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Abstract
This paper is designed to extend knowledge of flexibility in manufacturing supply chains through examination of procurement entity relationships, flexibility classifications and their commonalities as used by practitioners. Data were collected from procurement, supply chain, logistics and manufacturing managers in Australian companies in 17 Standard Industry Classification categories. The research findings suggest that Australian manufacturing organisations have not sufficiently integrated their manufacturing strategies with their organisational strategies and, more importantly, suppliers to manufacturers do not have sufficient flexibility in their supply activities. One limitation pertains to the possibility that targeted respondents may not have the assumed intimate knowledge of their organisation’s procurement activities, or are biased regarding their view of the quality of the organisation’s procurement performance. The major contributions of the study are the development of a definition of procurement flexibility (ProcFlex), a conceptual model for use as a benchmarking tool to measure procurement flexibility, and the presentation of an integrated model of ProcFlex for use by manufacturers and their suppliers to be more responsive and increase competitive advantage.

Introduction

In today’s highly competitive manufacturing environment, it is critical that manufacturers have a regular supply of procured materials and components. Consequently, in order for suppliers to remain competitive and respond rapidly to environmental uncertainties, they require organisational and supply flexibility to respond in real time (Perry & Sohal 1999; Chan, Bhagwat & Wadhwa 2009). Researchers such as Upton (1994) and More and Babu (2009) contend that flexibility is multi-purposed to characterise different qualities and improve the process capabilities of a system. The concept of flexibility as critical is in line with research by Beamon (1999) who considers that uncertain environments require vital supply chain flexibility.
Similarly, Barnes-Schuster, Bassok and Anupindi (2002) argue that supplier flexibility enables buyers to respond to changes in the environment. This paper extends research into flexibility capability of suppliers to Australian manufacturers from the buyer’s perspective and establishes manufacturer flexibility for contingency actions. Buyers, in this case, are Australian manufacturers who are also the research respondents.

Strategic alliances with suppliers improve competitiveness and enhance competitive advantage; however, alliances do not necessarily provide flexibility nor certainty in ensuring constant supply of materials in real time. Therefore, developing and maintaining a responsive flexibility could be the difference between the survival and the demise of a firm and the continued survival of other entities in the supply chain network.

Wadhwa, Mishra and Saxena (2007) and Chandra and Grabis (2009) promote the idea that the best forms of response strategy to uncertainties in manufacturing are flexibility and agility, as shown by Harris et al. (1999) in Quick Response research and Perry et al. (1998) in Efficient Customer Response studies. Other researchers suggest that the future of business competition will be between supply chains rather than between individual companies or brands (Christopher & Ryals 1999). Consequently, it appears that for supply chain networks to achieve a high level of competitive advantage, they need to develop the capacity to respond the quickest.

Supply chain networks, however, are complex and supply chain flexibility is even more complex and multi-dimensional (Garavelli 2003) with both factors adding to the problem of identifying appropriate flexibility dimensions. Each supply chain network consists of several independent entities whose corporate objectives and goals are secular, creating a conflict of objectives which leads to delays, excessive or lack of inventories, uncertainty in production capacity/capability, distribution problems, wasted resources and, finally, poor service to the network customer. Also, the level of complexity reduces coordination activities among entities and constrains flexibility.

Because of these complexities, the researchers focused specifically on supplier–buyer procurement flexibility (ProcFlex) activities where the buyer is the manufacturer and the suppliers are first-tier suppliers and the supplier–buyer relationship role is repeated along the supply chain between every entity in the network. All entities along a supply chain buy, value add and sell. Although some activities between various supply chain entities may be different and independent of each other, the desirable ProcFlex dimensions and elements remain the same. Therefore, the supplier–buyer dimensions and elements are repeated along the supply chain, but in different situations are exposed to sundry environmental uncertainties.

In addition, the current research was narrowed to ProcFlex in manufacturing and has proposed a generalisable model for use in measuring ProcFlex in any environment or situation in the economy. An extant literature search produced very few publications that promote ProcFlex, though one example is Aprille, Garavelli and
Giannoccaro (2005) who conclude that ProcFlex contributes to supply chain flexibility and provides supply chain performance. Another is Swafford, Ghosh and Murthy (2006) who believe that in order to achieve ProcFlex a firm must understand and maximise its options in terms of materials and quality of services such as delivery, quantity and lead time.

There is, however, insufficient research in the Australian manufacturing sector in terms of supplier capabilities or procurement activities. The current research was developed to fill that gap by identifying the various constraints and shortcomings in strategic procurement activities of Australian manufacturers.

**Background of Procurement Flexibility**

Although strategic procurement management has been promulgated as an effective business approach (Cox 1996) and a necessary business strategy in many organisations (Tassabehji and Moorhouse 2008), the constant changes in customer preferences are forcing manufacturers to change their procurement sources, find new suppliers or encourage their suppliers to develop flexible supply attributes. Not only is flexibility in supply activities essential, it is also necessary to understand, define and identify its meaning and capability. Gupta and Goyal (1989) believed that a single all-encompassing identification of flexibility remained to be developed, and two decades later the argument remains current (Gong 2008). Researchers like Crum *et al.* (1998) and Jarrell (1998) agree that good generalisable measures of flexibility have been inadequate and that there is a lack of established measures of flexibility in procurement relationships.

The present paper narrows the identified gap by proposing a generalisable concept of ProcFlex. The theoretical underpinnings of the flexibility concept are examined and used to define and identify dimensions of ProcFlex and its practical responses to supply uncertainty.

Confusing definitions and different meanings have been attached to the term procurement. Lysons and Farrington (2006) define procurement as ‘the process of obtaining goods or services in any way, including borrowing, leasing and even force and pillage’ (p. 6). This sounds primitive. They contend that procurement is a wider term than purchasing, unlike Van Weele (2005) who considers that procurement is the function of purchasing raw materials, supplies and other consumables. An alternative view is provided by Burt, Dobler and Starling (2003) who suggest that ‘the terms purchasing and procurement are used interchangeably although somewhat imprecisely’ (p. 23). In a similar way, and more recently, Waters (2009) provides a more simplistic definition that ‘procurement is responsible for acquiring all materials needed by an organisation’ (p. 304) and that procurement consists of activities to get the goods and services into the organisation from suppliers. A slightly different approach is taken by Baily *et al.* (2008) who provide a comprehensive explanation of the procurement cycle.
that explains all the activities required for the procurement of goods and services rather than a single, specific definition.

Research Objectives

Although supply chain management entails management of the supply chain from end to end, the current authors contend that it is difficult to conduct research on supply chains from the initial raw material stage to the final stage of the manufactured goods due to the occurrence of complexities resulting from most current supply chains having global, national or inter-state elements. Moreover, supply chains transcend several market economies, industry sectors, jurisdictions, legal systems, geographical conditions and so on, with each supply chain consisting of many independent entities required to act cooperatively and interdependently.

The independence of supply chain entities make it difficult, if not almost impossible, to manage the overall supply chain efficiently or effectively. Each entity has its own corporate goals and strategic plans for survival that do not necessarily incorporate the interests of other entities or create synergy with them. Hence, there is no one single, responsible or accountable owner along any supply chain able to manage the buy/value-add/sell activities within their own purview.

Since a supply chain transcends different market economies and industry sectors, the external economic influences impacting upon it at various stages are different and result in varied outcomes. The complexity and dynamism of economic influences on the supply chain suggest that investigating activities between two supply chain entities has more value and robustness for academics and practitioners. Consequently the authors propose the idea of investigating and creating a generalisable framework for ProcFlex—a framework that may be applicable at any stage of a supply chain and between any two adjacent entities along it.

Literature Review

Due to the lack of published literature on ProcFlex, process-based operational flexibility literature was investigated. A high percentage of this literature was based on supply chain and manufacturing flexibility. Extant research indicated that supplier and strategic integration were important components in supply chain strategies, and so the components were used in the development of the current survey instrument. The Li and Qi (2008) framework for assessing supply chain flexibility suggested three aspects of flexibility were identifiable: robustness, self-adaptability and network alignment. Also identified were five components of supply chain flexibility—operations, logistics, information, network and supply—which were included as part of the current survey. Added to the current research framework were the components of time dimension (especially lead time) as a critical concept in the environment of competitive advantage, as was the first to market concept (Handfield & Bechtel 2002).
Although entities along a supply chain may not be streamlined towards the end customer, time-based competition does provide a certain amount of synergy (Askenazy et al. 2006; Thomas 2008). Entities along a supply chain need to deliver their products in a timely fashion even where they are not optimally connected to all other entities in the supply chain. Kotler (1989) Kotha (1995) noted that increasing demand for product variety and customisation, shortened product life cycles and expanding industrial competition require a more highly flexible manufacturing strategy. They also make procurement time a critical flexibility dimension.

Contemporary research indicates similar trends to Skinner's 1969 research which identified that organisations fail to integrate their organisational strategies with their manufacturing strategies. Furthermore, Fisher et al. (1997) supported Skinner's (1969) contention that most manufacturers do not tailor their production systems to performance tasks which are critical to corporate success. Fisher et al. (1997) also found that manufacturing supply chain management was inefficient because of the mismatch between production strategy and supply chain strategy. More recently, Swink et al. (2005) found that high levels of strategy integration are needed to complement effective manufacturing practices.

Existing research on internal operational aspects of Australian manufacturing firms has not addressed the linking of manufacturing strategy with procurement strategy. Rather, it has primarily focused on manufacturing quality, competitiveness and performance (with many publications now outdated) or on logistics, supplier relations, performance and quality, indicating similar non-congruent strategies in manufacturing (Kiriden, Hasan & Kerr 2009). As a consequence, the current research has hypothesized that Australian organisations have not streamlined nor integrated their supply chain strategy with their organisational strategy.

The point has been made that for a supply chain to have total flexibility from end to end, all the entities and links along the chain—the operational activities of Source Make Deliver of and between entities—must be flexible (Garavelli 2003). Given Garavelli's (2003) identification of source as the starting point of procurement activities, sourcing performance metrics such as scheduling, information exchange, delivery, process integration, organisational strategy, transportation and sourcing (Lockamy & McCormack 2004) were used in the study.

Although many businesses have adopted world’s best practices in manufacturing (Quesada-Pineda and Gazo 2007; Perry & Sohal 1999; Sohal et al. 1999; Samson & Ford 2000; Beaumont 2005; Boyle & Scherrer 2009; Gurumurthy & Kodali 2009), that itself is considered insufficient as procurement best practices also are necessary. Therefore, it is timely that the advantages of ProcFlex are evaluated and used to further enhance their competitive edge.

In a study of value chain agility, Swafford, Ghosh and Murthy (2006) conclude that for manufacturing to benefit there must be ProcFlex because manufacturing flexibility...
correlates strongly with ProcFlex. Thus, their procurement determinants of lead time, capacity, contracts, order sizes and quantity were used in the current research.

Extant literature on manufacturing strategies has focused only on manufacturing process and seldom ventured outside manufacturing firms. Some literature has linked competitiveness with manufacturing strategy, but little research links strategy with procurement activities. A study by Hodgson et al. (1998) found the trends of shortening product life cycle and increasing complexity of product components required greater agility as well as higher procurement skills in partnerships and alliances. Therefore, the current study was designed to link manufacturing strategy with procurement activities.

**Definition of Procurement Flexibility**

Due to the lack of published literature on procurement and manufacturer relationship flexibility, the authors have applied manufacturing flexibility knowledge to the supplier-buyer procurement concept since both have similar process-based activities. An external supply chain is similar to internal business processes between departments. Beach et al. (2000) suggested that manufacturing flexibility remains in the realm of operations management and is closely associated with process technology. Similarly, the researchers felt that the same theoretical constructs may be applied in the procurement arena which is very process-orientated and adopts classifications related to operational relationships.

A comprehensive review of manufacturing flexibility literature was undertaken vis-a-vis the overall supply chain system, including definitions, objectives, general principles and properties of flexibility. In various modes, flexibility has been defined as reflecting an organisation’s ability to respond to changes (Gupta & Goyal 1989; Upton 1995; Kumar et al. 2006) as a reactive strategy to environmental uncertainty (De Meyer 1989; Suarez et al. 1995) and as a multi-dimensional concept (Sethi & Sethi 1990; Upton 1994). However, Evans (1991) and DeLeeuw and Volberda (1996) have dissenting views and conclude that the meaning of flexibility is still ambiguous.

While flexibility has been described as a capability or ability or reactive action (Upton 1995; DeLeeuw & Volberda 1996; Monteiro & Macdonald 1996), in this paper it is assumed these attributes are a strategic reaction. Flexibility has also been viewed as polymorphous with different meanings and contexts (Evans 1991) so it is difficult to provide a fixed definition for flexibility to fit all scenarios and situations. Thus, the definition of ProcFlex is considered situation-dependent necessitating a generalisable framework applicable to any stage along a supply chain.

Due to the lack of a precise definition, in this paper ProcFlex is: the ability to respond strategically to changing internal and external environments to ensure that the sourcing, purchasing and supply of raw materials, components and parts are continuous, to sustain the value adding process.
**Procurement Activities**

Relevant activities of procurement include sourcing, purchasing and receiving. Sourcing includes identifying required materials, specifying requirements, identification of suppliers, supplier selection, item search, item selection, requisition approval, quality verification and contract development. Purchasing includes order generation, information exchange, scheduling, order variation, contract negotiation, order tracking, pricing, transportation, supplier integration and transit storage. Receiving includes logistics, docking, warehousing, inventory, invoicing, checking, payment and sometimes reverse logistics and faulty returns.

Other strategic procurement elements which have an overall impact on procurement activities but which are not part of the focus of the paper are transaction costs analysis, spend analysis, total cost analysis, category management, forecasting, procurement ethics, governance, risk management, sourcing strategy, procurement strategy, partnerships, alliances, green procurement, outsourcing, information systems, product development, tender and organisational structure. It is suggested that these elements provide an opportunity for future research, especially in the Australian environment.

The current research focused only on the suppliers’ physical activities for maintaining the continuous supply of materials and directly related to the manufacturing process. This approach identifies activities linked to supplied materials’ attribute modification, information management, supplier attributes, delivery flexibility, logistics and manufacturers’ organisational strategy.

**Procurement Flexibility Dimensions**

Manufacturing flexibility literature indicates that discussion of flexibility contains a very large number of dimensions and elements and can, therefore, be considered multi-dimensional. A summary of flexibility dimensions found in literature includes range, cost, time, mobility, uniformity, adaptability, heterogeneity and ease. Based on pilot research through personal interviews with practitioners and on examination of research findings, the authors adopted the three flexibility dimensions (Slack 1987) of range, uniformity and mobility. Within these three dimensions, the constructs of range, quality, time, ease and cost were noted as critical in the pilot research interviews with practitioners and measurement items derived for each of the constructs.

Range was used to measure the: flexibility constructs of a physical number of products, components and sub-assemblies; number of spare inventory; choice of alternate routes, size of goods; strategic plan; and amount of information exchange. Uniformity was used to measure constructs with the same level of quality and time taken consistent within all levels of mobility. The uniformity constructs consisted of: criticality, accuracy, reliability and timeliness of information exchanges; component materials of consistent quality; modified product components; new product design; time taken to implement product design changes; capability of short delivery schedule
changes; supplier switching; changes in routes or transportation costs; and backup strategies. Mobility was used to measure the flexibility constructs of capability of easiness and cost within that range and uniformity. The mobility construct consisted of: compatibility information of management platforms; information exchange and human intervention; easy and cheap exchange of procurement information; new components and materials, design changes and product mixes; change to different suppliers; modification of transportation routes; organisational strategy, and responses.

Research Methodology

The major objective of the research was to evaluate flexibility capabilities of the suppliers for Australian manufacturers. The Dun and Bradstreet (2005) database was accessed to evaluate suitable respondents. A variety of manufacturing firms was included in the study. A postal survey, using a 7-point Likert scale, was used to provide an appropriately large sample size of responses because it was faster, cheaper and able to target a selective sample reflective of the identified population. The manufacturing firms represented 17 Standard Industry Classification (SIC) groups within the manufacturing sector; the SIC code was derived from Dun and Bradstreet’s (2005) Business Who’s Who of Australia database. The number of respondents and their SIC codes are listed in Table 1.

The research format was designed in accordance with Churchill’s (1979) paradigm for developing better measures of scale development and content validity. Interviews, in the form of a focus group, of procurement managers, practitioners and manufacturing managers were used to generate, test and purify scale items of the constructs.

Due to limited published literature on procurement dimensions, elements and their flexibility, it was decided to conduct preliminary research. From operations management, supply chain management and strategic management literature, 352 questions regarding supplier relationships in the manufacturing sector were complied. From this list, duplication questions were filtered out. Only those questions pertaining directly to supplier-buyer operational relationships were retained, resulting in 156 items. Face-to-face interviews with practitioners and academics were used to further consolidate the survey instrument which was reduced to 94 items. These were then subjected to the Q-Sort technique (Sachs 2000; Wright & Mechling 2002) and 15 industry practitioners and consultants in the logistics and procurement area further refined the instrument. Finally, the Q-sort technique provided 57 items which were used in the design of the postal survey instrument.

The Q-Sort technique was deemed appropriate to match proposed items with appropriate flexibility elements, having been proven to be effective in investigating differences between people and in testing theories on small sets of individuals carefully chosen for their knowledge, mostly in psychometric research (Ozer 1993; Sachs 2000), health studies (Stenner et al. 2003), marketing (Ekinci & Riley 1999; Rosenbaum,
Ostrom & Kuntze 2005), health (Cross 2005; Baker, Thompson & Mannion 2006) and operations management (Koste & Malhotra 2000; Thomas & Watson 2002). Q-Sort technique was deemed to provide a practical perspective of the Australian manufacturing industry’s procurement experience and made the survey questions more relevant to respondents.

Table 1: Standard Industry Classification Codes and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIC code</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fabricated metal products</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Food and kindred products</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chemicals and allied products</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Industrial and commercial machinery</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Electronic and electrical equipment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rubber and misc. plastics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Stone, clay, glass and concrete products</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Primary metal industries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lumber and wood products</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Transport equipment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Paper and allied products</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Printing, publishing industry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Leather and leather products</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Measuring analysing and controlling equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Textile products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-depth information was sought with regards to a firm’s procurement characteristics. This data were not publicly available so a postal survey approach was used to collect responses. The difficulty of obtaining confidential quantitative data such as cost or time estimates meant respondents were requested to provide general descriptive information and answer questions using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = low to 7 = high) based on capabilities, abilities and performance of the suppliers. Although face-to-face and telephone interviews can provide complete and more accurate data, it is much more costly and time consuming (Forza 2002). Owing to the number of questions, sample size and likely telephone charges, a postal survey was selected using prepaid return envelopes.

Basic univariate analysis established the distribution of respondents, categories of SIC classification, respondents’ positions, type of business, annual sales, industry type,
number of employees and company profile. Multivariate analysis tested whether there were distinct groupings on non-metric variables as a basis for identifying the respondents as leaders and laggars in ProcFlex capability. The survey data were also analysed using principal component analysis to identify the inter-relationships among the large number of variables explaining the common underlying dimensions.

**Sampling Frame**

Representative population samples were determined from the Dun and Bradstreet (2005) on-line database. Initial assessment of the database revealed more than 11,000 business registrations under the SIC codes. Therefore, to determine a manageable sampling framework, a few criteria were used. Since previous research publications indicated low responses in the area of operations management, a target list of 2,000 respondents was chosen.

The first criterion was that the procurement activities must be substantially large enough to warrant an investigation. Second, the targeted organisation must have a procurement manager/officer position with, at the least, a similar job description. Also the annual procurement volume must be more than AUD10m with the organisation having more than 70 employees. It was assumed that the larger the procurement volume and activities, the less likely the bias or the guessing in responding to the questionnaire items.

Initial filtering reduced the likely sample to 2,083 companies. On detailed investigation and analysis, it was found that some companies were duplicated in multiple SIC codes and so these duplications were traced and deleted. On further analysis, it was found that some companies did not have their manufacturing base in Australia, so these were also deleted. The list was refined further with the final target of 1,300 companies in 17 SIC categories.

Personalised survey instruments were sent to position titles such as Procurement Manager, Supply Chain Manager, Logistics Manager, Manufacturing Manager and Purchasing Manager. One hundred and eighty-four follow-up telephone calls were made to randomly selected non-respondents to potentially increase response rates and determine whether non-respondents were different from respondents.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

It is acknowledged that there were limitations to the study. It was assumed the targeted respondents would have intimate knowledge of the procurement activities of their organisation. Nevertheless, they might be biased regarding their view of how their organisation performs, or might not be fully knowledgeable of procurement activities. Also, it is recognised that the 57 items in the questionnaire did not cover all the areas of procurement activities, nor are all Australian manufacturers registered on the Dun and Bradstreet (2005) database.
Determination of Procurement Flexibility

Initially, the five flexibility dimensions in the survey were examined in relation to the three elements of range, uniformity and mobility. The results in Table 2 show the extended five constructs of range, uniformity as quality and cost, and mobility in terms of ease and time. The higher the mean score, the greater the flexibility achieved by the 252 manufacturers. On the 7-point scale the means varied from 3.34 to 4.85; a close to average indication of flexibility.

Table 2: Mean Scores of Flexibility Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility Dimension</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Exchange</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Integration</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Components</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Logistics</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Structure</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main objective in the research was to determine a generalisable framework of ProcFlex. The objective was accomplished by using means of the 57 flexibility items from the survey instrument’s 7-point Likert scale. ProcFlex was categorised into five levels of flexibility: extremely flexible, highly flexible, moderately flexible, low flexibility
and no flexibility (Table 3). The means value encompassed within each level of flexibility has been assigned somewhat arbitrarily and could be the subject of future research involving industries other than manufacturing to further test the suggested framework.

**Table 3: Procurement Flexibility Scaling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ProcFlex value</th>
<th>Level of flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.00 +</td>
<td>Extremely flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 – 5.99</td>
<td>Highly Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 – 4.99</td>
<td>Moderately flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.99</td>
<td>Low flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3.00</td>
<td>No flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis and Results**

Of the 1,300 targeted respondents, 297 responses were received, 17 deemed unusable and 280 usable, resulting in a usable response rate of 21.5 percent. One hundred and four were returned to sender due to the post box being closed or no longer at that address. This could mean that manufacturing operations had ceased or moved, or that the nomenclature of relevant procurement personnel had changed.

The valid data were analysed using univariate analysis, correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis and principal component analysis. The possibility of non-response bias was analysed by comparing early and late responses using a t-test and Levene’s Test for equality of variances. No significant differences were found except for five items whose two-tailed Sig. values were below 0.05. However, the mean difference for these five items did not show significant difference nor did the subsequent chi-square test. Since this was exploratory research, the researchers deemed that the difference was not large enough to affect the empirical nature of the research study. Cronbach’s alpha score for internal consistency of more than 0.93 was regarded as highly reliable, especially as the general accepted lower limit is 0.7 and in exploratory studies 0.6 is acceptable (Hair et al. 1998).

**Correlation Analysis**

An analysis of the correlation strength showed that 0.8 percent of the correlation had an $r$ value of more than 0.7 and 83 percent of the correlation had an $r$ value of less than 0.3. It was therefore concluded that there were no significant relationships between the 57 flexibility items. Four variables had negative correlations, all indicating that the cost would be too great for the supplier to modify routes, implement strategies, extend flexibility and increase responsiveness.
**Multivariate Analysis**

Multivariate analysis was used to establish causality and determine the operationalisation of ProcFlex. Due to the exploratory nature of the research, multiple regression was used first followed by principal component analysis. The variables in the five dimensions were subjected to multicollinearity, outlier, normality, homoscedacity and independence of residuals testing. The model of the five dimensions appeared both accurate and generalisable to the population. Principal component analysis (PCA) was used because multivariate analysis did not fully explain all the results and objectives of the research. PCA also identified the empirical structure of relationships among the 57 variables in the flexibility framework.

A scree plot extraction using Kaiser's criterion, with an eigenvalue of more than 1.0, revealed 15 components which explained 71.3 percent of the variance. Based on the Hair *et al.* (1998) recommendation that each component should have at least four or five variables, a forced extraction of eight components was applied. This was conducted with varimax rotation suppressing absolute values less than 0.3 for better visual representation.

Close analysis of the eight components revealed that there may be eight dimensions to ProcFlex rather than the five dimensions initially proposed by the researchers. The 57 flexibility items did not group together as initially thought and under PCA they grouped differently. Therefore, the 57 items were converted into eight new dimensions of ProcFlex with their own individual attributes, as tabulated in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Dimensions of New ProcFlex Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elements**

- Product design and modification
- Information exchange accuracy and reliability
- Organisational structure
- Connectivity, compatibility and automation
- Capability, capacity and quality
- Selection and modification
- Time, Ease and changeover cost
- Implementation and risk

**Industry Leaders and Lagers**

The present research decided to determine whether or not there were any patterns among manufacturing leaders and laggers and their capability of ProcFlex within the Australian manufacturing industry sector. The major aim was to determine which industry supplier had the highest level of ProcFlex. Figure 1 shows a plot of
supplier flexibility level against SIC codes to differentiate the flexibility capabilities among different manufacturing categories. The flexibility was categorised into five levels. The highest category was extremely flexible with a ProcFlex value of 6.00 and above. Highly flexible, with a ProcFlex between 5.00 and 5.99, was the next level followed by moderately flexible with a ProcFlex between 4.00 and 4.99. Low flexibility was attributed to those cases with a ProcFlex value between 3.00 and 3.99. Cases with a ProcFlex less than 3.00 were considered as having no flexibility. SIC codes with less than five cases were removed from the analysis.

**Figure 1: ProcFlex - Leaders and Laggers**

There was only one case which was scaled as being extremely flexible with a ProcFlex value more than 6.00. This case was from the Fabricated Metals Products Industry (SIC 34). In the highly flexible category (ProcFlex value 5.00–5.99) there were a total of 19 cases, most of which were from the fabricated Metals Products Industry. Others were in the Chemical and Allied Industry (SIC 28), Lumber and Wood Products Industry (SIC 24), Stone, Clay, Glass and Concrete Industry (SIC 32) and Industrial and Commercial Machinery Industry (SIC 35). The moderately flexible category, with ProcFlex values between 4.00 and 4.99, had 95 cases, mostly in the Fabricated Metal Products and Food and Kindred Products Industries (SIC 20). The low flexibility cases numbered 116, with most in the Fabricated Metal Products and Food and Kindred Products Industries. The remaining eight cases reported as having no flexibility.

Extremely and highly flexible procurement cases (5.00+) were considered leaders, with laggars having a mean less than 3.00. From Figure 1 there did not seem to be any
distinct leaders or laggers in ProcFlex. ProcFlex capabilities were spread evenly across all industries in the moderate and low flexibility scales, suggesting that, overall, there is very little range in the flexibility among suppliers to Australian manufacturing industries.

**Conclusion**

Although many articles are published by both practitioners and academics on collaboration efforts between suppliers and buyers, there still is a lack of empirical research regarding ProcFlex dimensions and how they fit into the overall supply chain strategy. In this paper, an integrated conceptual model for measuring ProcFlex has been presented. ProcFlex dimensions and elements have been identified, thereby filling the identified knowledge gap. The research also confirms Skinner’s (1969) identification of organisations not integrating their manufacturing and organisational strategies nor tailoring them to performance tasks that are critical for corporate success.

Results from this research have provided important insights into a practical model of flexibility which highlights the necessity to increase the understanding of ongoing procurement activities within a supply chain network. The researchers realise that further research and data collection are required to keep improving and developing the model. Similarly, it is suggested that the model could be tested on other types of Australian industry.

As manufacturing firms generate supply chain management strategies, procurement flexibility will continue to play a major role in the relationships between the different entities in the supply chain network. The success of procurement flexibility measurement and its implementation will lead to the creation of synergies among the various entities in a supply chain network and streamline their activities towards the common consumer at the end of the supply chain.
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