It is a list of all those people or items within a population that can be sampled. The sample size was fifty (50) employees from the four departments and was selected from the target population.

2.5 Sample and Sampling Technique

In survey methodology, sampling is concerned with the selection of subset of individuals from within a statistical population to estimate characteristics of the whole population. Two advantages of sampling are that the cost is lower and data collection is faster than measuring the entire population. The study used stratified random sampling to determine the sample which had the least bias of all sampling techniques, there is no subjectivity-each member of the total population had an equal chance of being selected.

2.6 Data Collection

Data was collected using questionnaires so as to give accurate information. There was pre-testing questionnaires whereby respondent were served with questionnaires and given a few days to fill them at their own time. Questionnaires were hand delivered and due to time constraints were collected as agreed. The questionnaire had semi-structured questions to ensure that the given answers were relevant and also for in depth response and accuracy. Open ended questions were used because it was economical in times of time and money and the respondents were able to give insight into their feelings, background, hidden motivation, interest and decisions.

3. Research Findings and Discussion

3.1. Introduction

This topic discusses the outcome of our study. The analysis was done using SPSS package. A regression analysis was done to determine the relation of the three independent variables: Tendering methods, E-procurement and Government Regulations on the performance of procurement function. Descriptive statistics showed that tendering methods had a standard deviation of 0.49. This meant that there was a wide variety of tendering methods to choose. Government regulations also varied widely as displayed by a coefficient of 0.435. The next in that order was E procurement with a value of 0.405. Overall, the performance of the procurement function would vary by 0.367. We considered the following table:

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Performance	1.84	.367	45
E- Procurement	1.80	.405	45
Tendering Methods	1.38	.490	45
Government Regulations	1.24	.435	45

We also carried out a co relational study and the results were quite convincing. Government regulations were negatively related to E-procurement (coefficient = -0.156), positively related to Tendering methods (coefficient = 0.024) and E- procurement was negatively related to Tendering methods (coefficient = -0.049). This information was obtained from the below table.

Coefficient Correlations					
Model			*Government Regulations*	*Tendering Methods*	*E- Procurement*
1	Correlations	Government Regulations	1.000	.024	-.156
		Tendering Methods	.024	1.000	-.049
		E- Procurement	-.156	-.049	1.000
	Covariances	Government Regulations	.014	.000	-.002
		Tendering Methods	.000	.011	-.001
		E- Procurement	-.002	-.001	.016

To ensure there was no inter dependence between our predictor variables we carried out a multi collinearity test. The results were as follows.

Coefficients						
Model		*Correlations*			*Collinearity Statistics*	
		Zero-order	*Partial*	*Part*	*Tolerance*	*VIF*
1	(Constant)					
	E- Procurement	-.061	.005	.004	.974	1.027
	Tendering Methods	-.298	-.321	-.303	.997	1.003
	Government Regulations	-.327	-.344	-.328	.975	1.025

The tolerance levels were less than 1, which indicated lack of multicollinearity. Lack of multicollinearity was sufficient for us to retain the three independent variables in our study.

The next item was to check the overall model fit. The following results were obtained from the SPSS software.

Model Summary

Model	*R*	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*Std. Error of the Estimate*
1	.446[a]	.199	.140	.340

ANOVA

Model		*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
1	Regression	1.174	3	.391	3.389	.027[b]
	Residual	4.737	41	.116		
	Total	5.911	44			

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.499	.293		8.528	.000
	E- Procurement	.004	.128	.004	.029	.977
	Tendering Methods	-.227	.105	-.304	-2.169	.036
	Government Regulations	-.280	.119	-.332	-2.347	.024

From the output above, the Anova table showed a significance level of 0.027which was less than the standard probability value of 0.05.This implied that our study variables were quite significant. The R value of 44.6% was a clear indication that that there exists other factors that influence the performance of the procurement function, other than those we considered in the study. We then fitted a regression equation to magnitude of contribution of the independent variables.

The equation was

$$y_{\text{performance}} = 2.499 - 0.004x_{\text{E.procuerement}} - 0.227x_{\text{tendering methods}} - 2.80x_{\text{Government regulations}}.$$

From this equation, Government regulations had greater significant effect (coefficient=0.28). This was followed by Tendering methods (coefficient=0.227) and then E-procurement (coefficient=0.004).

The results were then reported according to the objectives of the study.

3.2. Specific Objective 1: To find out the effect of government regulations and bureaucracy on the performance of the procurement function.

From the regression analysis we found that Government regulations had significant effect on the performance of corporation. This independent variable (Government Regulation) had a p-value of 0.024 which was less than the standard p-value of 0.05 hence implying its significance.

3.3. Specific Objective 2: To determine the effect of E-procurement on the performance of the procurement function.

From the regression analysis we found that E-procurement had no significant effect on the performance of procurement function. This independent variable (E-procurement) had a p-value of 0.977 which exceed the standard p-value of 0.05 hence implying no significance.

3.4. Specific Objective 3: To find out the effect of tendering methods on the performance of the procurement function.

From the regression analysis we found that Tendering methods had significant effect on the performance of procurement function. This independent variable (Tendering Methods) had a p-value of 0.036 which was less than the standard p-value of 0.05 hence implying it was significant.

References

[1] Armstrong, M. (2008). Human Resource Management. (5th Ed.). Washington DC: Kogan Page Publishers.
[2] Andrew, M. (2008). Procurement Reforms in Kenya. Journal of Economics, 22(1), 23-50
[3] Bayens, B., Martell, M., (2007), "Budget and organization reform: impact on Public procurement in Belgium", in Knight, L., Harland, C., Telgen, J., Thai
[4] Best, J., & Khan, V. (2000).Research in education. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
[5] Cox, A., (1997), Business Success and Critical Supply Chain Assets: A way of Thinking about Strategy, critical Supply Chain Assets and Operational Best Practice, Ears gate press, Boston
[6] Cooper, D. R. and Schindler, P.S. (2003). Business Research Methods. (8th Ed.), McGraw- Hill: New York
[7] Dale L.F, Aziza S., (1990).Operational Audits of Purchasing, Pitman. London
[8] Driedonks, B., Gevers, J. & Van Weele, A.J. (2009).Managing Sourcing Team Effectiveness: The need for a team perspective in purchasing, Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management, Winter 2009
[9] Devaraja, S., Swaroop, V., &Zou, H., (1996). "The Composition of public Expenditure and Economic Growth." Journal of Monetary Economics 37 (2): 313-44