shared with any interested party upon request. Given that the study targeted the management staff working with construction firms, it was quite hard to access them due to their relatively busy schedules. The researcher addressed this limitation by making appointments with the respondents prior to physically visiting their premises for data collection.

AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH
The study suggested various themes that ought to be investigated in Kenya in relation to strategic decision making practices and performance of firms. A study on strategic decision making practices and strategy implementation in large construction firms in Kenya should be
carried out. In addition, an investigation should be carried out to establish the determinants of performance of construction firms in Kenya. The role of management in enhancing organization performance in construction companies should also be carried out in order to ascertain the extent to which management contributes towards performance of the companies.
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