THE ROLE OF CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE PERFORMANCE OF SUPPLY CHAINS: THE CASE OF THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN SWAZILAND

by

MICAH BHEKI MASUKU

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

PhD

in the

Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development
Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria
Pretoria

April 2003
DEDICATION

To my family and friends
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To pursue a PhD degree is a very precious opportunity because it not only challenged me to explore and advance the knowledge of agribusiness in general and agricultural supply chain management in particular, but also provided me with an opportunity to work with many people. Among them are Professors: Johann Kirsten as my promotor, Sylvain Perret and Johan Van Rooyen as co-promoters. They have devoted a substantial amount of their valuable time to guiding me through the dissertation process. The intense discussions at the beginning of the thesis proposal and during the write up stages resulted in the success of this thesis. My appreciation and gratitude for their assistance will never be adequately expressed.

I am grateful to those smallholder sugarcane farmers and millers’ representatives who generously allowed me to interview with them while they were busy with their daily work. Many thanks to the Vuvulane Irrigated Farms (VIF) personnel for providing accommodation during data collection. This thesis would not have been possible without their support.

I owe a very special thanks to the Swaziland Government for their partial sponsorship during my studies and the Academy for Educational Development in Botswana for their thesis award, which helped me in data collection and thesis write up. My appreciation to the Agribusiness Chair in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development at the University of Pretoria for financial support through the National Research Foundation (NRF) bursary. Many thanks to the University of Swaziland for granting me study leave, the Postgraduate School of Agriculture and Rural Development at the University of Pretoria for providing me with part-time employment to enable me cover part of my academic expenses and providing me with accommodation as well as allowing me to still use their facilities even at the time when I had stopped working at the School.

I am indebted to Rina Owen for her assistance during data analysis and Dr. Rujeko Murata for statistical advice during the analysis process. Thanks to Ronald Phaswana for assisting me during data entry and Bongani Sigwane for data collection, without them the data entry and collection processes would have taken a much longer time.
I owe gratitude to my family, relatives and friends who trusted and encouraged me until this unpredicted journey is over. Especially, to Thoko, Nonhlanhla, Samkeliso, and Banele, I say, guys we share this work.

Finally, I would like to thank the Almighty God. First, for giving me the ability, strength, and the intelligence to successfully complete this program. Second, for strategically placing each of these individuals who provided assistance along the path of my journey and taking care of my family during the period of all my studies.
THE ROLE OF CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE PERFORMANCE OF SUPPLY CHAINS: THE CASE OF THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN SWAZILAND

by

MICAH BHEKI MASUKU

Degree: PhD
Department: Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development
Promoter: Professor Johann Kirsten
Co-promoters: Professor Sylvain Perret
Professor Johan Van Rooyen

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the role of relational factors in the performance of the sugar industry supply chain in Swaziland. In this study a supply chain is conceptualised as a series of connected activities concerned with planning, coordinating and controlling the production of sugar, starting with the production of sugarcane by farmers, through processing by the millers and finally delivery to the consumer. Thus it can be broken down into units, beginning with the cane growers who provide sugarcane to millers, who process it into sugar and pass it on to the Swaziland Sugar Association, which then markets it on behalf of the farmers and the millers.

This study has posited that social factors play an important role in the performance of smallholder cane growers in their relationship with millers, and hence the performance of the sugar supply chain. These factors are embedded in the behaviour of the units that form the supply chain and are important in enhancing the performance of the supply chain. In testing the hypothesis, descriptive and multivariate analyses involving regression analysis and
structural equation modelling, were used on a sample of 124 smallholder cane growers and 3 millers.

The results suggest that the performance of the sugar industry supply chain is influenced by two categories of factors: (1) those that relate only to the smallholder farmers, such as transport costs, amount of irrigation water, percentage changes in their production quota, distance between farmers’ production sites and the mill, value of assets per ha, yield per ha, and sucrose content; and (2) those that relate to the smallholder farmers’ relationship with millers, such as dependence on the millers, perceived poor cooperation between farmers and millers, lack of goodwill trust, and perceived opportunistic behaviour practised by millers.

The results agree with a priori theory that trust, cooperation, commitment and the absence of opportunistic behaviour are essential elements for a successful relational exchange. The study suggests that a relationship founded on trust and mutual respect is more likely to succeed than a relationship of convenience supported by legal contingencies. Therefore, a supply chain that is characterised by trust, physical and psychological commitment as well as cooperation between parties within the supply chain is important in providing mutual benefit and good relationships.

Several implications can be made from this study: Firstly, theoretically there is a need for more research incorporating elements of social capital in supply chains in order to establish a consensus in the conceptualisation of the different constructs and their measures. Secondly, both cane growers and millers need to focus on initiating, signalling and disclosing their behaviours in an effort to improve their relationship with each other. Cane growers and millers need fair practises, sense of integrity, effective communication, commitment and shared purpose. These conditions would facilitate the development of trust, reduce opportunistic behaviour and promote cooperation. This would improve the performance of the sugar industry supply chain. Finally, the Swaziland Government needs to create a macroeconomic environment that is conducive to creating cooperation between smallholder farmers and the private sector. This could be accomplished through: (1) a policy that ensures that the legal framework is favourable to business relationships, such as well-defined legal and regulatory measures that govern business relations and transactions; and (2) providing support for enterprises and encouraging creation of efficient, flexible and independent farmers’ associations and cooperatives that are based on economic objectives.
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