

**BUYER-SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIP IN KENYA'S PUBLIC
UNIVERSITIES**

FREDRICK OKUMU OTIENO

D61/81320/2012

**This research project is submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirement for the award of the degree of Master of Business
Administration, School of Business, and University of Nairobi**

NOVEMBER, 2016

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to God almighty my creator, who has given me strength, understanding, wisdom and knowledge throughout this journey. I also dedicate this work to my parents; Moses and Mary who have encouraged me all the way and whose encouragement have made sure that i give it all it takes to finish that which i had started. To my fiancée, my brothers and sisters who have been affected in every possible way by this quest. Thank you and may God Almighty bless you.

DECLARATION

I declare that this work has not been previously submitted and approved for the Award of a degree by this or any other University. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the project contains no material previously published or written by any other person except where due reference is made in the project itself.

Signature.....

Date.....

FREDRICK OKUMU OTIENO

D61/81320/2012

This project has been presented for examination with my approval as the University supervisor:

Signature

Date

MRS. NANCY MARIKA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Page
DEDICATION.....	ii
DECLARATION.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.1.1 Buyer-Supplier Relationship.....	2
1.1.3 Public Universities in Kenya	4
1.2 Research Problem.....	5
1.3 Research Objectives	6
1.4 Significance of the study	6
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Development of buyer -supplier relationship.....	9
2.3 Relationship spectrum.....	10
2.4 Relationship drivers.....	17
2.5 Critical Success factors for Buyer- Supplier Relationship.....	20
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	23
3.1 Introduction	23
3.2 Research Design.....	23
3.3 Target Population	23
3.4 Data Collection.....	24
3.5 Data Analysis	24
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION.....	25
4.1 Introduction	25
4.2 Response Rate	25
4.3 General Biodata.....	25
4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents	26
4.3.2 Age Category	26
4.3.3 Duration of stay in the Corporation	27

4.3.4 Average turnaround time for procurement process	27
4.3.5 Number of suppliers in the organizations' database	28
4.4 Relationship Kenya's Public Universities with Suppliers and the Level of Success.....	288
4.5 Critical Success Factors for a Strong -Buyer Supplier Relationship	30
4.5.1 Organization's long term strategic goals	32
4.6 Discussion	32
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
5.1 Introduction	35
5.2 Summary	35
5.3 Conclusion.....	36
5.4 Recommendations	37
5.5 Limitations of the study.....	37
5.6 Areas for Further Study.....	37
REFERENCES.....	38
APPENDIX I: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Response Rate.....	25
Table 4.2: Gender of the Respondents	26
Table 4.3: Age Category	26
Table 4.4: Duration of stay in the Corporation	27
Table 4.5: Average turnaround time for procurement process	27
Table 4.6: Buyer- Suppliers Relationship	28
Table 4.7: Buyer- Suppliers Relationship on the Level of Success	29
Table 4.8: Success Factors for a Strong -Buyer Supplier Relationship.....	30

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out to establish the effect of buyer – supplier relationships and in Kenya’s Public Universities. The study had two objectives, to establish the kind of relationship Kenya’s Public Universities have with their suppliers and to assess the extent of their performance and to establish critical success factors for a strong buyer-supplier relationship. The research design involved a cross sectional survey of 22 Chattered Kenya’s Public Universities. The Procurement Officers and Representatives of user departments in these twenty two public universities were the target sources of respondents of the researcher. Data was collected using a questionnaire that was administered through “drop and pick” method. Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze data. The findings are presented in tables. The study established that most Kenya’s Public Universities have been in existence for more than thirty years. The study confirmed that Kenya’s Public Universities had embraced the concept of buyer - supplier relationships as they had incorporated most buyer- supplier variables in their operations. It was also clear from the study that the buyer – supplier relationship variables of adversarial relationship, arm’s length relationship, transactional relationship, closer tactical relationship, single sourced relationship, outsourcing relationship, partnership and co-destiny. The study has confirmed that buyer – supplier relationships are very significant in enhancing the performance of organizations. Kenya’s Public Universities and other organizations should be advised to embrace the concept so that they can be able to reap the benefits of developing buyer – supplier relationships. By maintaining good relationships with their suppliers, Kenya’s Public Universities ensure that they perform well; they also help the suppliers themselves to perform well and also achieve their goals. The researcher recommends further research on the same topic but in other organizations other than Kenya’s Public Universities, both within the country and outside the country. This will help to establish whether the same effects will be found when the research is done on different organizations other than Kenya’s Public Universities. This will assist in providing concrete facts upon which reliable conclusions can be made.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Can organizations really have 'relationships' in the way people do? Most writers would acknowledge that hierarchical connections are not the same as interpersonal connections. Most business dealings are uneven and emotionless (Beverland and Lindgreen, 2013). In today's business surroundings, providers of merchandise or administrations can make a noteworthy commitment to a purchaser's execution in the ranges of value, conveyance, cost control and new item improvement. Therefore, compelling provider administration has turned into a basic issue for operations directors and what has been known as the "conventional" way to deal with purchaser - provider connections – where the principle centre is on value – can no longer convey an upper hand for something besides product parts. Along these lines, the path in which purchasers manage their providers has changed (Lamming, 2013).

Nowadays, supplier-buyer management is concerned with “organising the optimal flow of high-quality, value-for-money materials or components to manufacturing companies from a suitable set of innovative suppliers” (Goffin, 2007). The challenge for purchasers is to distinguish how to deal with their providers deliberately and successfully the significance of good provider - purchaser relationship has been perceived by a few creators (Becker, 2007; and Nachtweh, 2009). In any case, it has been found that driving edge store network administration practices and organization methodologies are not being embraced by many buyers (Friedrich et al., 2005).

Relationship can be seen on a continuum or range from low levels of force, commonality, co-operation and responsibility to abnormal amounts of each with an extensive variety of alternatives in the middle. Nobody sort of relationship is 'ideal', distinctive sorts of

relationship - far off and value-based or close and community oriented - might be suitable, contingent upon the circumstance and the gatherings included.

There is generally no point in investing in close relationship for low-value or one-off purchases, for example both the supplier and buyer will simply want to get the best deal from the transaction, 'without any strings attached'. However, high- investment purchases may require a high degree of mutual understanding and trust (Beverland & Lindgreen, 2013). An organization may seek to develop supply relationship with suppliers who are most potentially beneficial or profitable to the organization and therefore offer a good return on relationship investment, suppliers who present a potential risk to the organization which can be managed and minimised by close relationship and suppliers who offer realistic potential for deepening, on-going development and added value.

1.1.1 Buyer-Supplier Relationship

Relationship is the route in which at least two individuals, bunches, nations, and so on, converse with, carry on toward, and manage each other .An association is a social unit of individuals that is organized and figured out how to address an issue or to seek after aggregate objectives. All associations have an administration structure that decides connections between the distinctive exercises and the partners. Associations are open frameworks; they influence and are influenced by their surroundings.

Organizational relationship is a network of asset interdependencies. The "broadened endeavour" see incorporates providers, purchasers, sellers, clients, government offices and other outside associations that are basic to the achievement of the association (Tillquist, 2002). Associations search out associations with outside associations that give basic assets, for example, crude materials, work, and access to business sectors, particular aptitude and

learning. Regularly associations will structure their interior operations to safeguard access to the basic assets.

Business relationships have been defined very differently in the literature, ranging from “good business relationships are relationships customised to fit the appropriate position on a continuum of possible relationship styles” (Cooper and Gardner, 2013) to “inter organizational relationships are the relatively enduring transactions, flows, and linkages that occur among or between an organization and one or more organizations in its environment” (Oliver, 2000). This is a key difference between a relationship and a transaction - a single exchange between an organization and another party, such as a single purchase or exchange of information.

Relationships only develop when the focus shifts to plans for future interaction. Relationships also imply some kind of meaningful ties or links between the parties which may take various forms, (Hakansson and Snehota, *Developing Relationships in Business Marketing*, 2005). Actor bonds: Recurring contracts, interactions and communication between individuals in each firm, Activity links: Doing things together, Resource ties: The venture of assets, for example, time or fund in the relationship.

Business Relationships may differ broadly in the degree of their power, commonality, trust and duty. Scholars regularly allude to a relationship " range' stretching out from one - off a safe distance exchange toward one side to a long - term shared associations at the other. Cox's Stepladder of Contractual relationship describes a spectrum in order of increasing closeness and mutual dependency. Mark Moore (*Commercial Relationships*) describes a spectrum which mixes the type and closeness of the relationship with examples of purchasing approaches used - Particularly at the transactional and arms length end of the spectrum.

1.1.2 Public Universities in Kenya

Public procurement in Kenya has advanced to a deliberate and very much managed framework administered by the Public Procurement and Asset disposal Act, 2005. Preceding this, in focal Government it was administered by Treasury booklets in 1969, then the provisions manual of 1978, preceding the declaration of the exchequer and Audit (Public Procurement) Regulations, 2001. The Public Procurement and Disposal Act (2005), which was operationalized in 2007 connected to the acquisition of merchandise, works and administrations and in addition the transfer of benefits by open elements (Ngari, 2002).

The cabinet secretary in charge of treasury signed a new procurement law on 24th December, 2015, Public procurement and Asset Disposal Act, 2015, to be effective from 1st January, 2016. All public entities ought to comply with the new procurement law. The body tasked in Kenya to oversee Public procurement is the public procurement and regulation authority.

The initial move towards the presentation and advancement of college instruction in Kenya was embraced in 1961 when the then Royal College, Nairobi was lifted to college school status. The University College went into an extraordinary course of action with the University of London, which empowered it to get ready understudies for degrees of the University of London. Over the years several public universities have been established so as to meet the demand of higher education and research in various fields (Mutula, 2002).

Public University is a University established and maintained or assisted out of public funds; (Universities Standards and Guidelines, Commission for University Education, 2014). In Kenya, there are a total of twenty two fully fledged public Universities across the country. These Universities are built up through institutional Acts of parliament under the Universities Act, 2012, which accommodates the improvement of University instruction, the foundation, accreditation and administration of colleges. The interest for University training in Kenya

keeps on expanding and rivalry for get to rises every year another arrangement of applicants finish their optional or equal level of instruction. Interest for college instruction has prompted to the advancement of the college training segment therefore a need in the emerging economy. Stakeholders are increasingly becoming concerned about the quality of University education and hence need to ensure quality in all its process (Mbirithi, 2013).

Chacha (2002) contends that universities everywhere throughout the world should be described by quality, brilliance, value, responsiveness, productivity and adequacy in the arrangement of administrations, administration and administration of scarce assets. This can be achieved if stakeholders especially the suppliers are wholly involved in supply chain management and the relationship between the supplier and the buyer enhanced.

1.2 Research Problem

Universities as key learning institutions always strive to ensure minimal or zero disruption in its day to day operations. Like any other organization they too rely on suppliers for the provision of goods, services and works (Wangeci, 2013). For this reason, the kind of relationship the public universities cultivate with the suppliers can either make or break them. Quite often operations of public universities have come to a halt due to delay of supplies of critical items or worse still failure by suppliers to supply critical items required for day to day operations.

Korir (2015), Effect of buyer-supplier relationships on procurement performance: Evidence from Kenyan supermarket. The study concentrated on the effects of buyer-supplier relationship on procurement performance. The study did not determine the best kind of relationship to help improve performance of both buyers and suppliers. This study was purely conducted on firms belonging to the private sector whose governance is very different from those of the public sector.

Musodza Melody 2009, Buyer-supplier relationships in the Zimbabwean tobacco industry. The study concentrated on the nature of relationships in the Zimbabwean tobacco industry. The study did not establish the level of performance for each kind of relationship. It's therefore imperative that a study is conducted to evaluate the extent to which the buyer-supplier relationships are working to derive value.

Ayca Kuman, (2014) Buyer -supplier relationships in the Turkish automotive industry. The study was done on a developed country. The scenario in developed nations and emerging economies are totally different, hence the need to carry out a study in buyer-supplier relationship in public universities in Kenya, which is an emerging economy.

The study sought to add to the existing body of knowledge in this area by investigating the kind of relationship Kenya's public Universities have with their suppliers of goods, services and works and what they ought to do in order to improve their relationship with suppliers.

1.3 Research Objectives

- a) To establish the kind of relationship Kenya's Public Universities have with their suppliers and assess the extent of their performance.
- b) To establish critical success factors for a strong buyer-supplier relationship

1.4 Significance of the study

The research may be a noteworthy endeavour in stimulating good buyer -supplier relationship in Kenya's Public Universities. It may also be beneficial to the students and practitioners of Procurement and supply chain management when they apply the findings and recommendations therein in their studies and work place respectively

Moreover, this research provides endorsements on ways to improve buyer-supplier relationship in Kenya's Public Universities in accordance to supply chain management.

The study may also be helpful to the retail industry and businessmen who interact with the Public Universities. It may help in training and informing them in the area of buyer-supplier relationship and how to improve and sustain a good relationship with their customers.

The study may also serve as a future reference for researchers on the subject of buyer - Supplier Relationship.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In the course of the last twenty (20) years the exploration on between firms relationship has been blasting. This developing group of writing spins around the possibility that worldwide rivalry is making business excessively perplexing and excessively costly for one firm, making it impossible to do it all alone. The far reaching conviction that organizations need to concentrate on their capabilities (Prahad and Hamel, 2000) has prompted to an outsourcing pattern and an expanded consciousness of the significance of a focused supply base. Particular provider met works are by and large thought to be a critical wellspring of upper hand (Dyer, 2006).

Different supplier-relationships offer distinctive advantages to purchaser firms. Also, provider connections change while they create. Contemplating the way of buyer-supplier relationships ought to along these lines incorporate the examination of their advancement after some time (Ellam 2008). The way of purchaser provider relationship is changing from arm's-length connections to close associations. This change recommends that solitary or double sourcing will be more normal. With nearer contacts to providers, the writing additionally demonstrates that the data trade will be expanded. Regardless of the creating way of supplier-buyer relationships, it is apparent that there has been relatively little empirical research on supplier -buyer relationship in Kenya.

There is requirement for purchasers to have a decent association with its significant providers and go for giving most extreme thoughtfulness regarding the relationship to keep up it and upgrade upper hand consequently enhance production network administration (Korir 2015). In perspective of production network administration objectives it is key to characterize what

constitute purchaser provider relationship. While others have taken a gander at the issue of connections singularly; for example provider relationship (Gadde and Snehota, 2000; Nyamasege and Biraori, 2015). Others creators have investigated client relationship (For instance Choy et al, 2013). With the expanding worldwide rivalry there is have to inspect the issue commonly, consolidate these structures buyer and supplier (O'Toole and Donaldson, 2012)

2.2 Development of buyer -supplier relationship

Inquire about on store network administration has given numerous models that portray the way of between firm connections in the production network. In the writing there is a solid conviction and a general accord that organizations require an assortment of connections, while no broad "best" kind of relationship exists (Young and Wilkinson, 2007, Gadde and Snehota, 2000). Comprehensively, two stands in the writing can be recognized, one focussing on "grouping" models, the other receiving an improvement point of view on connections.

A few creators presented different typologies for the grouping and administration of purchaser provider connections. Understood illustrations are portfolio models (Kraljic, 1983), relationship sort grids (Krapfel, 2001), association models (Lambert, 2006), straightforward level structure models, and market-various levelled administration approaches (Williamson, 1975, 1985 and 2001).

Every one of these models have in like manner that they concentrate on the condition of a relationship at one particular point in time (Ellam 2008). Clearly, purchaser provider connections create after some time. The above - specified models and methodologies neglect to join such an existence cycle component as in they don't take into account or incorporate any key change starting with one sort of relationship then onto the next.

Toward the beginning of the '90s, relationships required a much more noteworthy level of association due to the additional requirement for item advancement and participation in mechanical improvements – and this abnormal state of collaboration is termed partnership (Lamming, 2013). Tragically, it is misty how precisely organizations vary from different types of relationship. Lemke's (2013) investigation of the characteristics of organizations was an uncommon experimental examination of this territory.

From a hypothetical perspective, the contrast between, customary arm's-length connections and associations is clear – organizations are nearer than different sorts of relationship (Ellram, 2001; Lambert, 2006; Lemke, 2013; Macbeth, 2008). This is a direct result of the unique way of most meanings of connections makes them hard to operationalize.

In America, suppliers had customarily been managed at arm's-length and it is accounted for this is still a typical approach today, even in purported associations (Ellam 2008). Another conclusion, be that as it may, may be that analysts have not yet distinguished the basic measurements of associations. Likewise, there is the solid probability that administrators' understandings of association are not the same as those of specialists. Bolster for this view originates from New and Payne's (2005) exploratory work, which showed an extraordinary assorted qualities of translations of association among chiefs. Along these lines, it can be reasoned that association is as of now an obscure idea and investigating provider producer connections from the manager's point of view is both convenient and significant.

2.3 Relationship spectrum

Adversarial relationship; adversarial approach to relationship was first suggested by Porter (1985) on maximizing bargaining power while minimizing reliance on providers. Doorman (1985) contended that so as to keep up bartering power , the buyer ought to source from

numerous providers, confer transient contracts with providers, impart no data to providers and make no change recommendations to (or from) suppliers (Wangeci 2013).

Saunders (2007) lists various factors that characterize the traditional (adversarial) nature of relationship between the buyer and supplier in a supply exchange. Antagonistic relationship is advanced when they work at a manageable distance with correspondence did in a formal way rather by individual contact. In an ill-disposed relationship, picks up by one of the gatherings are to the detriment of the other party.

Leenders and Flynn (2005) argue that, a conventional association with suppliers is one that utilizations transient contracts construct essentially in light of cost and that organizations switch between customary providers all the more much of the time looking for the best cost and may have an a safe distance, ill-disposed association with them. Shapiro (2004) additionally agrees with antagonistic view referring to that value-based connections are usually utilized where provider connections essentially serve to encourage the trade procedure and satisfy the agreement prerequisites. Kaufmann and Stern (1988) remarked that in monetary hypothesis, reliance is customarily viewed as something negative, hindering business sector powers to act in the most effective way, organizations ought to streamline and safeguard dealing power by being autonomous.

In an adversarial relationship buyer and supplier are adversaries or segments. Each is endeavouring to acquire advantage at the other's cost (Ellam 2008). There is little trust, correspondence or co-operation, and there might be open clash or compulsion in the quest for influence. The potential for ongoing future transactions is not taken into account.

Arm's Length Relationship; an arm's length is a distant impersonal relationship where the buyer does not need close, frequent or collaborative access to the supplier. Purchases are generally infrequent and of low volume and value, so investment in closer relationship is

unjustifiable. Impersonal efficient multi sourcing methods are used. An arm's- length relationship is one between unrelated persons each acting in their own self-interest. It entails little speculation, scarcely any data sharing and constrained connection between organizations. Additionally on the low side are trust and responsibility. Connections at this stage are short term, contract based and ill-disposed, with a few providers contending where the cost is the superseding element. At this level, organizations can without much of a stretch change accomplice and proficiently perform routine assignments (Lenoble, 2013).

Transactional relationship is the most well-known and the most fundamental kind of buyer/supplier relationship. There is almost no trust in this relationship and could be an onetime exchange between the buyer and supplier. There are once in a while enormous investment funds made in this sort of relationship and it normally requires next to no investment and exertion by either gathering to proceed with an assertion. At the point when connections like this are included it is generally a thing that is not inconvenient to the organization, and it is not as basic in the event that they come up short on the thing or the shipment is late. One of the focal points to having a value-based relationship is the lower aptitudes level of acquirement staff required. There is additionally less buying time and exertion put into deciding a cost for the thing that they are attempting to buy. This implies cost is not so much a major concern since it is typically consulted to be some place around the market value standard. Value-based connections have more normal dealings set up with a provider however are still sharp regarding multi-source, one-off business exchanges as opposed to relationship (Blevins, 2013).

Closer Tactical Relationship; the buyer tries to secure quality and progression of supply notwithstanding cost productivity , and along these lines looks to cultivate a level of common obligation in an ongoing relationship with selected, reliable suppliers (Swaminathan, 2012).

Single Sourced Relationship; single source partnerships are the place one firm administrations all the asset requirements for an outsourcing firm in a specific administration area. A case of a solitary source organization together is organization A, giving all the talented work administrations expected to work organization X's shore base offices (Ellam 2008). A case of a different source collusion is organization A, giving all generation administrator ability sets for all organization X's shore bases with organization B giving all welding administrations, and organization C giving crane working administrations. The principle disadvantage of single-source unions is that the sourcing firm might not have different providers to fall back on if the collusion accomplice neglects to perform or leaves business (Swaminathan, 2012).

In a single sourcing arrangement the client can look to the provider as a solitary purpose of disappointment of service delivery, notwithstanding when the provider has subcontracted. In principle, this model causes the provider to pick its subcontractors precisely, on the grounds that it is in charge of the subcontractor's execution or disappointment. There is a strong element of responsibility in single

Outsourcing Relationship; outsourcing can be defined as "the key utilization of outside assets to perform exercises customarily took care of by inside staff and assets". In some cases referred to likewise as "facilities management", outsourcing is a methodology by which an association contracts out significant capacities to specific and proficient administration suppliers, who get to be esteemed business accomplices (Ellam 2008). Organizations have constantly enlisted temporary workers for specific sorts of work, or to level-off pinnacles and troughs in their workload, and have framed long haul associations with firms whose capacities supplement or supplement their own (Hanfield, 2014). In any case, the contrast between just supplementing assets by ""subcontracting"" and real outsourcing is that the last includes significant rebuilding of specific business exercises including, frequently, the

exchange of staff from a host organization to a master, normally smaller, organization with the required core abilities.

Organizations outsource so as to : diminish and control working expenses, enhance have organization core, access world-class abilities, free inner assets for different purposes, share risk with partner organizations, utilize time efficiently if an activity consumes a lot of time, allocate resources efficiently; where there are insufficient resources. Fundamental elements impacting effective outsourcing include: understanding organization objectives and destinations, vital vision and plan, selecting the right merchant, progressing administration of the connections, appropriately organized contract, open correspondence with influenced people, senior official support and association, watchful consideration regarding individual issues, transient budgetary avocation (Mutua, 2009).

An association chooses a supplier to deliver goods or services beforehand produced in-house consenting it to (a) Focus its resources on its own core competencies and (b) access external expertise and resources that will enable the requirement to be met more efficiently or competitively than was possible in-house . An even higher level of trust, commitment and collaboration is required to ensure that standards are maintained (Blevins, 2013).

Partnership Relationship; conventional obtainment techniques which incorporate forceful offering and transaction have frequently brought about absence of trust, low quality, awful administration and firm costs. Lewis (2005) affirmed that if every part of the production network considers itself to be a financial specialist these results won't show up. He promote demonstrates that working co-operatively with the provider helps an association to amplify their advantages and contends that the co-operation between the buyer and provider' "unleash a limit with regards to development that far exceeds the transient investment funds offered by

a safe distance aggressive offering". In this way the point of association sourcing is to accomplish more noteworthy advantages through great provider purchaser connections.

Association sourcing is a component of focused methodology of an association and is produced and actualized with the goal to give benefits (Sadler, 2013). The point of an effective association is decreasing stock times, shortening lead times, accomplishing a more prominent adaptability, enhancing the income and bringing down the managerial costs (Ellam 2008). Furthermore this approach means to nature of data and its stream which prompts to fruitful long haul arranging, advancement and mechanical improvement. Be that as it may, associations won't work unless the impediments and conceivable issues are analyzed and dealt with the way they ought to be. Drivers of success for partnership relationship include: commitment and loyalty and trust (Belinda, 2010).

Supply chain partnerships are resource- concentrated investments, which include both budgetary and key dangers. Duties in these connections have a tendency to be higher; the accomplices have a tendency to create joint exercises in numerous capacities; operations frequently cover; and relationship regularly causes considerable changes in every accomplices' association. Basic buyer-supplier relationship may advance into more formal organization after some time as duty between the purchasing and providing form into upgraded joint effort in making new esteem for their definitive clients (Ellam, 2008). Then again, declared organizations shaped with a great deal of official and media consideration can swim into conventional purchaser provider relations. Shockingly, a couple thinks about have investigated the correct nature and importance of store network organizations (Lemke, 2013). The meanings of inventory network association utilized as a part of most studies concentrate on what they accomplish (Landeros, 2005) or rather dubious ideas, for example, "meeting of psyches", as opposed to recognizing particular qualities (Bharat, 2006).

Research into partnership alliances has tended to, as an element of continuation, relationship life span (versus disintegration), and the fulfilment of every accomplice, and has likewise tended to the reasons that organizations go into and stay in close business relationship (Mohr and Spekman, 2004). Association collusions are a pivotal relationship in the inventory network setting, which incorporates all players from both the market side, including retailers, wholesalers and merchants, and the supply side, including providers, sellers and strategic (Ryu II, 2009).

Co-Destiny Relationship; global rivalry and fast mechanical change are encouraging an enormous rebuilding crosswise over ventures. Generally, vast partnerships vertically incorporated various phases of industry bind from crude materials to definite item conveyance prompting to expanded direct control over operations, additionally making cumbersome aggregate structure all the while. Amid the 2000s, conversely, a quickly developing number of firms are switching this procedure, going into a progression of partnerships with different associations as a component of their methodology to lower overhead expenses, get new advancements, increment responsiveness to clients, enter new markets and, when all is said in done, upgrade their adaptability. A significant number of these organizations are scaling back to their centre capabilities, delayering administration progressive systems and deliberately outsourcing an extensive variety of exercises (Johnston and Lawrence, 1988).

An expanding number of associations are getting to be, as a result, multi-hierarchical in nature involving a nexus of associations with local and outside and remote firms. The subsequent thought of authoritative systems generally gatherings of associations. It's a considerably nearer relationship in which purchaser and provider interface their organizations together deliberately for long - term shared advantage (Ryu II, 2009)

2.4 Relationship drivers

Relationship Drivers are key qualities or values which build relationships. They are the main reasons which make two parties want to engage in a relationship (Lacey, 2007). Quality of Interaction; this is represented by customer service encounters. The relationship relies on upon the providers capacity reliably to satisfy client desires and to make a positive ordeal of working together, at each experience and touch point with the association (Antai, 2013).

Trust is normally characterized as ability to go for broke and a readiness to depend on a trade accomplice in whom one has certainty. Be that as it may, in numerous exploration works, trust has been all the more generally operationalized as "" saw reliability" or certainty (Moorman et al., 2007). Trust exists when one gathering has trust in trade accomplices' dependability and trustworthiness (Morgan and Hunt, 2004). Certainty however varies from trust since trust requires a presence of past engagement on a man's record, perceiving and tolerating that hazard (Luhman, 2008). Maister (2000) introduced four stages driving trust in business relationship; validity, dependability, closeness and an absence of self-introduction.

Trust incorporates the sub-dimensional develops, for example, genuineness, consideration and skill (Dyer and Chu, 2000). Trust, accordingly ,alludes to an association's desires that their accomplices will act to profit their organizations advantages paying little heed to their capacity to screen such conduct.

Beccerra and Gupta (2010) arranged both key negative outcomes of absence of trust and key positive results from high-trust connections. Relating to negative perspectives coming about because of an absence of trust, they watched development of higher exchange cost and office cost in low-trust connections. For example, a chief's opportunity and vitality went through on managing low-trust connections are higher than those went through on managing higher-trust connections. Conversely, an organization with high-trust would appreciate open

correspondence and ability to go out on a limb (Anderson and Narus, 2012). Individuals in high trust-connections are not hesitant to share all data and have faith in the data they get. Besides, more noteworthy readiness to go out on a limb happens past imparting data to high trust connections. They likewise showed that the general execution will be upgraded if the issues of doubt were diminished. It is fundamental to the accomplishment of production network connections. It diminishes the danger of working together, and backings shared interest in the relationship.

Transparency; it's the ability to share data. It relies on upon trust, since data can be abused: used to the benefit of one gathering at the others cost. Straightforwardness underpins a relationship by empowering a shared comprehension of both sides' needs, concerns and potential commitments. It's the basis of collaboration (Olson, 2013).

Eggert and Helm (2013), consider relationship straightforwardness as the subjective view of feeling educated about the significant activities and properties of the other party in the communication. They show that relationship straightforwardness includes giving data about vital business attributes, for example, specialized capacities and relationship climate. Relationship straightforwardness can minimize the apparent need to always hunt down better options and add to fulfilment, relationship responsibility, suggestion and upper hand.

Commitment; it's the intention or desire of one or both sides to proceed in a relationship, and to put resources into looking after it. On the off chance that gatherings are focused on the relationship, they are more likely to be loyal and reliable and to contribute to shared goals - over and above mere compliance with contract terms or basic expectations (Colbert and Kwon, 2010). Commitment is therefore important for adding value and minimising risk, especially in long-term supply chain relationships.

Dyer and Chu (2010) states that any persisting business exchanges among inventory network accomplices require responsibility between two gatherings with a specific end goal to accomplish their normal production network objectives. Without responsibility, business connections and consequent exchanges get to be delicate and defenceless. In like manner, continuing responsibility is an essential prerequisite for effective production network execution.

Dimensions of supply chain commitment include; top administration responsibility (without top administration duty the distance to the CEO, the vision required for store network achievement can't rise), wide based practical responsibility - (Supply chain supervisors are completely subject to other utilitarian chiefs inside the firm), Channel Commitment (Supply chain advantage requires responsibility past the dividers of the association) (Fawcett, 2006).

Co-operation and Collaboration; joint effort in a production network identifies with the ability of at least two self-sufficient firms to work successfully together, arranging and executing store network operations toward shared objectives (Cao, 2010). Collaboration between organizations is the fundamental notion of supply chain risk management practices; the literature on supply chain resilience lacks empirical insights beyond the single company perspective.

As most supply chain disruptions (58 percent) occur at the first- tier supplier (Business Continuity Institute, 2013) and the fact that "suppliers are the companies number one worry" in terms of risk sources (Blackhurst, 2011), buyer-supplier collaboration is of particular interest for investigations on supply chain resilience (Christopher and Peck, 2004).

Collaboration fosters relationships. Buyers and Suppliers can work together to add value, to mutual benefit, in supply chains and networks of alliances. Although supply chain collaboration brings about many benefits such as higher visibility, flexibility and reduced

lead times, it might not always be possible. Reducing the impact of any disruptions in the supply in the supply chain presents a clear business need and convergence of interests (goal congruence). Nevertheless, how to collaborate and what collaborative activities are important remains unclear.

Contending supply chains that oversee through coordinated effort to incorporate free market activity, convey altogether enhanced execution, and advantage yet assist from nearer connections that themselves cultivate more open doors for more prominent change (Barrat, 2006).

Mutuality; mutuality refers to as exchange or reciprocity. They express the idea that both parties gain some benefit from the relationship, and ideally share the benefits and risks of the relationship fairly between them (Sahay and Mohan 2006).

2.5 Critical Success factors for Buyer- Supplier Relationship

One of the acquiring capacity's fundamental destinations is to keep up a system of able suppliers. However numerous buyers see their provider's execution as ailing in the basic territories of value and cost change, conveyance execution, new innovation selection, and money related wellbeing (Beverland and Lindgreen, 2013). As today's organizations concentrate on their centre skills, they turn out to be more reliant on their providers to meet continually expanding rivalry. To contend in their particular markets, purchasing firms must guarantee that their providers' execution, abilities and responsiveness breaks even with, or outperforms that accomplished by the purchasing company's rivals. In this way making purchasing firms effectively encourage provider execution and capacity enhancements through provider advancement (Ellram, 2007).

Routroy and Kumar (2013), identified the critical success factors as: Long haul key objectives; it demonstrates the equal common acknowledgment of every one's exertion for

upgrading supplier ability in key points of view. It additionally guarantees win - win environment amongst maker and provider. There ought not be any equivocalness with respect to long haul vital objectives amongst maker and supplier for successful usage.

Top management Commitment; top administration responsibility is essential for growing long-term buyer-supplier relationship. It requires venture which might be as far as foundation, innovative work, preparing, and, and so forth. It can't be turned around in short notice. The long haul relationship requires duty from both producer and provider included and is a key empowering agent in starting a program in light of the organizations' aggressive methodology.

Incentives; the impetus is a way to deal with empower and perceive the supplier' distinctive endeavours in a deliberate way to improve the supplier execution. It depends on shared understanding of both producer and provider (Anderson and Narus, 2012). The maker ought to create proper motivating force procedure for actualizing and empowering programs effectively. These motivations might be through sharing of accomplished cost sparing, expanded volume of business and affirmation of future business however not restricted to.

Supplier's supplier condition; the supplier shifts a large number of his attempts to its supplier in assembling environment and it is completed supplier end (Beverland and Lindgreen, 2013). The provider condition as far as specialized capacity, budgetary steadiness, notoriety, conveyance time execution, quality execution, adaptability execution and so on assumes a noteworthy part on providers' capacity/ability. The better capacity of providers' provider condition pulls in a buying organization.

Proximity to the buying organization; the juxtaposition of the supplier to the buying organization prompts to decrease in acquirement lead time and upgrade of its unwavering quality (Beverland and Lindgreen, 2013). The providers' vicinity helps in physically getting

to its exercises and activities by purchaser effortlessly. It additionally makes a mental weight on provider for keeping up the quality gauges of the segments/parts/administrations.

Supplier certification; the supplier confirmation whether by buyer or an outer source dependably gives more certainty for buyers to proceed with business with supplier. It is likewise a stage for the purchaser to express his desire to the provider. The accreditation endeavours is a standout amongst the most imperative requirements before undertaking operational information exchange exercises, for example, site visits and provider training (Modi and Marbet, 2007). The inspirational demeanour of supplier for affirmation is constantly valued and energized by the buyer.

Innovation Capability; the creative abilities of provider not just incorporate customary skills in Research & Development and item/handle additionally advancement steady capacities and administrative practices (Beverland and Lindgreen, 2013). The supplier imaginativeness has constantly positive effects on purchaser execution over different measurements and is constantly valued by the purchaser. Thusly, the providers ought to have great creative state of mind and capacities with a specific end goal to contend effectively in the commercial centre.

Information Sharing; buyer and supplier ought to successfully convey to each other through applicable and nitty gritty data sharing on continuous premise to maintain a strategic distance from the data bending and upgrade inventory network coordination. The data sharing capacity requires appropriate equipment stage at both finishes. It additionally needs shared trust between the buyer and supplier.

Environmental readiness; the natural status demonstrate the present green capacity; level of willingness towards improving the green capacity in various headings in future and performance estimation framework for observing the green performance.

CHAPTER THREE:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The study is of experiential nature and intends at identifying and quantifying buyer -supplier relationships from the buyers' perspective. In the first place by taking the everyday experience of master acquiring specialists. Secondly the study presents survey data on a scope of relationship qualities with respect to the distinguished phases of relationship improvement.

3.2 Research Design

The sort of research that was utilized as a part of this study is Qualitative research and quantitative research. Qualitative analysts' mean to assemble an inside and out comprehension of human conduct and the reasons that represent such conduct. The train examines the "why" and "how" of basic leadership. Other than this, the specialist additionally inspected the marvel through perceptions in numerical representations and through factual investigation. Alongside surveys that were offered out to respondents for the measurable representation of the discoveries in the study, interviews with the respondents.

3.3 Target Population

The whole population was utilized as a part of this study to get a more logical result that was utilized to speak to the whole of the populace. A rundown of all public universities in Kenya was acquired from the Government of Kenya, Ministry of Education, and Science & Technology. All the twenty two Public Universities were surveyed. The Procurement Officers and Representatives of user departments in these twenty two public universities were the objective wellsprings of respondents of the scientist. The University administration was reached to acquire a verbal agree to manage the survey to staff at their establishments. A

letter of agree was sent to them alongside a specimen duplicate of the poll that was utilized, and additionally the convention of the researcher.

3.4 Data Collection

Data collection was done during the institutions working days of Mondays to Friday. A questionnaire was cast-off to gather information. The questionnaire requires information about the type of relationship the institution has with its suppliers Proclamations that are supposed to be features that effect good /bad buyer- supplier relationship were presented. The description of the type of desired buyer -supplier relationship was also presented.

3.5 Data Analysis

The data was analysed using descriptive statistics. The questionnaires were edited for accuracy, consistency and completeness. The data was analyzed according to the study objective. Each questionnaire was coded and data entered in SPSS Version 21.0. Objective 1 was measured using descriptive measure.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The section presents the findings of the study, data analysis and interpretation as set out in the research methodology. The aim of the research was to identify the buyer-supplier relationship and performance in Kenya's Public Universities.

4.2 Response Rate

The target population comprised of 66 Procurement Officers and Representatives of user departments in these twenty two public universities. Table 4.1 indicates that out of the 66 questionnaires administered, 60 responded, which gave a response rate of 90.90% that was found adequate for the analysis. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2013) the statistically significant response rate for analysis should be at least 55%. The collected data was mainly qualitative but quantifications were made where possible, thereby using both descriptive statistics and content analysis to analyze the data.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Responded	60	90.90
Did not respond	6	9.10
Total	66	100.00

Source: Researcher (2016)

4.3 General Biodata

These are the general demographic information. Respondents were asked about their Gender, age category, age of the organization, duration they have worked for the organization as well as average turnaround time for procurement process.

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents

The study wanted to determine the gender characteristics of the respondents. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.2

Table 4.2: Gender of the Respondents

Gender of the Respondents	Frequency	Percent
Male	44	73.3
Female	16	26.7
Total	60	100.0

Source: Researcher (2016)

From the findings, 73.3% of the respondents were male while 26.7% were female. The above finding reveals that the respondents were both male and female though majority of the respondents were female.

4.3.2 Age Category

The study sought to establish the age of the respondents. The findings were as shown in Table 4.2

Table 4.3: Age Category

Age Bracket	Number of Employees	Response Rate (%)
18-25 years	7	11.7
26-33 years	16	26.7
34-41 years	20	33.3
Above 42 years	17	28.3
Total	60	100

Source: Researcher (2016)

From the findings, it was established that 11.7% of the respondents are aged between 18 and 25 years, 26.7% of the respondents were aged between 26 and 33 years, 33.3% were at an age bracket of between 34 to 41 years, the other population consisted of respondents above the age of 42 years (28.3%). This shows that majority of the sampled respondents were young people mostly below 40 years of age. This is the most active segment of the population.

4.3.3 Duration of stay in the Corporation

The study wanted to determine the duration at which the respondents have been at the Corporation. The findings were as shown in Table 4.4

Table 4.4: Duration of stay in the Corporation

Age Bracket	Number of Employees	Response Rate (%)
1-10 years	48	80
11 -20 years	9	15
21-30 years	3	5
Total	60	100

The study established that most of the respondents (80%) had stayed at institution for a period of between 1 to 10 years while another 15% indicated that they had stayed at their respective institutions for a period of between 11 and 20 years and another population of 5% have been in the institution for a period of between 21 and 30 years.

4.3.4 Average turnaround time for procurement process

Table 4.5: Average turnaround time for procurement process

Turnaround time	Number of Employees	Response Rate (%)
1 week	7	11.7
2 weeks	16	26.7
3 weeks	20	33.3
Above 3 weeks	17	28.3
Total	60	100

Form the findings, it was established that 11.7% of the respondents had an average turnaroud time of one week, 26.7% of the respondents had an average turnaround time of two weeks, 33.3% had an average turnaround time of three weeks, the other population of 28.3% had an average turnaround time of above three weeks.

4.3.5 Number of suppliers in the organizations' database

All the respondents (100%) agreed that they have above 30 suppliers. Supplier assorted qualities is a proactive business program empowering the way toward sourcing supplies from minority-possessed. Not just does it profit the group around, it additionally gives a particular upper hand to organizations.

4.4 Relationship Kenya's Public Universities with Suppliers and the Level of Performance

The study in this part aimed at identifying the extent at which the following factors affects the Buyer- Suppliers Relationship at Kenya's Public Universities. Data was collected using Linkert scale of 1 = Weak performance, 2= Average Performance and 3 = Strong Performance. Table 4.6 presents the summary of means and standard deviation of the study variables.

Table 4.6: Buyer- Suppliers Relationship

Buyer- Suppliers Relationship	Mean	Std. Deviation
Adversarial relationship	2.0559	.32863
Arm's length relationship	1.5526	.36585
Transactional relationship	1.6579	.43664
Closer tactical relationship	1.8289	.58073
Single sourced relationship	2.0921	.55581
Outsourcing relationship	1.4145	.94358
Partnership	1.9474	1.46821
Co-destiny	1.4507	.74740

From the study that the buyer – supplier relationship variables of adversarial relationship, arm’s length relationship, transactional relationship, closer tactical relationship, single sourced relationship, outsourcing relationship, partnership and co-destiny all supported by a mean above 1.5.

The study also part aimed at identifying the extent at which the following factors affects the Buyer- Suppliers Relationship on the Level of Performance at Kenya's Public Universities. Data was collected using Linkert scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree 2= Disagreed 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Table 4.6 presents the summary of means and standard deviation of the study variables.

Table 4.7: Buyer- Suppliers Relationship on the Level of success

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation
Suppliers are aware of the mission, vision, completion target of your organization.	4.3696	.54772
Suppliers’ evaluation criterion is communicated to the suppliers in a structured way.	3.2211	.63084
Suppliers take advantage on an urgent requirement of supply.	3.0559	.49813
Supplier usually involved in the design process of the end product	4.6151	.67479
If any mistake is noted on the Local purchase order by the supplier, he/she brings it to the attention of the organization.	4.6941	.52824
Suppliers share their cost structure with the buying organization	4.6733	.74730
Efforts given in supplier development are always a rewarding experience to the organization.	4.0559	.32863
Apart from professional relationship, buyers and suppliers also share personal relationship	4.5526	.36585
Organization conducted periodic meetings with suppliers to address their views and or problems.	4.6579	.43664
Where a supplier is delisted from the list of suppliers, it is communicated to him with reasons justifying the same.	3.8289	.58073

Delisted suppliers can be re-admitted back to the suppliers' list when corrective measures and improved in their performance.	2.0921	.55581
---	--------	--------

Respondents were requested to give replies on statements that were measured by a five point Likert scale extending from 1 (low) to 5 (high). From Table 4.6, mean and standard deviation were utilized to test respondent thoughts where Standard deviation is the square foundation of the difference. It quantifies the spread of an arrangement of perceptions. The bigger the standard deviation is, the more spread out the perceptions are, while mean is the number-crunching mean over the perceptions, it is the most generally utilized measure of focal propensity. It is usually called the average.

From the findings, the statement that if any mistake is noted on the Local purchase order by the supplier, he/she brings it to the attention of the organization was strongly agreed with a mean of 4.6941. Other significant factors were; Suppliers share their cost structure with the buying organization (mean=4.6733), Organization conducted periodic meetings with suppliers to address their views and or problems as supported with a mean of 4.6579 and supplier usually involved in the design process of the end product with a mean of 4.6151. The least significant factor was the statement that delisted suppliers can be re-admitted back to the suppliers' list if they have taken corrective measures and improved in their performance with a mean 2.0921.

4.5 Critical Success Factors for a Strong -Buyer Supplier Relationship

The study in this part aimed at identifying the extent at which the following factors affects the Buyer-Suppliers Relationship on the Level of Performance at Kenya's Public Universities. Data was collected using Linkert scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree 2= Disagreed 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Table 4.6 presents the summary of means and standard deviation of the study variables.

Table 4.8: Success Factors for a Strong -Buyer Supplier Relationship

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation
The supplier selection criteria and procedures are known to all buyers.	4.4803	.90813
The awarding system and procedure is very fair in your organization	4.4145	.94358
There are systems in place to ensure equal opportunity for all	3.9474	1.46821
Organization supports development of infrastructure at suppliers end	4.4507	.74740
Organization provides financial assistance as and when required by the supplier	4.5230	.71716
Buying organization pays the suppliers promptly	3.7401	1.49197
Suppliers always invited to the organizations functions	3.5263	1.50663
Before delisting the supplier is given sufficient scope is given by the organization to justify his/her action	4.6190	.53967
There is formal grievance handling procedures for the supplier	4.4770	.99477
Organizational strategy for sourcing is known to all buyers	3.7769	1.11421
Periodically top management conducted meeting to review the purchasing strategy.	3.5620	1.25759
Organization is always interested in long term relationship with existing suppliers.	3.5537	1.26458
Organization keeps on searching for alternative and low cost suppliers.	3.6942	1.22368
Existing suppliers are always given a chance to relook at their prices with comparison to a new low cost supplier.	3.5455	1.29743

From the findings, the statement that before delisting the supplier is given sufficient scope is given by the organization to justify his/her action was strongly agreed with a mean of 4.6190,

other significant factors were; organization provides financial assistance as and when required by the supplier with a mean 4.5230, Organization supports development of infrastructure at suppliers end as supported by a mean of 4.4507, The supplier selection criteria and procedures are known to all buyers (mean= 4.4803) and the awarding system and procedure is very fair in your organization with a mean of 4.4145.

4.5.1 Organization's long term strategic goals

Respondents agreed that accomplices share key objectives that can be expert through joint activity and the upkeep of the relationship. These common objectives give a solid motivation to relationship duration. They additionally concurred that key objectives impact execution fulfilment which, thus, impacts the level of duty to the relationship. Shared-qualities is a comparable yet more extensive idea. They concur that key objectives are the degree to which accomplices have convictions in like manner about what practices, objectives and strategies are imperative, irrelevant, suitable or unseemly, and right or off-base." Although the more extensive idea of shared qualities has some interest it appears to be excessively expansive, making it impossible to be viably operationalized. Standards are the guidelines by which qualities are operationalized.

4.6 Discussion

From the findings the buyer – supplier relationship variables of adversarial relationship, arm's length relationship, transactional relationship, closer tactical relationship, single sourced relationship, outsourcing relationship, partnership and co-destiny all. This is in line with studies by Porter (1985; Doorman (1985) and Wangeci (2013) who contended that approach to relationship maximizes bargaining power while minimizing reliance on providers, the buyer ought to source from numerous providers, confer transient contracts with

providers, impart no data to providers and make no change recommendations to (or from) suppliers.

From the findings, the statement that if any mistake is noted on the Local purchase order by the supplier, he/she brings it to the attention of the organization; Suppliers share their cost structure with the buying organization, Organization conducted periodic meetings with suppliers to address their views and or problems and supplier usually involved in the design process of the end product. Delisted suppliers can be re-admitted back to the suppliers' list if they have taken corrective measures and improved in their performance. Routroy and Kumar (2013), identified the critical success factors as: Long haul key objectives; it demonstrates the equal common acknowledgment of every one's exertion for upgrading supplier ability in key points of view. It additionally guarantees win - win environment amongst maker and provider.

From the findings, delisting the supplier is given sufficient scope is given by the organization to justify his/her action, organization provides financial assistance as and when required by the supplier, Organization supports development of infrastructure at suppliers end, The supplier selection criteria and procedures are known to all buyers and the awarding system and procedure is very fair in your organization. Beccerra and Gupta (2010) arranged both key negative outcomes of absence of trust and key positive results from high-trust connections. Relating to negative perspectives coming about because of an absence of trust, they watched development of higher exchange cost and office cost in low-trust connections.

Respondents agreed that accomplices share key objectives that can be expert through joint activity and the upkeep of the relationship. These common objectives give a solid motivation to relationship duration. They additionally concurred that key objectives impact execution fulfilment which, thus, impacts the level of duty to the relationship. Shared-qualities is a

comparable yet more extensive idea. They concur that key objectives are the degree to which accomplices have convictions in like manner about what practices, objectives and strategies are imperative, irrelevant, suitable or unseemly, and right or off-base." Although the more extensive idea of shared qualities has some interest it appears to be excessively expansive, making it impossible to be viably operationalized. Standards are the guidelines by which qualities are operationalized.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This study was carried out to establish the effect of buyer – supplier relationships on among public universities in Kenya. The study had two objectives, to establish the kind of relationship Kenya’s Public Universities have with their suppliers and to establish critical success factors for a strong buyer-supplier relationship. This chapter presents the summary of findings for the three objectives mentioned above, the conclusions, recommendations made based on findings and the suggestions on areas that need to be researched as far as this concept is concerned.

5.2 Summary

The study established that most Kenya’s Public Universities have been in existence for more than thirty years. The study confirmed that Kenya’s Public Universities had embraced the concept of buyer - supplier relationships as they had incorporated most buyer- supplier variables in their operations.

It was also clear from the study that the buyer – supplier relationship variables of ill-disposed relationship, value-based relationship, outsourcing relationship, nearer strategic relationship, single sourced relationship, a safe distance relationship, organization and co-destiny. This study confirms an earlier study carried out by Renee et al (2007) that buyer - supplier relationships actually affect firm performance.

The findings of the study posits that Supplier know about the vision, mission, finishing focus of your association, providers' assessment criteria imparted to the providers structurally and providers exploit when there is a pressing necessity of supply. Supplier typically included in the outline procedure of the final result and if a mistake is noted on the Local purchase order by the supplier, he/she brings it to the attention of the organization. The results indicated that

suppliers share their cost structure with the buying organization. They further confirm that organization conduct periodic meetings with suppliers to address their views and or problems and delisted suppliers can be re-admitted back to the suppliers' list if they have taken corrective measures and improved in their performance.

5.3 Conclusion

The study concludes that Kenya's Public Universities have been embracing buyer - supplier relationships for more ten years. Buyer- supplier relationships have assisted the Kenya's Public Universities to enhance the performance of their organizations. This is bolstered by the outcomes from the examination led that demonstrated that there is a solid relationship between Buyer - supplier relationships and performance.

In view of the aftereffects of the study, it can be reasoned that the provider choice criteria and techniques are known to all purchasers, the granting framework and methodology is reasonable in your organization and there are systems in place to ensure equal opportunity for all. Further, organization supports development of infrastructure at suppliers end and financial assistance as and when required by the supplier. It could also be concluded that buying organization pays the suppliers promptly and suppliers are always invited to the organizations functions.

Further, there is formal grievance taking care of methodology for the supplier, hierarchical procedure for sourcing is known to all purchasers and intermittently best administration directed meeting to audit the obtaining system. Association is constantly keen on long haul association with existing suppliers and searching for alternative and low cost suppliers. Current suppliers are constantly allowed to relook at their costs with correlation with a new minimal effort supplier

5.4 Recommendations

The study has confirmed that buyer – supplier relationships are very significant in enhancing the success of organizations. Kenya’s Public Universities and other organizations ought to be encouraged to grasp the idea with the goal that they can have the capacity to receive the rewards of developing buyer – supplier relationships. By maintaining good relationships with their suppliers, Kenya’s Public Universities ensure that they perform well; they also help the suppliers themselves to perform well and also achieve their goals.

5.5 Limitations of the study

The research depends on consent of Kenya’s Public Universities authorities to access most employees thus leading to less than anticipated scope. Access was denied in most cases on grounds of security, confidentiality and delayed response. A lot of respondents were however non-committal to respond instantly to data collection.

It may not be easy to convince the management of the organization that the information collected would be treated with utmost confidentiality because organizations fear leaking sensitive information to their competitors. The researcher explored all possible ways to solve or minimize these problems, by getting information from the both the secondary and primary sources. The examiner clarified to the administration that the material given was kept surreptitious and used only for educational purposes.

5.6 Areas for Further Study

The examiner commends supplementary exploration on an identical theme but in other establishments other than Kenya’s Public Universities, both within the country and outside the country. This will build up whether similar impacts will be found when the examination is done on various organizations other than Kenya’s Public Universities. This will assist in providing concrete facts upon which reliable conclusions can be made.

REFERENCES

- Antony B. (2008), Enhancing strategic partnerships: Intervening in network organizations.
- Barratt M (2006), Understanding the meaning of collaboration in the supply chain.
- Beverland M. & Lindgreen A, (2013) Exploring the tactical implementation of relationship marketing.
- Chris F. et al (2011), Single and Multi-sourcing models.
- Commission for University Education (2014), Universities standards and guidelines.
- Daniel K. & Lisa E. (2007), Success factors in supplier development.
- Davies T. (2010), Effective supply chain Management.
- Fawcet S. (2006), Organizational commitment and Governance for supply chain success.
- Gary T. & Hector J. (2005), A model for evaluation and Selection of suppliers in global textile and apparel supply chains.
- Hakansson & Snehota (2005), Developing relationships in business marketing.
- Hwan Y. & Shin F. (2013), Influences of relationship transparency from intellectual reporting on supply chain partnerships with suppliers.
- Imoh A. & Hans O. (2013), Interaction: Anew focus for supply chain vs supply chain competition.
- John B. (2013) Buyer supplier relationship.
- Keith G. & Colin N. (2006), Managing suppliers - when fewer can mean more.
- Korir Loice (2015), Effect of buyer -Supplier relationships on procurement performance.
- Kristin S. & Sanne S. (2015), The role of collaboration in supply chain resilience.
- Lenoble, A (2013), Corporate governance, An institutionalist approach.
- Oliver Cooper (2000), Nature of commercial relationships.
- Reham Eltantawy, Larry Giunipero & Robert Hanfield (2014), Strategic sourcing management's mind-set: Strategic sourcing & its implications.

Robert Handfield (Phd) (2006), Outsourcing in Supply Chain Management.

Russel Lacey (2007), Relationship drivers of customer commitment.

Ryu II, Soon Huso & Chulmo Koo (2009), Role of partnership in Supply chain performance.

Srikanta Routroy & Sudeep Kumar (2013), Evaluating the critical success factors of supplier development

Stephen M. Mutula (2002), University Education in Kenya: Current developments and future outlook.

Wade G. Boudreaux (2009), Why pursue single source supplier relationships

Wangei Ruth (2013), Supplier relationship management and supply chain management in alcoholic beverage industry in Kenya.

APPENDIX I: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

This questionnaire is purely for academic project and the information you give shall be treated with high level of confidentiality

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Name of the Institution

2. Name of the respondent (Optional)

3. Gender: male female

4. Position in the organization.....

5. Age

18-25 years 26-33 years 34-41 years Above 42 years

6. How old is your organization?

1-10 years 11 -20 years 21-30 years Above 30 years

7. How long have you worked for the organization?

1-10 years 11 -20 years 21-30 years Above 30 years

8. Average turnaround time for procurement process

1 week 2 weeks 3 weeks above 3 weeks

9. Number of suppliers in the organizations' database

1-10 suppliers 11-20 suppliers 21-30 suppliers Above 30 suppliers

SECTION B: TO ESTABLISH THE KIND OF RELATIONSHIP KENYA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES HAVE WITH THEIR SUPPLIERS

- 1. Adversarial relationship
- 2. Arms length relationship
- 3. Transactional relationship
- 4. Closer tactical relationship
- 5. Single sourced relationship
- 6. Outsourcing relationship
- 7. Partnership
- 8. Co-destiny

SECTION C: TO ASSESS THE LEVEL OF SUCCESS FOR EACH RELATIONSHIP

RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WITH A SCALE OF 1-5. TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX. LOGIC BEHIND THE NUMBERINGS IS:

5 - Strongly agree to the statement

4 - Agree to the statement

3- Neutral to the statement

2- Disagree to the statement

1- Strongly disagree to the statement

	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Suppliers are aware of the mission, vision, completion target of your organization.					
2.	Suppliers' evaluation criteria communicated to the suppliers in a structured way.					
3.	Suppliers take advantage when there is an urgent requirement of supply.					
4.	Supplier usually involved in the design process of the end product					
5.	If any mistake is noted on the Local purchase order by the supplier, he/she brings it to the attention of the organization.					
6.	Suppliers share their cost structure with the buying organization					
7.	Efforts given in supplier development are always a rewarding experience to the organization.					
8.	Apart from professional relationship, buyers and suppliers also share personal relationship					
9.	Organization conducted periodic meetings with suppliers to address their views and or problems.					
10.	Where a supplier is delisted from the list of suppliers, it is communicated to him with reasons justifying the same.					
11.	Delisted suppliers can be re-admitted back to the suppliers' list if they have taken corrective measures and improved in their performance.					

**SECTION C: TO ESTABLISH CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS FOR A STRONG -
BUYER SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIP**

RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WITH A SCALE OF 1-5. TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX. LOGIC BEHIND THE NUMBERINGS IS:

5 - Strongly agree to the statement

4 - Agree to the statement

3- Neutral to the statement

2- Disagree to the statement

1- Strongly disagree to the statement

	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1.	The supplier selection criteria and procedures are known to all buyers.					
2.	The awarding system and procedure is very fair in your organization					
3.	There are systems in place to ensure equal opportunity for all					
4.	Organization supports development of infrastructure at suppliers end					
5.	Organization provides financial assistance as and when required by the supplier					
6.	Buying organization pays the suppliers promptly					
7.	Suppliers always invited to the organizations functions					
8.	Before delisting the supplier is given sufficient scope is given by the organization to justify his/her action					
9.	There is formal grievance handling procedures for the supplier					
10.	Organizational strategy for sourcing is known to all buyers					
11.	Periodically top management conducted meeting to review the purchasing strategy.					
12.	Organization is always interested in long term relationship with					

	existing suppliers.					
13.	Organization keeps on searching for alternative and low cost suppliers.					
14.	Existing suppliers are always given a chance to relook at their prices with comparison to a new low cost supplier.					

1. What are the organization's long term strategic goals?

.....

.....

2. What are the suppliers' supplier conditions?

.....