DRIVERS OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON CAPITAL PROJECT DELIVERY

Azeez, O. O., Adebisi, S. A., and George, O. J.
Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Akoka. Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Owing to the failure of administrative approaches used in managing government resources, public private partnership strategy, amongst other initiatives was introduced, as new public management theory for management of public infrastructure. This paper focused on public private partnership (PPP) strategy in Nigeria with regards to drivers of effective partnerships and their influence on some organizations. In investigating how effective the strategy has been, the research questions covers how some PPP drivers namely partner's responsibility, managerial competence, organizational structure, transparency, capacity of the project and legal environment has determined the success of the managed public infrastructure from stakeholder's perspectives. Organizations used were Garki Hospital, Bus Rapid Transit, and Benin Electricity Distribution Company. A total of five hundred and eighty one (581) samples respondents were selected with the use cross sectional method. Validated questionnaire was used to collect data which were analysed with the use of Multiple Regression technique. Findings showed that all the drivers have positive contribution to capital project delivery, but at different degrees of influence. Further analysis shows that partners' legal institutional framework constitutes the first, followed by capacity of the project in terms of profit making and stakeholder's responsibility constitutes the third and fourth respectively. Based on the findings, it was concluded that all the factors having contributed positively to the prediction of capital project delivery are drivers of PPP success. Thus, in an environment like Nigeria the legal requirements in PPPs, transparency of roles, partner's responsibility, and managerial competence are major facilitators that have to be considered.

Keywords: Public Private Partnership, Infrastructure, Transparency, Managerial Competence, Responsibility.

1. Introduction

The idea of public private partnership (PPP) is an initiative of the government to jointly manage public facilities, projects and utilities with the private sector. This idea has been design to address deficiencies experienced in the administration of public infrastructures solely managed by the government. The collaboration is to govern, encourage private sector participation and confidence in the provision of physical infrastructure which has been of great challenge to economic growth in many countries. This concept have often been touted not only for their ability to increase efficiency and quality, but also for enhancing effectiveness, transferring

or sharing risk, promoting coordination, and expanding resources for the attainment of goals that are in the public interest (Oblak, Bistricic, & Jugovic, 2013;Sfakianakis & Van de Laar, 2013; Osei-Kyei, Osei-Kyei, Chan, & Chan,2017).

Thus, PPPs are combination of human discipline and materials of both public and private sectors that needs proper management for effective delivery of capital projects and services. This is a contractual agreement between a public agency which can be federal or state or local, and a private sector entity or cooperation to execute or manage a large social project that is of significant benefit to the public. According to Monteduro (2014), many developed countries have recognized PPPs form of procurement as an effective tool of economic development by improving on their infrastructural development. The economic buoyancy of any country is linked to good infrastructure (Utevskaia, Burova, & Pokrovskaia, 2016). The European Union (EU) countries have exploited the advantages of PPPs to promote, provide capital projects and protect their economies (Garvin & Bosso, 2008; Hodge & Greve, 2016).

Collaborating with the private sector is the most valued option for the public sector to meet the demand of public infrastructure. Infrastructure challenges have stifled innovation, trade and numerous industries like manufacturing, agriculture, transportation, tourism and health in most developing countries. Public infrastructure is a social responsibility of the government and the Nigeria government has decided to merge with private investors as the best way out to fund social responsibility needs in the country like Nigeria banks (Oghojafor, & Adebisi, 2012). The traditional procurement model of Nigeria governments funding infrastructural development through fiscal budgets has become very unattractive and perhaps impossible due to burgeoning budgetary deficits, governmental inefficiencies and waste (Okonjo-Iweala, 2014). All these are result of poor administrative prowess and practices, and corruption. World over, PPPs is the solution to infrastructural deficiency and management.

1.1.1 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are to examine how successful capital project delivery is determined by drivers namely stakeholder's responsibility, expertise and competency, transparency of roles, organisational structure, capacity of project and legal institutional framework.

1.1.2. Research Question

What is the prediction of stakeholder's responsibility, expertise and competency, transparency of roles, organisational structure, capacity of project and legal institutional framework on capital project delivery?

1.2. Review of Literature

This study examines the drivers of public private management strategy and their

influence on capital project delivery. In this section, some theories lend themselves to buttress arguments raised in the study. Amongst these are the new public management theory, corporate social responsibility theory, managerial skills theory, agency theory, theory of organisational structure, theory of profit maximisation, and the legal theory. These theories were used to underpin ideas presented in this study.

New public management theory

The new public management theory was used to provide a justification for the use of private organisation philosophies to manage public utilities (Kalimullah, Alam & Nour, 2012). This theory emerged owing to failures in administrative practices often connected to the government. Amongst other liberalisation policies such as privatisation and commercialisation, public private partnership also reflects the involvement of private organization in the management of public assets (Gruening, 2001). These policies are directed at hastening the administration of bureaucratic form of government which is often described as very slow. The new public management theory provided a basis for some theories underpinned below.

Social responsibility theory

Public private partnership is collaboration between the government and private corporations for the management of public infrastructures (Antonio, 2007). This implies that both the private and public entities enter into agreements with an obligation to act for the benefit of the society at large and they become stakeholders in the management of a public property. As stakeholders, allocation of funds and proceeds derived from the management of the public facilities are shared. As stakes are shared between shareholders, so do partners share other responsibilities in terms of risks. Stakeholder responsibility is a description of shared obligations between partners in contract in terms of risks and benefits.
Stakeholders in public private partnership projects include also the general public. Thus, public organisation, Private Corporation and the general public constitutes the social actors in public private partnerships. Social responsibility theory is used in this paper to describe the internal and external obligations of partners towards ensuring project success.

Managerial skills theory

Management theories describe many skills that are meant to be possessed by managers. This theory implies that all the skills possessed by management must be centred on three major skills which are the technical skills, human relationship skills and the conceptual skills (Seyedinejat, Razaghi & Dousti, 2014). For the technical skills, Katz explained that managers should possess skills needed for the performance of technical tasks. Technical tasks are often connected with computations and modelling. Some of the human relationship skills needed by

managers are behavioural. Most of these skills are needed by managers to maintain relationship through emotional intelligence and understanding. Conceptual skills are often cognitive and they are often ideas useful for dealing with abstract problems (Mostafa, Habib, Farzad & Nahid, 2012). These skills must be present in PPPs arrangement for managers to deliver on time and manage projects effectively.

Agency theory

Agency theory presents a lot of problems or dilemma in the principal-agent relationships. Agents often act on behalf of the principal. The theory asserts that transparency should exist in agency relationships in order to ensure principal trust. Agency problems occur owing to information asymmetry, which describes a situation of unbalanced information (Panda & Leepsa, 2017).Due to unbalanced information the agent most often possesses more project data than the principal and vice versa. Lack of fairness and transparency in agent-principal relationship usually leads to agency cost. The more transparency through flow of information in agency relationships leads to project success as shown in many empirical literatures. In PPP arrangement, the public sector is the principal while the private sector is the agent. The agent enters an agreement to develop and manage public infrastructure on behalf of the public sector.

Organizational structure theory:

This theory is an organisational model that explains the functions, tasks, and hierarchies in defining organisational success. This theory aligns with the principle of equity, authority and responsibility. According to the theory organisation must be flexible, efficient, and innovative towards achieving sustainable strategic success. Organisational structure define how tasks are shared, how authority and power flows from the top to bottom, and vice versa. Organisational structure influences the way decisions are being made, and provides standards for operating procedures (Laegaard & Bindslev, 2006). In PPP arrangement, organisation structure of the sectors should lead to synergy of all resources for successful implementation of the project.

Profit maximization Theory

This theory defined the major objective of a private organisation which is to maximise profit. Traditionally, all government is known for is spending revenue and getting it back through fiscal and monetary policies (Mahedy & Wilson, 2018). A liberalisation policy which majorly involves the use of private partners indicates some element of profit maximisation in public infrastructures. Thus, public infrastructures must be managed in such a manner that profits are made. Any agreements, made by the private partner must maximise the corporation's profits on the one hand, and increase government revenue on the other hand.

Public private partnership projects must possess a capacity to make profits.

Legal theory

This is an embodiment of various theories in law as applicable in business. The theory explains conditions of contracts, and obligation of parties which should not be bridged to avoid legal sanctions. Legal theory as applicable to business presents various clauses, events, and deeds that inform ethical judgements.

1.2.1. Empirical Review

Many dynamics occur between the stakeholders within the PPP framework such that; the outcome of such behaviours and practices makes it inquisitive as to why there are still infrastructure management problems despite the use of PPP. Those dynamics which are of concern in this study revolves around the discharge of responsibility between the stakeholders, expertise/competency, capacity of the project, end user readiness to offer value, partner's organizational structure, and issues associated with legal institutional frameworks of the PPPs. More so, the problem interacts in such a way that the occurrence of one leads to the other and leads to infrastructure management problems. For example there are certain instances when lack of skills and competencies amongst partners prevents effective discharge of supervisory and monitoring responsibilities required for the projects. More so, lacunae or gaps in the legal and institutional framework imply absence of or lack of adherence to some regulatory principles required for governing the PPPs. Neglect of the function of some ministries, departments, and agencies that are meant to get involved with PPPs implies absence of organizational structure, function, roles and responsibilities. Reduction in the standard of living of citizens, achievement of social objectives and profit making motive is caused by the inability of the project managers to assess the viability of the PPP idea on the target beneficiaries.

1.2.1.1. Responsibilities of Public and Private Partners in Infrastructure Management

The government deploy private partners or consortiums to design, build, finance, operate and maintain government assets for some agreed period of time; prepare reports and communicate in line with government standards (Monk, Levitt, Garvin & South, 2012; South, Levitt & Dewulf, 2015). The discharge of such harmonious relationships is hampered by partner's anticipation of extra cost of cooperation. These on the one hand are one-time-only cost such as preparation, adaptation of the internal organisation on the one hand. Another factor is the cost of recurring such organisational coordination, adaptation, and adjustment of objectives (Edelenbos & Klijn, 2007). Decision making is also hampered by institutional complexity or by the unwillingness of actors to share information, because they fear opportunistic behaviour from other actors" (Edelenbos & Klijn,

2007). That was why Schepper, Dooms and Haezendonck (2014) explained that opposition between stakeholders in public-private management occurs as a result of differences in their partner's expectation and desired process or outcome of the projects.

1.2.1.2. Expertise/Competence of Public and Private Partners in Infrastructure Management

Infrastructure management problems in PPPs can be traced to lack of expertise and competencies amongst the partners. For example Ruuska and Teigland (2009) explained that competency problem occur in PPP owing to lack of intangible resources required to handle conflicting issues that occur between partners. Skills and competence are intangible resources needed to embrace and address conflicting issues through dialogue. Lack of intangible resources such as expertise, reputation, goodwill and legitimacy limits the ability of partners to effectively manage conflicting issues associated with capital projects management (Ruuska & Teigland, 2009). Most often however, and on the part of the government, issues of competence and/or the need to consider competence as a major requirement for the selection of project managers are usually prevented by god-fatherism, favouritism, nepotism, partisans issues, which are often political in nature (Majokodunmi & Olanrewaju, 2013; Omonijo, Nnedum, Oludayo & Anyaegbunam, 2015). This problem on the part of the government increases the likelihood of the deployment of weak and ineligible private partners to manage PPPs. Discharge of competencies required for the management of PPP infrastructure in terms of ideas, discharge of expertise, and dissemination of information, amongst others are prevented by divergence in partner goals.

1.2.1.3 Transparency of Public and Private Partners in Infrastructure Management

Lack of transparency has been a major source of problem affecting the management of PPP infrastructure in Nigeria. As observed by Reynaers & Grimmelikhuijsen (2015), successes in PPPs has been impeded by issues of lack of transparency which can be seen from the external, internal, input, process and output transparency perspectives. Transparency problem occur in PPPs due to lack of consistency between external transparency and internal transparency. For there to be external transparency, which is the expectation that the stakeholder should have access to all information that describes processes, functions and structures in PPPs; the disclosure of such information is affected by the need to maintain some form of managerial prerogatives, to prevent damage to public trust (Power, 1994; Worthy 2010; Grimmelikhuijsen 2012). According to Estache (2003), internal transparency problems occur due to lack of supervisory or regulatory oversight, insufficient process of data collection, lack of clear methods used by the government to evaluate and predict performance of private partners (Estache, 2003). The processes used for monitoring, evaluation and prediction of

private sector performance are not clear. A study observed that most public officials often decline in their supervisory responsibility (Papadopoulos, 2007).

1.2.1.4. Organizational Structure of Public and Private Partners in Infrastructure Management

Effective decision making in PPPs has been hampered through weak organizational structure. The nature and dynamics of interdependencies between tasks and functions performed by partners determine the extent of coordination, and equally predicts effectiveness of capital project, and infrastructure management. Action of a partner depends on appropriate action of another partner (Tasevska & Toropova, 2013). Thus, problems occur when a partners' gap or lapses restricts the other's progress. More elaborately, interdependence problem in a capital project occur when partners provide inputs with directly, unrelated methods, and at diverse speeds, which makes partners in public private partnership projects ahead of each other (Ruuska & Teigland, 2009).

1.2.1.5. Capacity of Project for Public and Private Partners in Infrastructure Management

Partners in PPPs struggle to address various forms of complication or address complexities that prevent effective management of PPP infrastructure in order to achieve their organisational objectives. The goal of the public partner is to generate revenue from the PPP and to deliver overall public satisfaction (Babawale & Awosanya, 2014). Moreover, that of the private partner is to maximise profits (Osei-Kyei, Osei-Kyei, Chan, & Chan, 2017). Owing to complexities which pose challenges to infrastructure management in PPPs, it is important to investigate whether the partners have been able to achieve their pre-determined social and profit making objectives. Complexity of trust relations between the public and private sector constitutes problems to infrastructure management (Smyth & Edkins, 2007). Complexities associated with management of resources utilised for PPP projects such as people, material, schedules, teams, sizes of units, are source of problems. High cost requirements needed to change technology, high cost of resources, materials, technical know-how, and other technology specifications are liabilities to revenue and profits (Vidal & Marle, 2015).

1.2.1.6. Legal Framework for Public and Private Partners in Infrastructure Management

According to Soyeju (2013) the legal infrastructure which underpins the PPP framework in Nigeria is inadequate and the inadequacy of the legal and regulatory environment is partly responsible for the lack of appetite for engagement on the part of the private sector – especially foreign investors in the nation's public infrastructure assets and service delivery – and the overall failure of the PPP

mechanism in attracting the required private investment into infrastructure sector (Soyeju, 2013). The Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission Act (ICRCA) ought to align with some relevant laws that guide private procurement of public infrastructure. However, it appears that the ICRCA does not completely abide with those laws in infrastructure procurements.

2. Methods

The purpose of this study is to establish links between capital project delivery and some factors implements such as Stakeholder's Responsibility (STR), Expertise and Competency, Transparency of Roles (TPR), Organisational Structure (ORS), Capacity of Project (CPC) and Legal Institutional Framework (LIF). To achieve this, survey research design was used. The population of study cuts across employees in health, transportation and power sectors. Organisations used were Garki Hospital in Abuja, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in Lagos State and Benin Electricity Distribution Company with head office in Benin City, Edo State. A total of five hundred and eighty one (581) respondents were selected with used of validated questionnaire. Data collected were analysed with the used of Multiple Regression Model. The model designed for the study is specified as follows:

$Y = F_O(x)$……1

Y = CPD ……2

X = STR + EXC + TPR + ORS+ CPC+ LIF ….……..3

IF $Y = F_O(x)$, then:

$CPD = \beta_0 + \beta_1 STR + \beta_2 EXC + \beta_3 TPR + \beta_4 ORS + \beta_5 CPC + \beta_6 LIF$……...……..4

The regression model is given by:

$CPD = \beta_0 + \beta_1 STR + \beta_2 EXC + \beta_3 TPR + \beta_4 ORS + \beta_5 CPC + \beta_6 LIF + \alpha$……..5

The above model was developed to establish links between capital project delivery and the drivers of project success. Proxies of successful capital project drivers as depicted on the model are Stakeholder's Responsibility (SRT), Expertise and Competency (EXC), Transparency of Roles (TPR), Organisational Structure (ORS), Capacity of Project (CPC) and Legal Institutional Framework (LIF), and they all represent the independent variables. The dependent variable is Capital Project Delivery which was coded as (CPD).

3. Results

This section shows the presentation of data used for the study. Data were presented on three tables which the first table is a summary of total variable contribution to the model prediction, the second table which is the analysis of variance shows individual variable contribution to the model prediction. The third table which is the coefficient of regression table shows individual variable contribution to the model prediction. The implication of the tables is shown below:

Table 1: Model Summary of Regression

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.857[a]	.734	.732	.79007

a. Predictors: (Constant), Legal Institutional Framework , Stakeholder's Responsibility , Expertise and Competency , Organisational Structure , Transparency of Roles , Capacity of Project

Table 1 above was used to examine the influence of some factors on the management of public private partnership and how they predict capital project delivery. Result on the table shows that R = 0.857; R Square = 0.734; Std. Error of the Estimate = 0.79007. With regards to the R Square value, result implies that factors such as the legal institutional framework, stakeholder's responsibility, expertise and competency, organisational structure, transparency of roles, and capacity of project predicts capital project delivery by 73.4%. This also implies that other factors which constitutes the remaining 26.6%, and which were not considered in the model developed determines the success of public private partnership projects. Thus, the model is a strong predictor of capital project delivery.

Table 2: ANOVA of Regression

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	991.072	6	165.179	264.622	.000[b]
	Residual	358.295	574	.624		
	Total	1349.366	580			

a. Dependent Variable: Capital Project Delivery

b. Predictors: (Constant), Legal Institutional Framework , Stakeholder's Responsibility, Expertise and Competency, Organisational Structure, Transparency of Roles, Capacity of Project

Table 2 is the analysis of variance of the regression model, and it indicates the amount of differences that occur amongst individual variable prediction. According to the table, F = 264.622; df_{bg} = 6; df_{wg}= 574. More so Sig. value = 0.000<0.05. The above analysis implies that difference occur in prediction of capital project delivery by the factors. The analysis also means that the difference is statistically significant. In order words, the extent to which the factor variables determine capital project delivery differs from each other. It also indicates a large amount of differences in individual prediction.

Table 3: Coefficient of Regression

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.033	.153		.217	.828
	Stakeholder's Responsibility	.125	.027	.117	4.604	.000
	Expertise and Competency	.031	.030	.027	1.015	.310
	Transparency of Roles	.072	.035	.065	2.068	.039
	Organisational Structure	.066	.024	.079	2.773	.006
	Capacity of Project	.185	.029	.202	6.325	.000
	Legal Institutional Framework	.563	.036	.545	15.578	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Capital Project Delivery

Table 3 goes further to explain the contributions of the managerial factor towards capital project delivery. Generally, result on the table indicates that all the factors have positive contribution to capital project delivery, but at different degrees of influence. The table shows that partners' legal institutional framework constitutes the first at ($\beta = 0.563$; $t = 15.578$; sig. $0.000 < \alpha = 0.05$). Capacity of the project in terms of profit making constitutes the second at ($\beta = 0.185$; $t = 6.325$; sig. $0.000 < \alpha = 0.05$); and stakeholder's responsibility constitutes the third at ($\beta = 0.125$; $t = 4.604$; sig. $0.000 < \alpha = 0.05$). Transparency of roles constitutes the fourth at ($\beta = 0.072$; $t = 2.068$; sig. $0.039 < \alpha = 0.05$); and organisational structure constitute the fifth at ($\beta = 0.066$; $t = 2.773$; sig. $0.006 < \alpha = 0.05$). Expertise and competency constitutes the last at ($\beta = 0.031$; $t = 1.015$; sig. $0.310 > \alpha = 0.05$)

4. Conclusion

In line with theoretical and empirical literature, the importance PPP for the management and administration of public utilities and projects cannot be underestimated. Moreover, this study sheds light on partnership practices that contributes to the effectiveness of PPPs in capital project delivery. This study concludes that factors that contribute positively to the successful use of PPP in the delivery of capital projects are legal institutional framework, stakeholder's responsibility, expertise and competency, organisational structure, transparency of roles, and capacity of project in terms of profit making.

On the basis of the findings from the study, the research made the following recommendations.

1. Government should strengthen and empower the PPP Act of 2005 and other government procurement laws. The legal and supervisory roles of government are very vital, hence for PPP to be effective, strong institutional framework is germane.

2. Stakeholders responsibility towards the project is important and this is displayed through their readiness to pay additional fee (users fee). More so, additional value of product and services will better the life of the citizen rendered by PPP even though it's the responsibility of government to provide social infrastructure. The benefits to be derived for such users' fee will outweigh the cost attached to it.

3. Experience private organisation with expertise and competency in field needed should be selected for the job without any politics or nepotism attached to the bidding and selection process.

4. In the same vein, for PPP business to be beneficial, flat organisational structure could help to reduce communication gap between partners and among stakeholders thereby leading to quick decision making.

5. Authority concerned should come up with strong policies of best practice in PPP arrangement. This could be contained in Code of Practice which will among other things spell out the in clear terms the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. This will encourage stakeholders' transparency in project execution.

References

Akintoye, A., Hardcastle, C., Beck, M., Chinyio. E. & Asenova, D. (2003). Achieving best value in private finance initiative project procurement. *Construction Management and Economics, 21*(5), 461-470.

Antonio, S. N. (2007). Stakeholders' theory and corporate social responsibility in China. *Euro Asia Journal of Management,* 34(17), 109-121.

Babawale, G. K., & Awosanya, A. O. (2014). Estimating household willingness to pay for improved electricity supply in Lagos Metropolis, *British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade*, 4(5), 672-693.

Edelenbos, J., & Klijn, E.H. (2007). Trust in Complex Decision- Making Networks A Theoretical and Empirical Exploration, *Administration & Society*, 39(1) 25-50.

Estache, E. (2003). Indicators to measure governance performance in integrated coastal management. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, *46*(3-4), 335-345.

Garvin, M. J., & Bosso, D. (2008). Assessing the effectiveness of infrastructure public—private partnership programs and projects. *Public Works Management & Policy*, *13*(2), 162-178.

Grimmelikhuijsen, D. (2012). Public–private partnerships: Perspectives on purposes, publicans and good governance. *Public Administration and*

Development, 31(1): 2–14.

Gruening, G. (2001). Origin and theoretical basis of new public management. *International Public Management Journal*, 4, 1-25.

Hodge, G. A., & Greve, C. (2017). Public private partnerships: Delivering better infrastructure services. Working Paper for Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, DC.

Kalimullah, N. A, Alam, K. M., & Nour, M. M. (2012). New public management: Emergence and principles. *BUP Journal*, 1(1), 1-22.

Laegaard, J. & Bindslev, M. (2006). *Organizational theory*. Jorgen Laegaard, Mile Bidslev & Ventus Publishing Aps. xxxx

Mahedy, T., & Wilson, D. J. (2018). Fiscal policy in good times and bad. *Research from Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco*, 9, 1-5.

Marcellus, I. O. (2009). Public-private partnership initiative in the implementation of Government programmes: Trends, features and practices in Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Public Administration and Local Government, 14,1 & 2. xxxx

Majokodunmi, A., & Olanrewaju, F. A., (2013). Godfatherism and political conflicts in Nigeria: The fourth republic in perspective, *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research*, 2(7), 70-51.

Monk, Y., Levitt, U., Garvin, D., & South, I. (2012). How to design and evaluate research in education (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Monteduro, F. (2014). Public–private versus public ownership and economic performance: evidence from Italian local utilities. *Journal of Management & Governance*, *18*(1), 29-49.

Mostafa, A., Habib, H., Farzad, Q., & Nahid, J. (2012). Prioritizing managerial skills based on Katz's theory in physical education offices of universities in Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 20 (3): 388-394.

Oblak, R., Bistricic, A., & Jugovic, A. (2013). Public-private partnership - Management model of Croatian seaports, *Management, 18, 1, 79-102.*

Oghojafor, B. A., & Adebisi, S. A. (2012). Evaluating Mergers and Acquisition as Strategic

Interventions in the Nigerian Banking Sector: The Good, Bad and the Ugly. *International Business Research*, *5*(5), 147

Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2014) "Nigeria's Infrastructure Spending at US$6 Billion" This Day, News Paper November Edition. http://www.icrc.gov/news_details.ppp

Omonijo, D. O., Nnedum, O. A. U., Oludayo, O. O., & Anyaegbunam, M. C. (2015). The menace of political godfatherism as a factor in the underdevelopment of Nigeria: justifying Rostow's thesis. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 75, 25-42.

Osei-Kyei, R., Osei-Kyei, R., Chan, A. P., & Chan, A. P. (2017). Risk assessment in public-private partnership infrastructure projects: Empirical comparison between Ghana and Hong Kong. *Construction Innovation*, *17*(2), 204-223.

Panda, B., & Leepsa, N. M. (2017). Agency theory: Review of theory and evidence on problems and perspectives, *Indian Journal of Corporate*

Governance, 10(1) 74–95.

Papadopoulos, I. (2007). Public private partnerships/private finance initiatives for financing infrastructure. *Built environment project and asset management*, *4*(2), 199-215.

Power, G. (1994). Public-private partnership: transaction costs of tendering. *Procedia Computer Science*, *100*, 818-825.

Reynaers, A. M., & Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G. (2015). Transparency in Public–Private Partnerships. Not so bad after all? Public Administration (in press). Article first published online: 15 JAN 2015 | DOI: 10.1111/padm.12142 xxxx-----(14)

Ruuska, I., & Teigland, R. (2009). Ensuring project success through collective competence and creative conflict in public–private partnerships – A case study of Bygga Villa, a Swedish triple helix e-government initiative, *International Journal of Project Management* 27, 323–334.

Seyedinejat, S. S., Razaghi, M. E., & Dousti, M. (2014). Prioritizing managerial skills based on Katz theory. *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences*, 5(1), 33-47.

Schepper, D. S, Dooms, M., & Haezendonck, E. (2014). Stakeholder dynamics and responsibilities in Public–Private Partnerships: A mixed experience, *International Journal of Project Management 32, 1210–1222*.

Sfakianakis, E., & Laar, M. V. (2013). Fiscal effects and public risk in public-private partnerships, *Built Environment Project and Asset Management, 3(2), 181-198.*

Shen, L., Tam, V., Gan, Ye, K., & Zhao, Z. (2016). Improving sustainability performance for public-private-partnership (PPP) projects, *Journal of Sustainability, 2-15.*

Smyth, H., & Edkins, A. (2007). Relationship management in the management of PFI/PPP projects in the UK. *International Journal of Project Management* 25, 232–240.

South, A., Levitt, R. E., & Dewulf, G. M. (2015). Dynamic Stakeholder Networks and the Governance of PPPs, Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Public-Private Partnerships, Austin, Texas, U.S.A., 26-29 May 2015.

Soyeju, O. (2013). Legal framework for public private partnership in Nigeria, Postgraduate Candidate, University of Pretoria, 814-832. xxxx

Tasevska, F., & Toropova, O. (2013). Management of project interdependencies in a project portfolio, *Umeå School of Business and Economics*, 1-99.

Utevskaia, M., Burova, N., & Pokrovskaia, N. (2016). Public private partnership as a tool for sustainable development of Russian economy. In *International Conference on Management, Leadership & Governance* (p. 354). Academic Conferences International Limited.

Vidal, L, & Marle, F. M. (2015).Understanding project complexity: implications on project management, Kybernetes, Emerald, 3-34.

Worthy, I. (2010). Developing public private people partnership (4P) for post disaster infrastructure procurement. *International Journal of Disaster*

Resilience in the Built Environment, *6*(4), 468-484.

Zhang, J., Zou, W., & Kumaraswamy, M. (2015). Developing public private people partnership (4P) for post disaster infrastructure procurement. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, *6*(4), 468-484.