

Critical Factors Affecting Public Procurement Policy Implementation for Effective Project Delivery in Yobe State Nigeria

Suleiman Saleh Aji,¹ Abdullahi Nafiu Zadawa,¹ Muhammed Musa Mukhtar¹

¹Department of Quantity Surveying, Faculty of Environmental Technology, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi, Nigeria

Abstract:- Public procurement policy guarantees that transparency and accountability are enshrined for effective project delivery. However, due to lack of competition and openness in the award of contracts, Yobe state's public procurement has been characterized as vulnerable to corruption. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the critical factors affecting public procurement implementation policy for effective project delivery in Yobe state. Consequently, a self-administered questionnaire was administered on a random sample of 118 members of MDAs tender board in Yobe state with 100 valid responses recorded. Data were analysed using mean ranking. Findings from the mean ranking revealed that the most critical factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy are lack of experts around public procurement policy, the inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases, political inference, frequency of changes in design due to improper planning, lack of political-will, poor cash flow and lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation. Therefore, it is recommended that the government should collaborate with allied construction professionals in improving implementation of public procurement policy in Yobe state, and appropriate strategies should be adopted for evaluating and getting feedback for the purpose of achieving effective project delivery in Yobe state.

Keywords:- Critical factors, Effective project delivery, Policy implementation, Public procurement.

I. INTRODUCTION

An effective project delivery is usually completed on schedule, within the estimated cost and the right quality (Bello and Kashaam, 2017). However, in order to achieve effective project delivery depends significantly on its public procurement policy (Jibrin et al., 2014). Public procurement according to Tukamuhabwa, (2012), is the process of assigning an external entity to obtain works, goods and services to be funded from the public treasury. Public procurement involves the procurement of goods and services by third party on behalf of the government, which could be various municipalities, ministries, provinces, agencies or any other governmental organization (Othman et al., 2010). As a result, Bureau of public procurement and the enactment of public procurement Act 2007

were set-up to make public procurement processes more professional, efficient and effective. The enactment of public procurement policy ensures compliance to enthrone transparency, accountability, and value for money in the procurement of goods, works and services, both for project planning and implementation (Shwarka & Anigbogu 2012). For instance, the procurement Act stipulates the punitive measures which are aimed at discouraging the arbitrary award of contract and the wanton abandonment of government projects and corrupt activities of some government official. Thus, the enactment of public procurement policy aid to accelerate infrastructural development in the country by elimination of inflation of contract cost and abandonment of project, thus launch the country into the comity of progressive nations.

However, public procurement and award of contract in Yobe state has been identified as the government activity most vulnerable to corruption as a result of lack of open processes and procedures, and mismanagement of resource in the award of contracts. This is because public procurement provides multiple opportunities for both public and private sectors to divert public funds for private gain (Jibrin et al., 2014; Wambui, 2013). This is corroborated by OECD (2007) asserting that bribery by international firms in OECD countries is more prevalent in public than in utilities, taxation, judiciary and state capture. The persistence of these scandals despite the presence of the public procurement policies points to poor implementation of these policies (Hui et al., 2011). Consequently, studies have showed that public procurement reforms will bring transparency and accountability to public procurement issues (Fullan 2000; Fullan 2009). Though, Payne (2008) argued that only looking for general solutions and not acknowledging the particular context can lead to incoherent public procurement transformation efforts. As a result, a number of factors need to be identified to enhance the change of successful implementation of public procurement policy. It is in this light that this study proposed to identify the critical factors affecting the implementation of public procurement policy in Yobe state. Thus achieve this democratic government's social and economic development plan and vision of becoming one of the top states in Nigeria.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Procurement is the acquisition of goods or services, government institutions often define procurement as the processes intended to promote fair and open competition for their businesses while minimizing exposure to fraud and collusion. In fact, in many developing economies the profession is still being treated as a 'back-office' function (Muli, 2017). However, not much has been done to explore and address challenges facing procurement professionals in developing economies. There is limited understanding regarding the role procurement plays in both government and non-government institutions in developing economies. Organisations need a well-defined method to implement policies of procurement in order to unlock the potential value in the procurement function. Eja, and Ramegowda, M., (2019). The public sector is an essential part of every economy which governments spend large sums of public money on a range of services and infrastructure for their citizens. Governments increasingly use fiscal policy measures to support public social, infrastructure and health systems, and provide direct financial support to businesses and citizens through measures such as income support and unemployment benefits. Most public sector entities face many challenges, which can include:

III. RESEARCH GAPS

- Increased demand for high quality services,
- Outdated infrastructure,
- Tax competition
- Poor Implementation policies and Project delivery methods

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

The need for achieving effective project delivery process in Nigeria is ever becoming more crucial and urgent. The pace at which this can be realized is hinged on the ability of the government to formulate appropriate policies that will ensure transparency and accountability in project delivery. As a result, public procurement policies were formulated (Jibrin et al., 2014). This involves establishment of Bureau of public procurement and the enactment of public procurement Act 2007, which ensures compliance to enthrone transparency, accountability, and value for money in the procurement of goods, works and services, both for project planning and implementation. Therefore, aid to reduce the high level of poor governance, public procurement irregularities and fraud within the public sector, and accelerate infrastructural development by elimination of inflation of contract cost and abandonment of project (Akenroye et al., 2013).

However, many factors can affect the implementation of public procurement policy for an effective project delivery. For these reason, several studies in many countries have been carried out to identify specific factors which affect the implementation of public procurement policy. These include studies by Akenroye et al. (2013); Agaba and Shipman, (2012); Enofe et al. (2015); Eyaa and Oluka, (2011); Fayomi, (2013);

Gelderman et al. (2006); Hui et al. (2011); Jibrin et al. (2014); Kangogo & Kiptoo, (2013); Lisa, (2010); Ntayi et al. (2010); Onyinkwa, (2013); Rossi, (2010); Shehu, (2014); Wambui, (2013); and Williams-Elegbe, (2012). The studies analysed tender bids, and found out that implementation of public procurement policy is affected by ineffective political leadership, sectionalism and ethnic bias, lack of continuity, over-ambitious and unrealisable goals, non-appreciation of public procurement Act by the public, lengthy time of tendering procedures, political interference, poor cash flow, lack of political will, the inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases, corruption, late passage of annual budget, frequency of changes in design due to improper planning, lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation, and lack of experts around public procurement policy.

These factors offers the opportunity to understand the problem of implementation of public procurement policy. For instance, policy implementation is positively or negatively affected by the attitude of the implementers. That is, if they are negatively disposed to the policy, there will be lack of commitment to the implementation process. Also, ineffective political leadership foster policies to be made for the purpose of selfish and egoistic interest of the political leaders with less regard to its appropriateness in addressing societal issues. On the other hand, sectionalism and ethnicity has also continue to mar public policy implementation in Nigeria. This may be as a result that the policy implementing officials do so to only favour their immediate ethnic group. Moreover, corruption forces resources appropriated for the public procurement to be criminally diverted, thus public projects are awarded to ghost names, party loyalists and their children. This fostered unpredictability in the award of contract, as contract guidelines or criteria could be changed at any time, and also lengthy time of tendering procedures. However, lack of rules governing the public procurement process made it extremely difficult to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases. Besides, lack of appropriate framework to support implementation of public procurement policy has made public procurement officials to possess a wide measure of discretion in conducting and managing the procurement process, which could easily be exploited. It was also noted that some public procurement officials lack the relevant knowledge necessary to implement public procurement and its related procedures. Furthermore, every new government often change a few areas in the existing policies and then give it a new name rather than continue with the policies. Thus resulting in distortion of project cash flow leading to abandonment of projects. This has also made some government public policies unreliable, as there is likely little or no desire by the public.

From the foregoing, the findings of these studies forms the underlying basis for identifying the critical factors affecting public procurement policy in Yobe state as outlined in the study's objective.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Approach

To gather the data required, this study adopted an exploratory research strategy which involves literature review of 15 factors which have been examined by previous researchers before conducting quantitative analysis. A preliminary study was carried out on a small scale of respondents to ensure clarity and also to determine the ease of completing the questionnaire. As shown in Table 1, 15 factors were selected as the factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy. These factors were used to construct a structured questionnaire for the pilot study. 40 members of MDAs tender board in Yobe state were selected in a non-

random style for the pilot survey. The respondents suggested few changes to the questionnaire regarding the wordings of the questions (Fayomi, 2013).

The questionnaire consisted of two sections. Section A consist of respondents personal particulars such as; years of experience, membership of professional regulatory bodies, academic qualification, numbers of projects executed and type of projects executed. In section B, each respondent was asked to rate the factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy in Yobe state on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 1 represents “very low” and 5 represent “Very high”.

B. Method of Data Collection

Table 1: Factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy

S/N.	Factors	Authors
1.	Ineffective political leadership	Akenroye et al. (2013); Agaba and Shipman, (2012); Enofe et al. (2015); Eyaa and Oluka, (2011); Fayomi, (2013); Gelderman et al. (2006); Hui et al. (2011); Jibrin et al. (2014); Kangogo & Kiptoo, (2013); Lisa, (2010); Ntayi et al. (2010); Onyinkwa, (2013); Rossi, (2010); Shehu, (2014); Wambui, (2013); and Williams-Elegbe, (2012).
2.	Sectionalism and ethnic bias	
3.	Lack of continuity	
4.	Over-ambitious and unrealisable goals	
5.	Non-appreciation of public procurement Act by the public	
6.	Lengthy time of tendering procedures	
7.	Political interference	
8.	Poor cash flow	
9.	Lack of political will	
10.	The inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases	
11.	Corruption	
12.	Late passage of annual budget	
13.	Frequency of changes in design due to improper planning	
14.	Lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation	
15.	Lack of experts around public procurement policy	

C. Population of the Study

The population of this study comprises the members of building projects tender board of MDAs in Yobe state. Accordingly, there are 24 MDAs in Yobe state, with permanent secretaries and directors making up the building projects tender

board of each MDAs. These members follow Yobe state procurement Act as the member of each MDAs building projects tender board. As presented in Table 3.1, this became the sampling frame from which the respondents were taken.

Table 2: MDAs and number of members of tender board

S/N	Names of MDAs	Number of members of tender board
1.	Ministry of finance and economic development	8
2.	Ministry of works	6
3.	Ministry of transport and energy	7
4.	Ministry of commerce, trade and industry	7
5.	Ministry of housing and urban development	6
6.	Ministry of land and solid minerals	6
7.	Ministry of justice	7
8.	Ministry of local government and chieftaincy affairs	7
9.	Ministry of Agriculture	8
10.	Ministry of budget and planning	5
11.	Ministry of humanitarian and disaster management	6
12.	Ministry of health and human resource	8

13.	Ministry of water resources	8
14.	Ministry of religious affairs	7
15.	Ministry of environment	8
16.	Ministry of information	7
17.	Ministry of youth, sports and social development	7
18.	Ministry of higher education	6
19.	Ministry of basic and secondary education	8
20.	Ministry of women affairs	6
21.	Office of the head of service	10
22.	Government house	8
23.	Yobe state universal basic education	9
24.	Rural water supply	6
	Total	171

Source: Field survey, 2021

D. Sample Size

A sample is precisely a part of the population. A sample size is therefore the portion of the population that has been selected for as it saves time spent and reduces costs that would have been incurred if the whole population were to be used.

(Boniface, 2011). Therefore to determine the sample size from the study population, which are 171 member of each MDAs building projects tender board, the krejcie and Morgan, (1970) equation was used, as presented in Table 3. below.

Table 3: Table for determining sample size from a given population

<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>
10	10	220	140	1200	291
15	14	230	144	1300	297
20	19	240	148	1400	302
25	24	250	152	1500	306
30	28	260	155	1600	310
35	32	270	159	1700	313
40	36	280	162	1800	317
45	40	290	165	1900	320
50	44	300	169	2000	322
55	48	320	175	2200	327
60	52	340	181	2400	331
65	56	360	186	2600	335
70	59	380	191	2800	338
75	63	400	196	3000	341
80	66	420	201	3500	346
85	70	440	205	4000	351
90	73	460	210	4500	354
95	76	480	214	5000	357
100	80	500	217	6000	361
110	86	550	226	7000	364
120	92	600	234	8000	367

<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>
130	97	650	242	9000	368
140	103	700	248	10000	370
150	108	750	254	15000	375
160	113	800	260	20000	377
170	118	850	265	30000	379
180	123	900	269	40000	380
190	127	950	274	50000	381
200	132	1000	278	75000	382
210	136	1100	285	1000000	384

Note.—*N* is population size, *S* is sample size.
Source: Krejcie and Morgans, (1970)

From Table 3.2, this means that for a population of 171, and with an accuracy rating equal to 95%, 118 sample sizes are required for this study.

E. Sampling Technique

A random sampling technique was adopted for this study. Creswell and Creswell, (2018) pointed out that this technique is mostly associated with survey-based study and is ideally suited where the respondents is not homogeneous.

F. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Test

Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient test is used for evaluating the reliability of the instrument. The measure is considered to be reliable if the value of Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient equals or exceeds 0.70 (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). In this study, the values of Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient for the construct ranged from 0.701 to 0.746. Since these values were more than 0.7, the entire construct as well as the variables was believed to have demonstrated a good reliability to be measured on the same latent trait and scale.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study employed the use of Multiple Regression Analysis to determine public procurement policy contribution to the effect on project delivery. As presented in the formula below:

$$Y_i = f(X_i, \beta) + e_i$$

Where; Y_i = dependent variables; f = function; X_i = independent variable; β = unknown parameter; e_i = error terms.

The study determined which factors (Beta and significance values) were checked for each of the variables. The Beta value determines the unique contribution by the variable to explaining the dependent variable when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled for. The significant value tells whether a variable made a statistically significant contribution to the equation.

Table 4: Number of projects executed yearly

Number of projects executed	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
0 -5	16	16.0
6 – 10	12	12.0
11 – 15	16	16.0
16 and above	56	56.0
Total	100	100

Source: Field survey, 2021

As presented in Table 4, a total number of 16 (16%) of organisations represented by the respondents executed between 0-5 projects yearly. 12 (12%) of organisations represented by the respondents executed between 6-10 projects yearly. While 16 (16%) of organisations represented by the respondents executed between 11-15 projects yearly. 56 (56%) of

organisations represented by the respondents executed between 16 and above projects yearly. This reflects the involvement of the respondents in the construction activities.

To Identify the Most Critical Factors Affecting Implementation of Public Procurement Policy

Table 5: Mean ranking of the most significant factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy

Factors	Mean	SD	Ranking
Lack of experts around public procurement policy	4.24	0.588	1
The inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try & dispose public procurement cases	4.16	0.615	2
Political interference	4.12	0.327	3
Frequency of changes in design due to improper planning	4.00	0.696	4
Lack of political will	3.96	0.602	5
Poor cash flow	3.96	0.724	5
Lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation	3.96	0.530	5
Corruption	3.92	0.631	8
Lengthy time of tendering procedures	3.92	0.563	8
Non-appreciation of public procurement Act by the public	3.92	0.273	8
Ineffective political leadership	3.88	0.656	11
Over-ambitious & unrealisable goals	3.80	0.696	12
Sectionalism & ethnic bias	3.76	0.429	13
Lack of continuity	3.64	0.689	14
Late passage of annual budget	3.64	0.689	14
Total	58.88		
Average mean	3.93		

Source: Field survey, 2021

From Table 5, the results show that the mean values ranged from 4.24 and 3.64. As presented in the Table, the mean value of lack of experts around public procurement policy was ranked first with mean value 4.24, while, the inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases was ranked second, political inference was ranked third, frequency of changes in design due to improper planning was ranked fourth, lack of political-will, poor cash flow and lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation were ranked fifth, corruption, lengthy time of tendering procedures and non-appreciation of public procurement Act by the public were ranked eighth, ineffective political leadership was ranked eleventh, over-ambitious and unrealisable goals was ranked twelfth, sectionalism and ethnic bias was ranked thirteenth, lack of continuity and late passage of annual budget were ranked fourteenth. Based on the outcome, 7 factors; lack of

experts around public procurement policy, the inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases, political inference, frequency of changes in design due to improper planning, lack of political-will, poor cash flow and lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation are above the average mean. This indicates how much more these factors are important to the respondents. The results are in agreement with those by Akenroye et al. (2013), Hanks et al. (2008) and Kiama, (2014) who affirmed that in Nigeria there are no framework and supervisory mechanism for ensuring public procurement policy are complied with, and partly because public procurement are often subject to unannounced changes by the government. Also, this facilitated the award of contract on a non-commercial basis or non-competitive manner.

Public Procurement Policy for Effective Project Delivery in Yobe state

Table 6: Mean ranking of the possible ways of improving implementation of public procurement policy on effective project delivery.

Ways	Mean	SD	Ranking
Establishment of regulatory authority in the state	4.32	0.469	1
Implement potentials for improvement base behaviour of compliance on project participants	4.24	0.429	2
Involvement of professional/experts in public procurement	4.08	0.394	3
Top management support	4.04	0.530	4
Implementing disputes management strategies	3.96	0.602	5
Drafting of general & particular conditions of contract	3.96	0.530	5
Allocating contract risk	3.84	0.678	7
Effective & frequent progress meeting	3.80	0.569	8
Implementing pre-contract award meeting	3.60	0.636	9
Total	35.84		
Average mean	3.98		

Source: Field survey, 2021

From Table 6, the results show that the mean values ranged from 4.32 and 3.60. As presented in Table 6, the mean value of establishment of regulatory authority in the state was ranked first with mean value 4.32, while, implement potentials for improvement base behaviour of compliance on project participants was ranked second, involvement of professional/experts in public procurement was ranked third, top management support was ranked fourth, implementing disputes management strategies and drafting of general &

particular conditions of contract were ranked fifth, allocating contract risk was ranked seventh, effective & frequent progress meeting was ranked eighth, and implementing pre-contract award meeting was ranked ninth.

Possible Ways of Improving the Implementation of Public Procurement Policy for Effective Project Delivery in Yobe state.

Table 7: Mean ranking of the possible ways of improving implementation of public procurement policy on effective project delivery

Ways	Mean	SD	Ranking
Establishment of regulatory authority in the state	4.32	0.469	1
Implement potentials for improvement base behaviour of compliance on project participants	4.24	0.429	2
Involvement of professional/experts in public procurement	4.08	0.394	3
Top management support	4.04	0.530	4
Implementing disputes management strategies	3.96	0.602	5
Drafting of general & particular conditions of contract	3.96	0.530	5
Allocating contract risk	3.84	0.678	7
Effective & frequent progress meeting	3.80	0.569	8
Implementing pre-contract award meeting	3.60	0.636	9
Total	35.84		
Average mean	3.98		

Source: Field survey, 2021

From Table 7, the results show that the mean values ranged from 4.32 and 3.60. As presented in Table 7, the mean value of establishment of regulatory authority in the state was ranked first with mean value 4.32, while, implement potentials for improvement base behaviour of compliance on project participants was ranked second, involvement of professional/experts in public procurement was ranked third, top management support was ranked fourth, implementing disputes management strategies and drafting of general & particular conditions of contract were ranked fifth, allocating contract risk was ranked seventh, effective & frequent progress meeting was ranked eighth, and implementing pre-contract award meeting was ranked ninth.

The results which were considered as the possible ways of improving implementation of public procurement policy on effective project delivery in Yobe state, and thus achieved the third objective of this study. The results was supported by a research of Akenroye et al. (2013); Hanks et al. (2008) and Williams-Elegbe, (2012) who believed that regulatory mechanism and relevant professionals could help drive implementation of public procurement policy in each of the government ministries, departments and agencies, thus ensure quality services in the public organisations.

VII. MEAN RANKING

The output of each variable was rated based on the basis of the mean value using SPSS. Hence, the variable with the highest mean is the first in the rank order. This was extensively applied in research by Khadija and Kibet, (2015) and Kiama, (2014). Consequently, in order to mark the cut-off points for interpretations, the level of agreement was derived by dividing the sum of mean of each variable by the total number of variables (Zannah et al., 2017). Therefore, the variables with mean above the level of agreement should be accepted as the most critical variables. While, the variables with mean below the level of agreement should be rejected, as it does not represent the perceptions of the respondents

From Table 2, the results show that the mean values ranged from 4.24 and 3.64. As presented in Table 4.6, the mean value of lack of experts around public procurement policy was ranked first with mean value 4.24, while, the inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases was ranked second, political inference was ranked third, frequency of changes in design due to improper planning was ranked fourth, lack of political-will, poor cash flow and lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation were ranked fifth, corruption, lengthy time of tendering procedures and non-appreciation of public procurement Act by the public were ranked eighth, ineffective political leadership was ranked eleventh, over-ambitious and unrealisable goals was ranked twelfth, sectionalism and ethnic bias was ranked thirteenth, lack of continuity and late passage of annual budget were ranked fourteenth.

Table 8: Mean ranking of the factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy

Factors	Mean	Ranking
Lack of experts around public procurement policy	4.24	1
The inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try & dispose public procurement cases	4.16	2
Political interference	4.12	3
Frequency of changes in design due to improper planning	4.00	4
Lack of political will	3.96	5
Poor cash flow	3.96	5
Lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation	3.96	5
Corruption	3.92	8
Lengthy time of tendering procedures	3.92	8
Non-appreciation of public procurement Act by the public	3.92	8
Ineffective political leadership	3.88	11
Over-ambitious & unrealisable goals	3.80	12
Sectionalism & ethnic bias	3.76	13
Lack of continuity	3.64	14
Late passage of annual budget	3.64	14
Total	58.88	
Average mean	3.93	

Based on the outcome, 7 factors; lack of experts around public procurement policy, the inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases, political inference, frequency of changes in design due to improper planning, lack of political-will, poor cash flow and lack of appropriate framework to support public procurement policy implementation are above the average mean. This indicates how much more these factors are important to the respondents. The results which were considered as the most critical factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy in Yobe state. The results are in agreement with those by Akenroye et al. (2013), Hanks et al. (2008) and Kiama, (2014) who affirmed that in Nigeria there are no framework and supervisory mechanism for ensuring public procurement policy are complied with, and partly because public procurement are often subject to unannounced changes by the government. This fostered unpredictability as contract award criteria or guidelines could be changed at any time. Also, this facilitated the award of contract on a non-commercial basis or non-competitive manner. This meant that public/political officers possessed a wide measure of discretion in conducting and managing the procurement process, which could easily be exploited. Thus, marred the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This study identifies seven critical factors affecting implementation of public procurement policy in Yobe state which include lack of experts around public procurement policy, the inability of the anti-corruption agencies to promptly try and dispose public procurement cases, political inference, frequency of changes in design due to improper planning, lack of political-will, poor cash flow and lack of appropriate

framework to support public procurement policy implementation.

Drawn from the results, it revealed that the critical factors arises from mode of operation of public procurement policy. This confirms the perceived ineffective project delivery in Yobe state. In view of the above, it was recommended that the government should collaborate with allied construction professionals in improving implementation of public procurement policy in Yobe state. Also, appropriate strategies should be adopted for evaluating and getting feedback for the purpose of achieving effective project delivery. Consequently, the implementation of public procurement policy is a collaborative effort of both the government, allied construction professionals and the contractors. Hence, there is need for attitudinal change in the implementation of public procurement policy.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Agaba, E., & Shipman, N. (2012). *Public procurement reform in developing countries: The Ugandan experience*. In Piga, G., & Thai, K. V. (Eds.), *Advancing Public procurement. Practices, Innovation and Knowledge- Sharing*. Pp 373-391.
- [2.] Akenroye, T.O., Oyegoke, A.S. & Eyo, A.B. (2013) 'Development of a framework for the implementation of green public procurement in Nigeria', *Int. J. Procurement Management*, 6(1). Pp.1-23.
- [3.] Bureau of Public Procurement (2010). *Public Procurement Journal*, 6/e, April June. Bureau of Public Procurement (2010). *Public Procurement Journal*, 4/e, October December.

- [4.] Eja, K. M., & Ramegowda, M., (2019). Government project failure in developing countries: a review with particular reference to Nigeria: *Global Journal of social sciences vol. 19*. Pp.35-47.
- [5.] Enofe, A. O., Okuonghae O., & Onobun, I. S. (2015). The impact of the public procurement Act on government accountability in Nigeria. *Journal of Political Science and Leadership Research, 1(8):Pp.114-128*.
- [6.] Eyaa, S., & Oluka, N. (2011). Explaining non-compliance in public procurement in Uganda. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(11),Pp.35-44*.
- [7.] Fayomi, I. O. (2013). Public Procurement and Due Process Policy in Nigeria: Thrust, Prospects and Challenges. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1(4)*. Pp.39 – 45.
- [8.] Fullan, M. (2000). 'The three stories of education reform', *Phi Delta Kappan*: Pp.581-584.
- [9.] Fullan, M. (2009). 'Large-scale reform comes of age', *Journal of Educational Change 10*: 101-113.
- [10.] Gelderman, C. J., Ghijsen, P. W. T., & Brugman, M. J. (2006). Public procurement and EU tendering directives-explaining non-compliance. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 19(7)*. Pp702-714.
- [11.] Hanks, J., Davies, H. and Perera, O. (2008) *Sustainable Public Procurement in South Africa*, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Manitoba, Canada, available at http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/spp_south_africa.pdf (accessed on 3 July 2021).
- [12.] Hui, W., Othman, R., Normah, O., Rahman, R., & Haron, N. (2011). Procurement issues in Malaysia. *International Journal Public Sector Managt, 24(6)*. Pp.567-593.
- [13.] Jibrin, M. S., Ejura, S. B., & Augustine, N. (2014) The Public Procurement Reforms in Nigeria: Implementation and Compliance Challenges; *Journal of Asian Business Strategy, 4 (11)*. Pp.149-162.
- [14.] Kangogo, J., & Kiptoo, E. J. (2013). Factors Affecting Ethical Standards in Public Procurement in Kenya. *International Journal of Management Science, 1(3)*. Pp.90-99.
- [15.] Khadija, R., & Kibet, Y. (2015). Factors affecting implementation of public procurement procedures and practices in Elgeyo-Marakwet County. *International Academic Journal of Procurement and Supply Chain Management, 1(5)*. Pp.121-135.
- [16.] Kiama, G. P. (2014). Factors affecting implementation of public procurement Act in SACCO societies in Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 4(2)*. Pp.169-194.
- [17.] Kiiver, P., & Kodym, J. (2014). The practice of public procurement: tendering, selection and award. Intersentia.
- [18.] Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, vol.30* Pp.607-610.
- [19.] Lisa, I. (2010). Compliance culture. A conceptual framework. *Journal of Management and Organization, 19(7)*. Pp.702-714.
- [20.] Muli, C. W., (2017). Challenges facing the procurement process in parastatals in Kenya: A Case Study of Tanathi Water Services Board. University of Africa
- [21.] Ntayi, J. M., Eyaa, S., & Ngoma, M. (2010). Moral disengagement and the social construction of procurement officers' deviant behaviours. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 11(4)*. Pp.95-110.
- [22.] OECD, (2007): Integrity Corruption in tactical Procurement Good practice from A to Z, OECD Publishing, Paris. France.
- [23.] Onyinkwa, J. (2013). Factors influencing compliance to procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Kenya: a case of Nyamache District, KisII County. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business, 5(1)*. Pp.561.
- [24.] Othman, R., Zakaria, H., Nordin, N., Shahidan, Z., & Jusoff, K. (2010). The Malaysian Public Procurement's Prevalent System and its Weaknesses. *American journal of economics and business administration, 2(1)*. P.6.
- [25.] Payne, C. (2008), *So much reform, so little change: the persistence of failure in urban schools*, Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- [26.] Rossi, C. L. (2010). Compliance: an overlooked business strategy. *International Journal of Social Economics, 37(10)*. Pp.816-831.
- [27.] Shehu, A. S. (2014,). *An Overview of Public Procurement Guidelines in Nigeria*. Paper presented at the Institute of Quantity Surveyors National Seminar 'Procurement of Construction Works and Services – Adapting to Contemporary Challenges' on the 11th -12th June, 2014 at Gombe International Hotel, Nigeria.
- [28.] Shwarka S. M., & Anigbogu, N. A. (2012) Impact of the Public Procurement Reform on public building projects delivery in Nigeria In: Smith, S.D (Ed) Procs 28th Annual ARCOM Conference, 3-5 September 2012, Edinburgh, UK, Association of Researchers in Construction Management. Pp. 969-977.
- [29.] Spillane, J. P., Oyedele, L. O., & Meding, J. V. (2012). Confined site construction. *Journal Engineering Design Technology, 10(3)*. Pp.397–420.
- [30.] Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. (6th Ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [31.] The Nigeria Public Procurement Act (PPA) (2007). Public Procurement Act of 2007. Abuja: Federal Republic of Nigeria.
- [32.] Tukamuhabwa, B. R. (2012). Antecedents and Consequences of Public Procurement Non-compliance Behavior. *Journal of Economics & Behavioral Studies, 4(1)*.
- [33.] Wambui, E. N. (2013). Role of procurement on organization performance; A survey study of public secondary schools in Imenti North District, Kenya.

International Journal of Social Sciences Entrepreneurship, 1(3). Pp.289-302.

- [34.] Williams-Elegbe, S. (2012). The Reform and Regulation of Public Procurement in Nigeria. *Public Contract. Law Journal*, 41(2). Pp.339-365.
- [35.] Zannah, A. A., Latiffi, A. A., Raji, A. U., Waziri, A. A., & Mohammed, U. (2017). Causes of low skilled worker's performance in construction projects, *Path of Science*, 3(6). Pp.4.1-4.15.