

Factors responsible for slow adoption of public private partnership (ppps) in Nigeria

- ~ **Amir Hussin B. Baharuddin** (*Universiti Sains Malaysia*)
- ~ **Abdul Hamid Kadir Pakir** (*Universiti Sains Malaysia*)
- ~ **Abdelnaser Omran** (*Universiti Sains Malaysia*)
- ~ **Otairu Abdulganiyu** (*Universiti Sains Malaysia*)

Abstract: *The growth and development of any nation is greatly dependent on the availability of basic social infrastructure like good road, efficient power supply, buildings, ports, rails etcetera. Over fifty years after independent Nigeria is still in a very undesirable state of infrastructural development; variety of broad-based opinion surveys in recent years have shown that prominent infrastructure deficiencies are responsible for the country's disappointing economic performance. This paper is designed to unfold factors responsible for the slow adoption of public private partnership PPPs in Nigeria and proffer workable solutions that could help revised the current trend. A questionnaire survey was conducted seeking the opinions of one hundred (100) experienced professionals within the industry comprising architects, engineers, quantity surveyors, project managers and contractors. Out of 100 questionnaires sent out, 61 came back resulting in a response rate of 61%. The result shows that high rate of corruption in government, high cost of participation and lack of adequate security have all combined to slow the uptake and use of PPPs for the provision of public infrastructures and services. In order to improve the use of PPPs to provide the much needed infrastructures to enhance economic growth and well-being of the growing population of the country, it was found that the elimination of corruption in government, the building of strong financial institutions, improvement in security and improving the knowledge of professionals in the PPP procurement strategy would greatly assist the country to overcome the dearth of public services and enhance economic growth.*

Keywords: Factors, Slow adoption, Public, Private, Partnership, Abuja, Nigeria.

1.0 Introduction

Public private partnerships are the new age procurement strategy used by many governments across the world to provide the much needed world-class public services for their citizenry. The move to PPPs is now worldwide movement where there are marked differences in terms of levels of development and overall emphasis, all of which are in need of analysis and comparison (Broadbent & Laughlin, 2003), this move is not limited to poor countries only as the concept of PPPs emanated from the UK, which cannot be termed a poor country nor a developing country by any standard. The adoption of PPPs as the preferred procurement method in this era has to do with a number of factors which include, Value for Money (VFM), time overruns, Quality of final products, efficiency of services, reforms in governments to improve effectiveness, creating a private sector-led economy policy, and to hasten development, "reduce project life-cycle costs, promote local economic growth and strengthening national infrastructure" (Pribadi & Pangeran, 2010). There are a number of definitions of Public-Private Partnerships but the one adopted in this study is that by Union, a UK's Public service union which defined PPP thus "Public Private Partnerships (PPP) is the umbrella name given to a range of initiatives which involve the private sector in the operation of public services. The Private Finance Initiative (PFI) is the most frequently used initiate. The key difference between PFI and conventional ways of providing public services is that the public does not own the asset. The authority makes an annual payment to the private company who provides the building and

associated services, rather like a mortgage. A typical PFI project will be owned by a company set up specially to run the scheme. These companies are usually consortia including a building firm, a bank and a facilities management company. Whilst PFI projects can be structured in different ways, there are usually four key elements: Design, Finance, Build and Operate" (www.unison.org.uk). The rationale for the introduction of the PFI in 1992 by the conservative government in the UK was to reduce the public borrowing requirement by the use of private funding and also reduce the risks of time and budget overruns (Fewings, 2005) and these are achievable using this procurement approach. The lack of world class efficient infrastructure in developing countries is one of the major reasons why Foreign Direct Investments are scarce in developing countries in Africa, as the presence of basic infrastructures is a prerequisite for economic development. Business cannot flourish in the absence of good roads, electricity, pipe borne water and good and efficient modes of transportation; and those who decide to still do business under such conditions will incur very high production costs as they have to create alternative sources of power supply, clean water and transportation for distributing their products to the end users. This pre-condition for economic growth has been recognised by developing countries in East Asia, hence their heavy investments in infrastructural developments. In Malaysia under the tenth Malaysian Plan, the government intends to execute 52 High Impact Projects (HIP) worth about RM63 billion naira (10th Malaysian Plan), while in Taiwan, as of 2008 after the PPP Act was passed, private investment in Public services stood at nearly 382 billion NT dollars (about

US\$ 11.5 billion)" (Public Construction Commission, PCC 2009). The same situation is experienced in developed economies of the UK and Europe where the concept emanated from initially. PPPs are not entirely new as a couple of projects had been procured using this strategy, an example is the Suez Canal PPP which had a concession period of 99 years and was contracted in 1856. PPPs were also used in the 17th century France to supply drinking water to Paris, while the Former Prime Minister of Turkey, Orzal Targut also used the concession based model of PPP for roads in his country. Some like the UK, use this procurement strategy due in part to shrinking revenue while others use it to transfer risks, "the main risks transferred are in construction delay, cost overrun, design problems which are not to do with changing the scope, some planning risks and even some occupancy risks which are controllable" (Fewings, 2005). PPPs are still emerging in developing countries and the extent of their use has depended, amongst other things, on economic strength, prevalent political environment and housing tradition of a particular city (Sengupta, 2006), the most popular PPP option is the concession-based type such as Build – Own – Operate- Transfer in which the private partner (concessionaire) undertakes to finance, design, construct, operate and maintain the facility during a concession period that is usually determined by their public sector counterpart at the outset (Zhang & Kumaraswamy, 2001). Generally PPP/PFI projects are very large complex deals that involve not only the provision and running of a built asset, but also the delivery of services to the general public (Cartlidge, 2004). The complexity of the arrangements between the parties in any PPP agreement

often implies that the 'first mover' must be granted attractive terms to encourage investment" (Alonso-Conde et al., 2007).

As observed by (Ng et al., 2007) there is a growing trend for governments and other clients in the construction industry to place major projects into the private sector as against the previous view where traditional federalism advocates typically view the government as a central funding source for programs with consensual conditions to be met, and view state/local programs as expenditures requiring strong governmental oversight (Maxwell & Husain, 2005). The use of Public – Private Partnerships has covered a wide spectrum of human activities as can be noticed by the varying areas of research work that has been carried out under this concept, they range from Air Traffic services (Goodlife, 2002), Housing delivery, (Sengupta, 2006), Telecentres (Kuriyan & Ray, 2009), Transport (Medda, 2007), Education (Srivastava & Oh, 2010), Metropolitan Subway (De Jong et al., 2010), Healthcare (Crimson, 2008), Conservation of protected areas (Thackway & Olsson, 1999), Water supply (Hukka & Vinnari, 2007), Infrastructure (Grimsey & Lewis, 2002) and Satellite communication (Franzolin, 2009) to mention a few. Though, Public-Private Partnerships are not limited to construction or infrastructure works only, the bulk of the projects undertaken under this procurement system are usually construction based creating the need for an efficient and ready construction industry with practitioners who are knowledgeable in the Process. To understand the involvement of the construction industry, (Martimort & Pouyet, 2008) it is useful to keep in mind that most public services (water management, waste disposal services, sanitation, public transportation, prison

transportation, prison management) involve a complex array of tasks. Those activities necessitate indeed, first, to build infrastructures and second to operate these assets as efficiently as possible. It is worthy to note that Public-Private Partnerships is not panacea for solving all the problems of the construction industry, but some of the principles for integrated project management which have been emerging such as early involvement of the contractors, the committed use of Risk Management and Value Management, integrated design and construction, life-cycle costing and collaborative relationships are an integral part of this procurement (Fewings, 2005). However, the contractual arrangements between the private and public sectors generally aim to transfer risk between the parties and create a clear profit outcome for the private sector (Alonso-Conde et al., 2007), though the level of profits that is being created to encourage the private sector's involvement is already being questioned. There are many forms of PPP, which the concession period. In individual situations, different types of PPP need to carefully selected to adapt to real situations (Tang et al., 2010), Zhang and Kumaraswamy cited in (Ng et al., 2007) observed that the most popular PPP option is the concession-based type such as Build-Own-Operate-Transfer in which the private partner (concessionaire) undertakes to finance, design, construct, operate and maintain a facility during a concession period that is usually determined by their public counterpart at the outset.

2.0 Problem statement

There has been very limited research work carried out on PPPs in Nigerian context,

this is due in part to lack of PPP projects in Nigeria and host of other factors, though there is a regulatory body, The Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC), which is supposed to draw up a framework for implementation and regulation of PPP deals in Nigeria. On the international scene, a lot of work has been done on PPP projects, their advantages and otherwise. One research that has come close to this intended study is the work of (Babalola & Odunowo, 2010) that tried to assess the critical success factors of PPPs in infrastructure development in developing economy with specific reference to Nigeria and found that legislation, cost-benefit analysis and creating the right environment were very important for the success of PPP projects in Nigeria. However their research was limited to Lagos state out of the 36 states in Nigeria. They also pointed to the inadequate infrastructure developments in the country by observing that several years after independence. Nigeria is still in a very sorry state in terms of infrastructural development, though they did not provide the reasons for the absence of PPP projects in the country. Nigeria could be said to have been afflicted by the 'Dutch disease' as revenue is not its problem because it has abundant natural and human resources, with revenue from crude oil rising significantly over the years since the discovery of the 'black gold'. The revenue from Nigeria's Oil and Gas wealth has risen steadily from 26.3 percent in 1970 to 83.5 percent in 2000 (Ibrahim, 2008) but its public services and infrastructure is 'traveling' very fast in the opposite direction. The government acknowledges the shortage of infrastructure to meet the growing population and the pressure of globalization and the development rate of other countries with less

resources like Malaysia has further brought to the fore an urgency to devise a sustainable way to provide the much needed infrastructure. Political instability and corruption at the top levels of government has in large parts contributed to the slow development of most developing countries and robbed them of the benefits of their enormous revenue generating resources. The lack of infrastructure cannot be said to be due to lack of funds, or inadequate planning but that of implementation and the common disease of most African countries-corruption. According to Transparency International (TI) the public works contracts and construction sector is perceived to be most likely to engage in direct bribery of officials and of those charged with creating relevant regulations (www.transparency.org). Although certainly not absent from developed countries, developing countries face a particular challenge in this regard. There the misuse of funds is the second biggest barrier to more public investment (37%) and trying to establish accountability for stimulus spending the greatest challenge in distributing that sort of funding (45%). TI cites two studies which show that, controlling for other factors, corrupt environments drive up water costs in a range of African states on average by 64% and electricity costs in Latin American ones by 23% (www.transparency.org). The paper intends to achieve the following objectives: (1) to identify the reasons for the slow adoption of PPPs in developing countries of Africa especially Nigeria; and (2) to propose how to overcome the slow pace of PPPs adoption in developing countries of Africa and particularly Nigeria. The study was limited to the city of Abuja, which is the capital of Nigeria and presently is the hub of construction work and seat of government.

3.0 Research methodology

A questionnaire comprising two sections was designed to acquire information from respondents on their knowledge of the subject of the research in Abuja, Nigeria. A Likert scale of 1-5 was used in the questionnaire to assess the reasons and possible solutions to the slow adoption of PPP as a procurement strategy for public infrastructures and services, where '1' represents the least effect and '5' the highest effect. The study focused on all groups of professionals/participants in the construction industry in both public and private sectors among the Ministry of Works, Infrastructure Concession and Regulatory Commission (ICRC), Federal Housing Authority (FHA), Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA). They include Architects, Quantity Surveyors, and Engineers, Project managers, Contractors and others. Section A of the questionnaire sought to know the general particulars of the respondents while section B focused on the reasons and possible solutions to the slow adoption of PPPs. The questionnaire survey was used to investigate major reasons for the slow use of PPPs in Nigeria and relative importance of the principal factors, and ways of improving the situation based on the experiences and perceptions of the respondents. The questionnaire was distributed to 100 respondents who are actively involved in construction and consultancy in the private sector and those at decision making level in the public sectors. Sixty-one (61) were returned, yielding a response rate of 61%. The study was directed to public sector officials and construction industry professionals because they are the organizations and individual who are responsible for planning and executing public sector infrastructure projects.

4.0 Results analysis

4.1 Background of Respondents

A total of 100 questionnaires were sent out and 61 came back representing 61% response rate. The brake-down of the received questionnaire is as follows: Architects 8, Engineers 22, Quantity Surveyors 14, Project Managers 7, Contractors 2 and other professionals not listed 8, giving a total of 61 in total. This was considered adequate for the

analysis based on the assertion by Moser and Kalton cited in (Aibinu & Jagboro, 2002) that the result of a survey could be considered as biased and of little value if the return rate was lower than 30-40%. The result of the analysis of returned questionnaires shows that of all that the 61 valid respondents, 22 (36.1%) were Engineers and represented the highest number of respondents, followed by Quantity Surveyors with a score of 14 (23.0%), (Table 1).

Table 1: Response by Profession

Profession	Frequency Percentage
Architect	8(13.1)%
Engineer	22(36.1)%
Quantity Surveyor	14(23.0)%
Project Manager	7(11.5)%
Contractor	2(3.3)%
Others	8(13.1)%
Total	61(100)%

With regard to the qualification, 27 (44.3%) of respondents hold a first degree, followed by 20 (32.8%) respondents had

M.Sc., in various fields of terms of construction for further details (Table 2).

Table 2. Response by qualification

Qualification	Frequency Percentage
PhD	5(8.2)%
M.Sc	20(32.8)%
B.Sc	27(44.3)%
PGD/Dip.	8(13.1)%
Others	1(1.6)%
Total	61(100)%

The questionnaire also sought to know how many years each respondent has spent on their job, of the 61 respondents, 15(24.6%) have spent between 1-3 years on their job,

16(26.2%) had spent 4-6 years, 10(16.4%) have between 1-10 years experience on the job while 20 (32.8%) respondents have had above 10 years of experience, if we look at the

cumulative range of between 4-10 & above a total of 46 (75.4%) respondents have had above four years experience either in the private or public sectors. This is good as it will increase the reliability of some of the respondent's answer. In terms of response according

to sector, the public sector leads the respondents with 50.8% of the total respondents representing 31 respondents out of a total of 61 total sample, while respondents from the private sector is 49.2% representing 30 respondents (Table 3).

Table 3. Response by Sector

Sector	Percentage
Public Sector	31(50.8)%
Private Sector	30(49.2)%
Total	61(100)%

4.2 Relative Importance Index for Problem Factors

4.2.1 Political Factors

Using the Relative Importance Index to rate the various factors based on responses of all the respondents surveyed reveals the following, 'corruption in government' turned up as the most important factor with an RII=0.90 and ranked (1), this is a surprising result because the questionnaire was served not only on private sector officials but also

public sector officials. 'Government policy on infrastructure' turned up second (ranked 2) with an RII=0.78, while 'lack of consensus on infrastructure policy' returned an RII=0.77. The fourth place goes to 'political stability' which came up with an RII=0.68 and 'effective and respectable judiciary' came up as the least factor among the political factors identified and presented to the respondents through the questionnaires with an RII=0.61 (Table 4).

Table 4. Relative Importance Index of Political Factors

Political Factors	RII	Ranking
Corruption in government	0.90	1
Government policy on Infrastructure	0.78	2
Lack of Consensus on Infrastructure	0.77	3
Priorities		
Political Stability	0.68	4
Effective and respectable judiciary	0.61	5

4.2.1 Economic and Social Factors

On the economic and social factors, 'high participation cost' came up as the most important and significant factor as rated by the respondents and shown by the weighing returned through the RII with an RII=0.71

and ranked (1), this was followed by 'absence of strong financial institutions' with an RII=0.65 and ranked (2). "Public support" came next with an RII=0.57 which it tied with 'unemployment'. High participation costs and absence of strong financial institutions are the two most important factors within the

economic and social factors category which create barriers to or slow down the adoption of PPPs in Nigeria. From the response from the respondents from which the RII was generated, public support and unemployment

do not seem to be very important factors, however the issue of ‘unemployment’ could be debated under a PPP situation since the services to be provided have to be paid for by the end-users (Table 5).

Table 5. Relative Importance Index of Economic and Social Factors

Economic and Social Factors	RII	Ranking
<i>High participation costs</i>	0.71	1
<i>Strong financial institutions</i>	0.65	2
<i>Public support</i>	0.57	3
<i>Unemployment</i>	0.57	4

4.2.3 Environment Factors

Under the Environmental factors responsible for the slow adoption of PPPs in Nigeria, after the analysis to determine the most important environmental factors using the RII, ‘lack of adequate security’ returned as the most important environmental factor with an RII=0.76 and ranked number (1) this was followed by ‘Absence of a clear contract’ with an RII=0.63 and ranked number (2) which it tied with ‘absence of an efficient construction industry’. The ‘lack of knowledgeable professionals’ factor with an RII=0.60 came a surprising fourth place out of five factors rated. And the least influential factor showing down the adoption of PPPs for the provision of public infrastructure in Nigeria is ‘presence of competing project’ with an RII=0.51, (Table 6). This response is not surprising since it is known that there are very few PPP projects in the country and the number is so small that the citizens do not know what constitutes PPP projects. The ONLY tolled road within the country right now has been prevented from taking – off after completion by the end-users who are reluctant to pay for the service. Though there

are a lot of opportunities for PPPs in Nigeria with a population of almost 150 million inhabitants, yet the lack of adequate security prevents investors from bringing risk money into the country to invest. High participation cost and corruption in government which are the most important economic and political factors respectively have also made it difficult for local contractors to form consortiums to bid for PPP project in the country. Political stability, absence of corruption breeds trust and reputation which many investors seek from their public sector partner as there are what gives assurances that at the end of the day, the investor will get returns on their investments irrespective of the marginal profits that may be realized.

4.2.2 Factors That Will Help Overcome the Problems

4.2.2.1 Solution to political factors

From the analysis using relative importance index, ‘Elimination of corruption’ returned an RII=0.9 ranked number (1), which appears to be the highest among all the other factors. This means that, this factor is the most important of all the other five factors.

Table 6. Relative Importance Index of Environmental Factors

Environmental Factors	RII	Ranking
<i>Lack of adequate security</i>	0.76	1
<i>A clear contract</i>	0.63	2
<i>An efficient construction industry</i>	0.63	3
<i>Lack of knowledgeable professionals</i>	0.60	4
<i>Presence of competing projects</i>	0.51	5

If this factor is taken care of within the public sector, then the rate of adoption of PPPs will increase positively. Existence of 'Political Stability' came up as the next most important factor with an RII=0.85 and ranked number (2), which was followed by 'improvement in government policy on infrastructure' with an RII=0.84, the factor 'effective and respectable judiciary' came at the rear among all the political factors which had earlier been listed above, next from behind included 'setting priorities on infrastructure among policy makers' (Table 7). It is very interesting to find that corruption was agreed as the most

significant factor by both public and private sector respondents alike this is because if anything it is the private sector alone that should be complaining of this factor because they are the ones who have to find alternative ways of getting permits and other statutory requirements signed. It will be worth investigating to know why public sector officials would admit that corruption within their own establishments was a major factor responsible for the slow adoption of PPPs for the provision of public infrastructure and services in Nigeria.

Table 7. Relative Importance Index of Solution to Political Factors

Political Factors (Solutions)	RII	Ranking
<i>Elimination of Corruption in government</i>	0.90	1
<i>Political stability</i>	0.85	2
<i>Improved government policy on infrastructure</i>	0.84	3
<i>Setting priorities on infrastructure amongst policy makers</i>	0.81	4
<i>Effective, respectable and independent judiciary</i>	0.73	5

4.2.2.2 Solution to Economic and Social Factors

On the economic and social factors, the RII returned 'developing strong financial institutions' as the most important factor with an RII=0.83 and ranked number (1) this was

followed by 'adequate involvement and sensitization of the public' with an RII=0.78 and ranked number (2), while 'reduction in participation cost' came third place with an RII=0.74 the rear was taken by 'staff transfer agreement to reduce unemployment' with

an RII=0.69. This is not surprising as it is believed that with the implementation of PPP procurement, there will be jobs available for the different categories of jobless youth

presently available since, such infrastructure provision will involve construction works, information technology related jobs, maintenance jobs etc (Table 8).

Table 8. Resolution to Economic and Social Factors

Economic and Social Factors (Solutions)	RII	Ranking
<i>Developing strong financial institutions</i>	0.83	1
<i>Adequate involvement and sensitization of the Public</i>	0.78	2
<i>Reduction in participation costs</i>	0.74	3
<i>Staff transfer agreements to reduce unemployment</i>	0.69	4

4.2.2.3 Solution to Environmental Factors

On the issue of Environmental factors, ‘improving the knowledge of professionals’ came up as the most important factor under the environmental factors suggested as being able to help hasten the adoption of PPPs in Nigeria with an RII=0.86 ranked number (1), this was followed by ‘improvement in security’ which came up with an RII=0.84 and ranked number (2). The first two factors are indeed very important for the investors who intend to come and provide services in any country as they will guarantee and create the confidence that they will be able to get return

on their investments. The respondents did not think that ‘proper cost benefit analysis’ with an RII=0.79 and ‘joint ventures with foreign firms’ also sharing an RII=0.79 were significant factors that could help speed up the use of PPPs for the provision of infrastructure. ‘A clear contract’ came out with an RII=0.76 to make the fifth place and guaranteeing demand/- competing projects’ RII=0.65 came up as the least factor under the environmental category that had the power to speed up the rate of adoption of PPPs for the provision of public infrastructure and services in Nigeria and other developing countries (Table 9).

Table 8. Resolution to Economic and Social Factors

Environmental Factors (Solutions)	RII	Ranking
<i>Improving the knowledge of professionals in PPP</i>	0.86	1
<i>Improvement in Security</i>	0.84	2
<i>Proper cost benefit analysis</i>	0.793	3
<i>Joint ventures with foreign experienced firms</i>	0.79	4
<i>A clear contract/Toll review mechanism</i>	0.76	5
<i>Guaranteeing demand/absence of competing projects</i>	0.65	6

5.0 Finding and observations

The various reasons for the slow adoption of PPP for the provision of public infrastructure were discussed separately, each with its causes, and possible remedies that could be used to enhance the perception and use of this procurement strategy that holds a lot of potential to improve the infrastructure conditions in the country within a very short time. The descriptive statistics and relative importance index was adopted for the analysis of data collected from the questionnaire survey. From the 'Relative Importance Index analysis, the most significant factors were treated within their respective categories viz: Political factors, Economic and Social Factors, and Environmental Factors. The most significant political factors from the Relative Importance Index were 1) Corruption in Government, 2) Government policy on infrastructure, 3) Lack of consensus on infrastructure priorities, while 4) political stability and 5) Effective and respectable Judiciary were ranked as not too significant political factors by the respondents. For the economic and social factors, of the four factors under this category, 1) High participation cost, 2) Absence of strong financial institutions, 3) Lack of public support, were ranked as the most significant in that order, while 4) unemployment among end-users was not considered as being very significant an economic factor to result in slowing the adoption of PPPs for the provision of public infrastructures and services in Nigeria as perceived by the respondents. And finally, on the last category, environmental factors, 1) Lack of adequate security, 2) Absence of a clear contract, 3) Absence of an efficient construction industry were ranked as the most significant environmental factors responsible for the

slow adoption of PPPs in Nigeria by the respondents, while 4) Lack of knowledgeable professionals and 5) Presence of competing projects were ranked as not too significant environmental factors as perceived by the respondents and determined through the Relative Importance Index. The reasons identified above and their rankings in terms of significance were in response to the first objective of the study, which was to identify the reasons for the slow adoption of PPPs for the provision of public services in Nigeria. The second objective of the study was to identify the possible ways to overcome slow adoption of PPPs in Nigeria in total 15 possible strategies which can help overcome the slow level of adoption of PPPs for infrastructure provision were identified from literature review, these factors were further categorized under three headings namely, Political factors, Economic and Social Factors and Environmental Factors and then analyzed separately based on the 3 categories created. Under the Solutions to Political factors, of the five political solutions identified and processed using RII to determine the most significant factor, it was not surprising that 1) elimination of corruption, 2) Political stability and 3) improvement in government policy on infrastructure turned up as the three most significant factors in that order while under economic and social factors, 1) Developing strong financial institutions 2) adequate involvement and sensitization of the public and 3) reduction in participation costs were found to be the most significant. Finally, under the solutions to Environmental factors, 1) improving the knowledge of professionals in PPPs 2) improvement in security and 3) proper cost-benefit analysis were found to be the most significant factors that would help

improve the use of PPPs for the provision of public infrastructure in Nigeria.

6.0 Conclusion and recommendations

Public private partnerships has become the most preferred method of providing public infrastructure and services, this change in procurement method has been made possible by government will to reduce public sector borrowing, transfer the twin construction risks of time and cost overruns and reduce the presence of the government in the economy in line with the principles of the New Public Management (NPM). However in most developing countries and especially in Nigeria, high rate of corruption in government high cost of participation and lack of adequate security have all combined to slow the uptake and use of PPPs for the provision of public sector infrastructure and services. In order to improve the use of PPPs to provide the much needed infrastructures to enhance economic growth and well-being of the growing population of the country, it was found that the elimination of corruption in government, the building of strong financial institutions and improving the knowledge of professionals in the PPP procurement strategy would greatly assist the country overcome the dearth of public services and enhance economic growth. The availability of good public services is a basic medium for economic growth. Electricity, good roads, pipe-borne water are

essential for the well being for any nation, therefore the government should Endeavour to fight corruption consequent upon which private investors and foreign firms would be confident about investing their risk-capital in Nigeria albeit other developing countries. The government should also assists its financial institutions to achieve world-class standard so they would be able to provide the necessary financing for PPP projects. The government should also provide a means for training both public and private sector on the benefits and strategies employed in this procurement strategy. These will go a long way in helping the countries overcome the present shortage of good public infrastructure which has clogged the wheels of its progress since its independence from Britain 50 years ago. Though there are other areas that need improvements to help speed up the use of PPPs like having a respected and independent judiciary, a clear policy on infrastructure by policy makers and the provision of security for the lives and properties of the population including foreign nationals; but it is hoped that if government fights corruption and enlightens the population on the importance of adopting this procurement strategy it will succeed in speeding up the provision of the necessary public infrastructure for economic development. In conclusion, the research questions were all answered by the study, and the study also achieved the objectives of the research.

REFERENCES:

1. **Aibinu, A.A., & Jagboro, G.O.** (2002). *The Effect of Construction Delays on Project Delivery in Nigeria Construction Industries*. International journal of project management 20 , 393–599.
2. **Alonso-Conde, A., Brown, C., & Rojo-Suarez, J.** (2007). *Public Private Partnerships: Incentives, Risk Transfer and Real Options*. Review of Financial Economics, 16, 335– 349.

3. **Babalola, J., & Odunowo, O.** (2010). *Assessment of Critical Success Factors of Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) on Infrastructure Development in Developing Economy*. Second International Conference on Construction in Developing Countries (ICCIDC-II) "Advancing and Integrating Construction Education, Research & Practice", (pp. 623–628). Cairo.
4. **Broadbent, J., & Laughlin, R.** (2003). *Public-Private Partnerships: An Introduction*. Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 16 (3), 332–341.
5. **Cartlidge, D.** (2004). *Procurement of Built Assets*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth Heinemann.
6. **Crinson, I.** (2008). *Assessing the 'Insider-Outsider Threat' Duality in the Context of the Development of Public-Private Partnerships Delivering 'Choice' in Healthcare Services: A Sociomaterial Critique*. Information Security Technical Report, 13, 202–206.
7. **De Jong, M., Rui, M., Stead, D., Yongchi, M., & Bao, X.** (2010). *Introducing Public-Private Partnerships for Metropolitan Subways in China: What is the Evidence?* Journal of Transport Geography, 18, 301–313.
8. **Fewings, P.** (2005). *Construction Project Management: An Integrated Approach*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.
9. **Franzolin, A.** (2009). *The Future of Public-Private Partnerships in Satellite Communications*. Space Policy, 25, 193–194.
10. **Goodliffe, M.** (2002). *The New UK Model for Air Traffic Services-A Public Private Partnership under Economic Regulation*. Journal of Air Transport Management, 8, 13–18.
11. **Grimsey, D., & Lewis, M.** (2002). *Evaluating the Risks of Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure Projects*. International Journal Of Project Management, 20, 107–118.
12. **Hukka, J.J., & Vinnari, E.M.** (2007). *Public-Private Partnerships in Finnish Water Services Sector*. Utilities Policy, 15, 86–92.
13. **Ibrahim, M.J.** (2008). *Growth Prospects of Oil and Gas Abundant Economies: The Nigerian Experience (1970-2000)*. Journal of Economic Studies, 35 (2), 170–190.
14. **Kuriyan, R., & Ray, I.** (2009). *Outsourcing the State? Public-Private Partnerships and Information Technologies in India*. World Development, 37 (10), 1663–1673.
15. **Martimort, D., & Pouyet, J.** (2008). *To build or not to build: Normative and Positive theories of Public-Private Partnerships*. International Journal of Industrial Organisations, 26, 393–411.
16. **Medda, F.** (2007). *A Game Theory Approach for Allocation of Risks in Transport Public Private Partnerships*. International Journal of Project Management, 25, 213–218.
17. **Ng, S., Xie, J., Cheung, Y., & Jefferies, m.** (2007). *A simulation model for optimizing the concession period of Public-Private Partnerships schemes*. International Journal of Project Management, 25, 791–798.
18. **Pribadi, K., & Pangeran, M.H.** (2010). *Assessing Readiness of Public Sector Risk Management for PPP in Infrastructure Development in Indonesia*. Second International Conference on Construction in Developing Countries (ICCIDC-II): "Advancing and Integrating Construction Education, Research & Practice", (pp. 217–280). Cairo.
19. **Sengupta, U.** (2006). *Government Intervention and Public-Private Partnerships in Housing Delivery in Kolkata*. Habitat International, 30, 448–461.
20. **Srivastava, P., & Oh, S.A.** (2010). *Private Foundations, Philanthropy and Partnership in Education and Development: Mapping the Terrain*. International Journal of Educational Development, 30, 460–471.
21. **Tang, L., Shen, Q., & Cheng, E.** (2010). *A review of studies on Public-Private Partnership projects in the construction industry*. International Journal of Project Management, 28, 683–694.