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ABSTRACT

Nigeria is still in search of solutions to her infrastructures challenges and Public Private Partnership (PPP) has been advocated because it has succeeded in some other countries with similar challenges. However, observers have expressed fears about its successful adoption in Nigeria. This paper examines some of the factors that pose threats to the successful adoption of PPP in the Nigerian tertiary institution and how to neutralize them. The study uses both primary and secondary data obtained from field survey and literatures. For the purpose of this study, data were collected from five tertiary institutions in Sokoto and Zamfara. The targeted population was the Architect, Engineers, Builders, Quantity Surveyors, Town Planners, Project Supervisors/managers and hostel supervisors who are involved in the construction and managing of those hostels accommodations in tertiary institutions. The sample size was obtained from 35 professionals working in the physical planning as well as works and maintenance departments of the various institutions in the survey area. Seven professionals were sample from each tertiary institution in the study area. A total of 30 questionnaires were administered in equal proportion to construction professionals as well as hostel supervisors in the study areas (i.e 7 questionnaire in each institution works/PP&D units). A total of 30 questionnaires were retrieved back. This comprised of 9 Architects, 4 Town planners, 5 Quantity Surveyors, 5 Engineers, 3 Project Supervisors/managers, and 4 Hostel Supervisors. Structured questionnaire were issued in equal proportion to three tertiary institutions in Sokoto and Two in Zamfara state respectively. A total of five institutions were surveyed.
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Introduction.

Historically, tertiary institution infrastructure development in Nigeria has mainly been executed by the public sector, using traditional procurement methods, Such as: Open, Competitive and Selective tendering etc. Furthermore, public finance has been used to award contracts to private sector contractors. The public sector entities awarding the contracts have been in charge of the actual delivery of services to the public. Thus, the private sector role was limited to the designing and construction of facilities, (Gunawansa, 2010).

As government started facing the challenges of scarcity of funds to deal with increasing demand for new and modern infrastructure facilities in tertiary institution, in view of increased pressure on fiscal budgets due to competing demands. As a result of available funds could rarely meet crucial infrastructure expenditure requirements in a timely and adequate manner. Clearly, the traditional budgetary allocation for hostel accommodation development has proved wholly inadequate in meeting the infrastructure needs of tertiary institutions in Nigeria, (Ahmed, 2011).

In addition, there has been steady growth in the student population in almost all tertiary institutions in the country. As a result most institutions have been expanding their teaching, administrative and research infrastructures to cope with the increased enrolment. But no effort has been made to provide more accommodation for students and staff! This could be attributed to a deliberate resource allocation policy or due to the failure of the existing method of procurements within tertiary institutions- at regional and national levels- uninterested in committing funds to hostel accommodation, (Fatunde, 2010).
Indeed, one would be surprised that many of our tertiary institutions in the country possess large amount of land on which student hostel accommodations could be built. But it is not being done, why? Some claimed that private sector figures on tertiary institution governing councils have discouraged government investment in building campus residences. Critics say that owners of houses and landlord near such institutions made proposals to authorities of such institutions to build cheap and affordable hostel accommodation for students. According to reliable sources, officials of some tertiary institutions obtained bank loans to build hostels that are operated under holdings whose owners are often their relatives. The reason for this strange policy is not far-fetched. Members of the property class who have invested in the construction of these hostels would naturally want their investment to yield dividends’, (Ezekel Tolu, expert in estate management personal communication, 5 February, 2011).

Therefore, students will have rough times at the hands of hostel owners outside campuses whose primary obsession, it has been alleged is to maximize profit with little concern for students’ welfare. Students have also complained about the absence of a learning environment in off-campus hostels. According to the Nigerian daily tabloid Business day recently that undertook a detailed survey in some cities on the living conditions of students in private residence (hostels). The journalists reported that rents being charged were too high and many hostels characterized by noise pollution. Street trading near hostels also constituted obstacle to proper learning. The Newspaper further called on various institution and municipal authorities to draw-up rules mandating hostel proprietors to change moderate rents, forbid hawking and improve hygiene conditions around hostel (Fatunde, 2010).

What is therefore the alternative option? To alleviate this problem however, most governments of the world, Nigeria inclusive, have had to forge a partnership with the organized private sector, otherwise known as public-private partnership (PPP). Where governments and institutions partnering with the private sector for the finance, design, build, operation and maintenance of hostel accommodations, and delivery of associated services. Also, as a means of meeting the need for modern, efficient infrastructure and for reliable cost effective delivery of public services. It also provides an opportunity for efficient allocation of project risks whereby risks could be borne by parties who are best able to manage them.

**Literature Review  PPP in Context.**

Under PPP, usually, a public entity would typically specify the outputs or services required, and a private company or consortium would be responsible for the finance, design, construction, operation and maintenance of a facility. The consortium is typically organized by a project developer who brings together financiers, engineering firms, construction companies and facilities management companies to provide individual services. A typical PPP structure is shown in Figure 2.1. below

The PPP contract between the public agency and the consortium would usually be for a period of 10 to 30 years, and unlike traditional procurement methods, the public sector does not own the facility during this time period. A PPP thus allows the public sector to move away from directly owning and operating facilities, to purchasing services directly from the private consortium (MOF, 2004). However, the public sector may continue to deliver the core services traditionally associated with a facility (such as teaching in schools and medical services in hospitals) while the consortium may deliver the ancillary services which support the infrastructure (Department of Treasury and Finance, 2002). It is often only after the contract period that the facility returns to public ownership

Unlike in conventional projects, in a PPP, the consortium would only be able to recover its investment through income earned by operating the facility. As stated by KPMG (2007), the public sector may compensate the consortium with service payments, rights to levy tariffs or fees against the public users, or a combination of these. For a project that produces a public utility service, an off-take contract may be signed between the consortium and the public agency, whereby the public agency agrees to purchase the output of the facility at an agreed price and volume on a long-term basis. This off-take contract serves as the basis for the financing of the project (Yescombe, 2002).
The PPP payment mechanism typically provides the government with the power to withhold or deduct payments if the quality of service provided by the private sector consortium is lower than agreed. The government may also reserve the right to step in and regain control of the asset, in the event of repeated default in service provision by the private sector operator (ICRC, 2005).

**Public Private Partnerships (PPP) In Nigeria.**

The use of PPPs in Nigeria is still at its nascent stage although a number of concession contracts have been awarded, the volume compared to what is actually required is less than adequate (Abdulganiyu et al., 2013). He further continued that even the legislation empowering the use of private finance for public services was not signed into law until late 2005. Section 1, subsection 1 of the Acts states that

- *As from the commencement of this Act, any Federal Government Ministry, Agency, Corporation or body involved in the financing, construction, operation or maintenance of infrastructure, by whatever name called, may enter into a contract with or grant concession to any duly pre-qualified project proponent in the private sector for the financing, construction, operation or maintenance of any infrastructure that is financially viable or any development facility of the federal Government in accordance with the provision of the Act (ICRC, 2005).*

The establishment of a mother Agency to oversee all concession was also empowered by the Act, however, this agency only started skeletal operations in 2008, and hence there is a dearth of work on PPPs in Nigeria due to the limited use of the procurement strategy in the country (Abdulganiyu et.al, 2013). The few available literature include a world bank 2009 report cited by (Akinyemi et al., 2009) who observed that over the last decade, there has been limited success in infrastructure development in Nigeria primarily due to three major reasons which include:

- Inability by commercial banks operating in the country to generate attractive profit margins. This is mainly due to high operational cost and a lack of technical expertise in managing PPP risk.
- Significant regulatory gaps.
- Undisciplined and poor tracking of PPP project progress and delivery. This is linked to the fact that neither government nor commercial banks have generated acceptable benchmarks against which to manage risk.

**Process for Procuring PPPs Projects in Nigeria.**

The development of PPP projects is generally initiated by Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) within their functional and geographical jurisdiction. They conceptualize the project, undertake various preparatory studies to develop the project and take the project through various stages of approvals and reviews. Given the importance of determining a project’s viability before proceeding to PPP procurement, making sure the procurement process itself is professionally managed, covering the government’s oversight responsibilities for the full PPP lifecycle, and having a system for any PPP fund transfers (i.e. subsidies
going out or royalties coming in), a very first critical step is for the sponsoring MDA to secure the necessary funding to cover all of government’s responsibilities from the appropriate budget and planning entities (ICRC Act, 2005) as shown in figure 2.2 below.

**Why Adopting PPP Procurement Strategy For Hostel Accommodation In Nigeria?**

Traditionally, government has been the sole financier of infrastructure projects in the Universities and has often taken responsibility for implementation, operations and maintenance of those infrastructures in the tertiary institutions (Ahmed, 2011). Furthermore, budgetary financing are often volatile and rarely meet crucial infrastructure expenditure requirements in a timely and adequate manner, Exerts constant pressure on fiscal budget due to competing demands. Consequently, the traditional budgetary allocation for infrastructure development has proved wholly inadequate in meeting the infrastructure needs of the tertiary institutions in Nigerian.

Indeed, the adoption of PPP as the preferred procurement method in this situation will improved value for money (MVF), reduction in time and cost overruns, Quality of final products, efficiency of services delivery, reforms in governments to improve effectiveness and efficiency, creating a private sector-led economic policy, hasten development, reduce project life-cycle costs, promote local economic growth and strengthening national infrastructure (Pribadi and Pangeran, 2010).

- **Step 8**: MDAs permitted to move the spending between different budget heads.
- **Step 9**: Disbursement of funds to MDAs through a federation Account.
- **Step 5**: Advice by MOF to MDAs on the revision to be made to the cost estimates.
- **Step 2**: Advice from NPC on the economic feasibility of projects to be included in the national Development plan.
- **Step 7**: Approval of the budgets by the House of Representatives and Senate.
- **Step 1**: Identification and prioritization of PPP projects by MDAs
- **Step 3**: Submission of spending plan by MDAs to MOF
- **Step 4**: Review of the costs and contingent liabilities from PPP projects by MOF and DMO.
- **Step 6**: Inclusion of the revised spending plans in the federal Budget.
- **Step 10**: Preparation of annual accounts by MDAs and the same audited by Auditor general’s department.
- **Step 11**: Consolidation of contractual payments under PPP projects into the national account.

Figure 2.2 Process/stages in procuring PPP projects in Nigeria (Sources: ICRC Act, 2005).

**Factors Responsible For Adopting PPVs in Nigeria.**

According to Abdulganiyu (2013), citing (Ibrahim *et al* 2006) there are numbers of factors responsible PPPs procurement method are unable to thrive in developing countries and Nigeria in particular, outside the general inability to raise finance and the technological difference between developed and developing countries. These factors include:

- Political instability
- Corruption in government
- Government policy on infrastructure
- Lack of security
- Lack of consensus on infrastructure priorities among tertiary institutions
- High participation cost
Absences of strong financial institution  
Absence of a clear contract  
Lack of expertise  
An efficient construction industry  
Absence of an effective and responsible judiciary  
Lack of public support  
Fear of unemployment  
Unfavorable legal framework  
Non-transparency and competition in the procurement process  
Inappropriate risk allocation and risk sharing in doing business.

Aim and Objectives of the Research.
The aim is to identify the factors responsible for non-adopting of PPP Procurement method in the provision of hostel accommodation in Nigerian tertiary institutions. Using some selected universities in the Northern Nigeria as a case study. While the main objectives to achieve the aim are specified as:
1. Identify the factors responsible for adopting ppp procurement option for infrastructure provision in Nigeria.
2. Examine the perceptions of professional on barriers to the use of PPP in tertiary institutions.

Hypothesis of the Research
H₀¹: That there is no difference between the respondents on PPP Barriers in Nigeria.
H₁¹: That there is difference between the respondents on PPP Barriers in Nigeria.
H₀²: That there is high rate of corruption in PPP procurement process in Nigeria.
H₁²: That there is no high rate of corruption in PPP procurement process in Nigeria.

Methodology
For the purpose of this study, data were collected from five tertiary institutions in Sokoto and Zamfara. The targeted population was the Architect, Engineers, Builders, Quantity Surveyors, Towner Planners, Project Supervisors/managers and hostel supervisors who are involved in the construction and managing of those hostels accommodations in tertiary institutions. The sample size was obtained from 35 professionals working in the physical planning as well as works and maintenance departments of the various institutions in the survey area. Seven professionals were sample from each tertiary institution in the study area. A total of 30 questionnaires were administered in equal proportion to construction professionals as well as hostel supervisors in the study areas (i.e 7 questionnaire in each institution works/PP&D units). A total of 38 questionnaires were retrieved back. This comprised of 9 Architects, 4 Town planners, 5 Quantity Surveyors, 5 Engineers, 3 Project Supervisors/managers, and 4 Hostel Supervisors. Structured questionnaire were issued in equal proportion to three tertiary institutions in Sokoto and Two in Zamfara state respectively. A total of five institutions were surveyed.

Data Analysis
Data were collected from the professional on their perceptions on barriers to the use of PPP option in tertiary institution as identified in literature review. Those data collected were analyzed using simple percentage, mean, and multi-attribute analytical technique was used to analyze the ratings of the respondents. This approach was recommended in past studies (Mbachu and Nkado, 2007; Chang and Ive, 2002) as the appropriate analytical approach to group ratings of the variables in a given set. The analysis involved the computation of the Mean Rating (MR), which is the average or representative rating point for the collective ratings made for each variable in the subset. Equation 1 shows the computation for the MR as provided by Mbachu and Nkado (2007).

\[ MR_j = \frac{\sum (R_{pj} \times \%R_j)}{\sum \%R_j} \]  
\[ \text{equ.(1.0)} \]

Where:
\( MR_j = \text{Mean ranking for success factor } j; \)
\( R_{pj} = \text{Ranking point K (Ranking from 5-1)}; \)
%Rjk = Percentage response to ranking point K for success factor j.
K = 1 to 5. (5 point likert scale i.e 1= Little effects to 5 = very high effects)

Level of Significance of the Constraint Factors
Based on the MR values, the most significant constraint factor in a subset is one with the highest MR value. The constraint factor having an average or higher level of impact on onsite labour productivity is considered significant as shown in Equation 2.

Significant success factor: $MR > 3$  
Non-significant success factor: $MR < 3$  
Where: $1 < MR < 5$ on a rescaled 5-point Likert rating scale.

Results and Discussions
Survey Responses
Out of a total of 35 initial invitations, only thirty usable responses were received by the cut-off date; this represented about 85.71 percent usable response rate. The thirty usable responses were from Architects (30%), Town Planners (13.33%), Quantity Surveyors (16.67%), Engineers (16.67%), Project Supervisors/Managers (10%) and Hostel Supervisors (13.33%). The feedback was therefore biased towards the Project Supervisors/Managers’ views with little inputs from the Town Planners and Hostel Supervisors.

The demographic profiles of the respondents showed that the majority - 77 percent – had at least 15 years work experience in the construction industry, 83 percent occupied high ranking positions in their respective institutions as directors, managers, Senior Architect, Principal Quantity Surveyors or Deputy Directors etc. The feedback was therefore from highly experienced subjects who had the authority to give important advice and guide on PPP procurement option in their respective institutions. This adds to the quality and reliability of the feedback, though the findings could not be generalized beyond the data points due to the non-representation of the whole institutions in the North.

From table 1.1 the MR calculated, the values obtained were showed based on their level of significant effects on PPP procurement method. The results shows that corruption in governments and inappropriate risk allocation/sharing in doing business (MR=4.10) are the most significant factors or barriers in use of PPP for the provision of infrastructure in tertiary institutions, this factor has a serious implication in term of policy making, whereby political heads of these institutions and senior executives are either involved in corrupt practices or shield those doing so. Lack of security is the second factor with (MR=4.00) the issue of security has taken a more dangerous dimension owing to the huge sums of money and life distraction which some like, Boko haram insurgency in the North-East and kidnappers in the restive Niger-Delta areas of the country have made in the last couple of years. The insecurity issues have made both foreigners and indigenous contractor to run away from making any infrastructure or property investment in different sectors. According to Abdulganiiyu et al (2013), progress as well as advancement can only be achieved in a peaceful secure environments rather than areas prone to conflicts. The third factor is inefficient construction industry (MR=3.97)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS FACTORS FOR PPPs Option</th>
<th>LEVEL OF EFFECTS</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>MR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.H.E</td>
<td>H.E</td>
<td>A.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption in government</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political instability</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policy on infrastructure</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of security</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consensus on infrastructure priorities among tertiary institutions</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High participation cost</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of a clear contract</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of expertise</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient construction industry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient construction industry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient construction industry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public support</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Non Significant Barriers
Hypothesis $H_0^1$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>V.H.E</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>0.93</th>
<th>0.86</th>
<th>23.25</th>
<th>21.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>28.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X-X')</td>
<td>(X-X')^2</td>
<td>F(X-X')</td>
<td>F(X-X')^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X-X')</td>
<td>(X-X')^2</td>
<td>F(X-X')</td>
<td>F(X-X')^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 T-test hypotheses for ($H_0$).

Therefore, $t^*$ calculated is $X-\mu/\sigma$,

$t^* = \frac{X-\mu}{\sigma} = \frac{4.07 - 4.34}{0.13} = -2.077$

And $T$-tabulated,

$t_{n-1}, 0.05 = t_{4}, 0.05 = 2.132$

**Result**

T-Test is equal to 2.077 on both sides. Based on our decisions that, we reject $H_0$ if $t^*$ computed is greater than $T$-tabulated, otherwise accept $H_0$. Since $T$-computed $= -2.077$ is less than $T$-tabulated $= 2.132$, we accept $H_0$ and conclude that there is no difference between respondents on PPP Barriers in Nigeria.

Hypothesis $H_1^1$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>V.H.E</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>1.47</th>
<th>2.16</th>
<th>19.11</th>
<th>28.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X-X')</td>
<td>(X-X')^2</td>
<td>F(X-X')</td>
<td>F(X-X')^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X-X')</td>
<td>(X-X')^2</td>
<td>F(X-X')</td>
<td>F(X-X')^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 T-test hypotheses for ($H_1$).

Therefore, $t^*$ calculated is $X-\mu/\sigma$,

$t^* = \frac{X-\mu}{\sigma} = \frac{3.53 - 3.88}{0.13} = -2.059$

And $T$-tabulated,

$t_{n-1}, 0.05 = t_{4}, 0.05 = 2.132$

**Result**

T-Test is equal to 2.059 on both sides. Based on our decisions that, we reject $H_1$ if $t^*$ computed is greater than $T$-tabulated, otherwise accept $H_1$. Since $T$-computed $= -2.059$ is less than $T$-tabulated $= 2.132$, we accept $H_1$ and conclude that there is high rate of corruption in PPP procurement option in Nigeria.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study, as part of its key aim, has identified the key factors responsible for non-adopting PPP in tertiary institutions in Nigeria and the perceptions of professionals in the PP&D/works departments in tertiary institutions on these factors are examine and evaluated base on their levels of effects. 15-factors have been identified with significant effects, while only 1-factors have non-significant effects. Corruption in government and inappropriate allocation of risk in business were the factors having very high effect with (MR=4.10), the followed by lack of security with (MR=4.00), and inefficient construction industry with (MR=3.97). While the least factor with non-significant effect is the absence of an effective and responsible judiciary in the
country (MR=2.63). The major reason for corruption as the most significant factor is either due to corrupt people have rarely been known to own up to accusations of corruption, therefore it seems to suggest that the political heads of these ministries, institutions and senior executives are both involved as well as shield those doing so. While, security deterioration reduce confidence in the mind of investor, social security situations will increase the risk of project development, resulting in higher cost of money and decreased viability of project. There is therefore the need for an enabling environment. Furthermore, at 0.05 level of significance and 4 df, the critical value of T was found to be 2.132, while the calculated T value was -2.077 and -2.059. Therefore, since the calculated T value was less than the tabulated T value, the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the respondents on PPP Barriers in Nigeria is accepted. Also, the hypothesis that there is high rate of corruption in PPP procurement process in Nigeria was accepted.

In conclusion, it is recommended that by adopting these partnerships it will fill the resource gap in infrastructure delivery and operation by; engender acceleration of infrastructure provision, they will also Promote faster implementation of projects, and reduced whole life costs of project in tertiary institutions, they will offers better risk allocation between public and private sectors, offers better and sustainable incentive to perform, and engender accountability in fund utilization. Also, they will improve the overall quality of service; and they often lead to the generation of additional revenue and overall value for money for the entire economy.
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