

Research Paper

Open Access

Rapheal Abiodun Ojelabi^{1,*}, Lekan Amusan¹, Adeoye Olugbenga Adewolu²,
Oladeji Olubunmi Olanipekun³

Government's motives and investor's commitment in public-private partnership procurement system adoption

DOI 10.2478/otmcj-2025-0007

Received: August 14, 2024; accepted: April 29, 2025

Abstract: The study examined the government's motives in adopting public-private procurement (PPP) and its relationship with the private investor's service commitment to infrastructure delivery. The study adopted a quantitative research method with a survey conducted using a structured questionnaire targeted at 384 respondents selected through random sampling. The data were analysed using mean, percentile and Pearson correlation statistical tools. The study identified 17 key motives responsible for the government adopting PPP in socio-economic infrastructure delivery. These motives were factored into three main groups: public infrastructure maintenance, financial and economic benefits; improved discipline in the contractual relationship and predictable path in infrastructure delivery and integration of innovative approach in enhancing infrastructure delivery. Therefore, the relationships between the three factored government's motives and investor's commitments, including finance, management, technical and operational services in PPP, were tested using the Pearson correlation statistical tool. The results showed that the motive for public infrastructure maintenance, financial and economic benefits of

the government in PPP showed a significant relationship with the four services commitment of private partners. Also, the government's motive for improved discipline in the contractual relationship and predictable path in infrastructure delivery showed significant relationships with technical, finance and management commitments of investors. Lastly, the government's motive for the integration of innovative approaches in enhancing infrastructure delivery showed a significant relationship with only technical commitment. The outcome indicates that factors measuring government motive and investor's services commitment are mutually dependent and critical in ensuring a sustained relationship among stakeholders in a PPP arrangement for infrastructure procurement.

Keywords: public-private partnership, procurement system, infrastructure, government, motives, Nigeria

1 Introduction

The relevance of infrastructural development in a nation cannot be denied due to its transformative impact on society (Afolabi et al. 2019; Deep et al. 2023). Public infrastructure procurement has been a vital role of the government (Xu 2023); hence, her search for a procurement option that can guarantee its continuous provision is crucial. Among the existing procurements options, public-private partnership has been considered important and widely adopted by governments for public infrastructure procurement (Roumboutsos et al. 2017; Sun et al. 2021; Deep et al. 2024). Public-private procurement (PPP) can be defined as a collaboration between the government and private parties to meet the social and economic needs of the people (Zhang et al. 2025). The procurement of public infrastructural facilities under the PPP

*Corresponding author: **Rapheal Abiodun Ojelabi**, Department of Building Technology, Covenant University. Km 10, Idiroko Road, Cannanland, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria. E-mail: rapheal.ojelabi@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

Lekan Amusan, Department of Building Technology, Covenant University. Km 10, Idiroko Road, Cannanland, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

Adeoye Olugbenga Adewolu, Department of Architecture, Belles University of Technology. Km 8, Idiroko Road, Benja Village, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Oladeji Olubunmi Olanipekun, Project and Property Development Department, Ecobank Nigeria Limited, Victoria Island, Lagos State, Nigeria.

arrangement has taken a new dimension beyond the traditional system mainly driven by governments (Ojelabi et al. 2018; Kukah et al. 2025). The Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (2009) affirmed that the Nigerian government has placed high priorities on the provisions of social and economic infrastructure through its efforts in adopting PPP to create new infrastructure and expand and refurbish the existing assets. The country's poor infrastructure ratings coupled with inadequate finance to bridge its infrastructure gaps necessitate private financing under the public–private partnership arrangement. Bello (2017) stated that the adoption of PPP in Nigeria will not only help unlock the infrastructure space but also provide jobs for the population. The economic and social transactions that resulted from the implementation of the public–private partnership procurement system are factors that can also contribute to Nigeria's economic ratings in the global market (Ibem 2010). The positive implications of PPP are unparalleled compared to other existing procurement systems. However, there are still mixed feelings among stakeholders in the Nigerian construction industry about why the government is adopting public–private partnership procurement for the nation's public infrastructure provision.

Though it was generally believed that the government's motive in adopting PPP was to break its monopoly in public infrastructure provisions, some researchers think differently. Monibot (2010) argued that PPP adoption in infrastructure procurement had enriched some contractors due to the excessive profit made from the execution of public works. Sambrani (2014) also viewed the public–private partnership as a medium through which governments shift infrastructure provision responsibility to the private sector. However, Robinson et al. (2010) argued that PPP is a medium through which the public sector can manage sluggishness in the provision of infrastructure facilities and minimise corruption. In the same vein, Jintamanaskoon and Chan (2011) revealed that PPP adoption provides enhanced service delivery and better value for money. Arewa and Farrell (2011), however, asserted that PPP has come to stay because infrastructure provision is gradually overwhelming the government. The introduction of the PPP procurement system has not only promised to accelerate infrastructure provision worldwide but also helped to reduce the overreliance on the government for infrastructure provision.

Nevertheless, for the PPP procurement system to be successfully implemented in any part of the world, the government needs to establish credible motives capable of attracting private investor's commitment to infrastructure provision. Past studies have been carried out to investigate

government's motives in PPP procurement implementation for infrastructure delivery. Onyemachi et al. (2015) examined the critical success factors for public–private partnerships in housing project; Osei-Kyei and Chan (2018) addressed the reasons for PPP in developed and developing economies and Kukah et al. (2023) focused on motivations for adopting PPP for a power project in Ghana. However, there is a dearth of studies investigating relationships between government's motives and the commitment of private investors' services in a PPP arrangement. Therefore, this study addressed the research gap.

The study is critical due to Nigeria's poor infrastructure gap and poor relationships among PPP stakeholders. World Economic Forum (2016) data indicated that Nigeria was ranked 132nd out of 138th in infrastructure strength among nations worldwide. However, despite the wide infrastructure gaps, a number of PPP projects were terminated due to poor relationships among the PPP stakeholders from the initiation phase. Babatunde (2015) reported a concession contract for the 105 km Lagos–Ibadan Expressway between Bi-Courtney Concession Company and the Federal Government of Nigeria to develop and manage the Lagos–Ibadan expressway which failed due to the bad relationship between the private investor and the government. Another case cited by Afolabi (2011) was the PPP contractual agreement between Muritala Muhammed Airport (MMA) II concessioner and the Federal Government, which experienced repeated changes in the concession agreement due to poor relationships among the parties. Hence, unveiling the relationships between the government and private partners helps to establish the government's motives that serve as a critical enabler to private investors' commitments in infrastructure provisioning. The study would impact a clear understanding of requisite shared factors essential for successful collaboration among stakeholders in a PPP arrangement.

2 Literature review

The government's choice to adopt the public–private partnership procurement system in infrastructure provision amidst other procurements types can be attributed to its inherent motives. McClelland et al.'s (1989) theory of human motives established that human action is triggered by motives. The theory further buttressed that there are two forms of motives that dictate human action: implicit and explicit motives. Kehr (2004) and Hermans et al. (2017) explained that implicit motives are triggered by things that are loved or desired, while explicit motives are influenced by obligation. The government's obligation

to infrastructure provisions dictates her motives for the adoption of the PPP system. Nevertheless, there have been speculations among the PPP stakeholders as to why the government adopted the procurement system beyond public infrastructure provision. Cheung et al. (2010) and Sallberg and Numminen (2022) raised the question of the government's motives in PPP adoption. Various stakeholders in the built environment hold separate views on PPP adoption in public infrastructure procurements. Jamali (2004) viewed PPP adoption as a tool for aid relief by developing countries from international organisations. In contrast, Lee (2013) argued that global issues ranging from society and security to economics and environment to poverty in developing countries could not be resolved by aid but rather by collaboration between governments and private organisations. Liu and Wilkinson (2011) also identified the benefits of local economic development as one of the motives for PPP adoption. It is revealed that infrastructure strain or developmental need has been evidenced in the countries finding PPP attractive. Jintanaskoon and Chan (2011) further reinforced that PPP adoption lies in its capacity to provide better service delivery and value for money than other procurement options. Arewa and Farrell (2011) instead viewed PPP's attractiveness in its cost and time predictability compared to other procurement routes.

The research findings on motives for PPP adoptions are limitless, and they include better mobility of resources by the private sector (Walker and Smith 1995; Skietrys et al. 2008), ability to raise funds for projects and enhance technology transfer to the locals (Walker et al. 1995; Ghobadian et al. 2004; Li et al. 2005b), ease in public administration costs (Walker et al. 1995; Li et al. 2005b), enhance management and maintenance of public infrastructure (Li et al. 2005b; Babatunde et al. 2012), facilitate creative and innovative approach and accelerate infrastructure provision (Li 2003; Osei-Kyei and Chan 2017; Kavishe and Chileshe 2018), capacity to raise funds for projects (Walker and Smith 1995; Babatunde et al. 2012), resolve issues with public sector budget limitation and enhance government integrated solution capacity (Cheung et al. 2010) and minimise public funds fixed in capital infrastructure projects (Jones et al. 1996). In the same vein, Oyebanji et al. (2011) identified the government motives for PPP adoption to include its budget enlargement benefit, synergy provision and capacity enlargement. Kulasingam (2012) also asserted that beyond the financial motives for PPP adoption, the provision of employment on a large scale through the PPP industry is another salient primary factor why PPP should be encouraged. It further buttressed that the implementation of PPP creates opportunities in different units, which

include facilities management, maintenance and construction, among others, which will require professional services.

However, despite the general motives for PPP adoption, governments in different countries across the globe have shown differences and similarities in motives for PPP implementation within their jurisdictions. Roehrich et al. (2014) indicated that the United Kingdom was motivated to adopt PPP in the country's health system due to its capacity to ease the bottlenecks in the public system. It further disclosed that in the United Kingdom health system, the major motives for PPP adoption include the need to control the rising expenditure of refurbishment, guarantee maintenance and operation of public assets, and the need for the private sector's innovation in service due to constraints on the government's budget and the issue of risk management. In the same vein, KPMG (2010) highlighted the motives for the adoption of PPP in Australia to include value for money, significant design innovation and appropriate risk transfer. English (2016) also disclosed that the Australian government's motive to adopt PPP is due to the procurement system provisions to transfer risk and protect the public sector from being burdened by debt. Likewise, Osei-Kyei and Chan (2018) conducted a study to determine the Hong Kong government's motives for PPP adoption in the country. It was revealed from the study that the government of Hong Kong considers PPP because the procurement system provides reliable and valuable service delivery, allows for shared risk and guarantees quick delivery of public infrastructure projects compared to other procurement routes.

Studies were also conducted in developing countries to investigate the government's motives for PPP adoption. Onyemachi et al. (2015) unveiled the motives for PPP adoption by the Nigerian government for housing provision, which include solutions to public infrastructure budget constraints, faster project completion and limited debt due to public infrastructure projects. Also, Owusu-Manu and Kukah (2017) and Osei-Kyei and Chan (2018) revealed that Ghana's motives for adopting PPP are centred on the procurement system's ability to guarantee reductions in public expenditure, facilitating faster delivery of public infrastructure, benefits of risk-sharing and the value-for-money advantage. Hence, it is evident from the foregoing that the motives of developed and developing countries for PPP adoption are not far apart. The similarities in government motives across different jurisdictions for PPP adoption include accelerated infrastructure provisions and risk-sharing benefits. However, the financial motives of PPP do not cut across all countries; rather, they are more peculiar to the governments of developing countries.

Notwithstanding the government's huge responsibilities under the PPP procurement arrangement in infrastructure provisioning, it cannot be sufficient without the private sector resource commitment (Castelblanco et al. 2025). This is a pointer to the significant position occupied by the private sector in a PPP arrangement. (Hamilton and Holocomb, 2013), (Gunnigan and Rajput, 2010) and (Zhang and Cheng, 2013) revealed that among the key private investor's resources in PPP critical for effective collaboration with the government includes finance, technical and management services. Berkley Legal Management (2020) also affirmed that the provision of capital is one of the commitments of private partners in a PPP arrangement, which is critical in infrastructure delivery and management. Furthermore, Vandenberg (2015) emphasised that beyond the private sector, financial resources in PPP, technical, management and operational services are also essential inputs from the private sector for a successful partnership with the government. It is evident from the foregoing that four critical services of the private investor, which include financial service, technical service, management service and operational service, are vital in PPP's successful implementation. The commitment of the private investors' services in PPP is one of the focal directions of the study. Hence, the study examined the relationship between the government's motives in PPP and private investor's services to determine the triggers to the investor's commitment under the procurement arrangement as fulfilled in the relationship theories explored in Meyer et al. (2004) on motivation and commitment.

3 Research methodology

3.1 Research process

In evaluating the relationship between government's motives in PPP and private investor's services commitment, the study adopted a survey approach through a well-structured questionnaire. The targeted respondents were PPP stakeholders operating in Lagos and Abuja, Nigeria. Lagos and Abuja were selected for the study because they represent the commercial centre and Federal Capital Territory in the country. Also, most of the targeted government organisations and key players in the construction industry with requisite experience in PPP construction project management operate majorly from these two locations. Despite the selection of the two locations for the study, other regions across the country collectively hold a sizable number of stakeholders that could potentially

contribute to the outcome of the study but are not considered due to time and cost constraints. The study adopted a project-based method to select 19 PPP projects in Lagos and Abuja. Thus, a total of 384 sample representatives were identified, and questionnaires were administered using a random sampling approach. The representative sample for the study consists of a selection of construction professionals with PPP project experience operating within the two selected locations. The targeted groups consist of the Bureau of Public Procurement Agency (108), Lagos State Public Procurement Agency (125), consultants (36), financiers (18) and contractors (97). The representative sample represents the broader population of potential project participants operating in the listed organisations from the two locations in the study. The approach was adopted by taking a cue from Babatunde (2015), indicating that when a country's PPP is in the infant stage, the lists of professionals in PPP are still growing; hence, a representative sample from the population identified from a project-based method is valid.

The questionnaire used for the survey was divided into three sections. The first section addressed the characteristics of the respondents. The second section investigated the government's motivating factors in the application of PPP in social and economic infrastructure management. The government's motives for the application of the PPP procurement route in socio-economic infrastructure management were measured using the Likert scale ranging from '1 = strongly disagree' to '5 = strongly agree'. The third question focused on the critical services of the private investors in PPP procurement implementation using the Likert scale ranging from '1 = strongly disagree' to '5 = strongly agree'. The data generated were analysed using mean score and factor analysis. The relationships in the study were also tested using Pearson correlation. Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between government's motives and investor's services commitment because it is suitable for measuring the consistency of movement between two variables, whether they are both moving in a positive or negative direction.

4 Result presentation

4.1 Characteristics of respondents

This section focused on the characteristics of the study respondents. The characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1. The study includes both public and private stakeholders, and the result presented showed

that public sector stakeholders have the highest representation, with 59% of the total respondents, while private sector stakeholders have 41% of the total respondents. The results in Table 1 further classified the role of the

Tab. 1: Respondent characteristics

| Characteristics | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Respondent sector | | |
| Private | 113 | 41.24 |
| Public | 161 | 58.76 |
| Total | 274 | 100 |
| Respondent role | | |
| Lagos state public procurement Agents | 91 | 33.2 |
| Contractor | 76 | 27.7 |
| Bureau of public procurement agents | 70 | 25.5 |
| Consultant | 26 | 9.5 |
| Financier | 11 | 4.0 |
| Total | 274 | 100 |
| Industrial experience | | |
| 1–10 years | 154 | 56.0 |
| 11–20 years | 116 | 42.0 |
| 21–30 years | 4 | 2.0 |
| Total | 274 | 100 |

Bold letters are for headings and total.

public and private stakeholders' representative organisations in the study as contractors, consultants, Bureau of Public Procurement Agency, Lagos State Public Procurement Agency and financier. It is evident from the result presented in Table 1 that the Lagos state public procurement agents have the highest number of respondents, with 33.2% of the total participants, followed by the contractors, with 27.7% of the total participants, and then the bureau of Public procurement agents, with 25.2% of the total respondents.

The respondent's industrial experience ranges from 1 year to 30 years; however, the results in Table 1 showed that 56% of the respondents have 1–10 years of industry experience, 42% have 11–20 years of industry experience and 2% of the respondents have 21–30 years of industry experience.

4.2 Government's motives in PPP in the procurement of socio-economic infrastructure

This section focused on examining the motives of the government for PPP implementation in social and economic infrastructure management. The results presented in Table 2 showed the 17 factors measuring the government's motives for PPP implementation in the study.

Tab. 2: Government's motives for adopting public–private partnership

| Motivating factors | Public | Private | Overall mean | Remark |
|--|--------|---------|--------------|-----------------|
| | Mean | Mean | | |
| Resolve issues with public sector infrastructure budget limitations | 4.48 | 4.52 | 4.50 | Strongly agreed |
| Guarantee local economic development | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.49 | Agreed |
| Better risk sharing | 4.38 | 4.59 | 4.48 | Agreed |
| Facilitate creative and innovative approach | 4.42 | 4.50 | 4.47 | Agreed |
| Accelerate infrastructure provision | 4.39 | 4.38 | 4.38 | Agreed |
| Saves time in delivering public projects | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.35 | Agreed |
| Minimises corruption in public infrastructure procurement | 4.39 | 4.25 | 4.30 | Agreed |
| Invoked discipline in infrastructure provision | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.29 | Agreed |
| Resolve public sector administrative cost | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.23 | Agreed |
| Improve public infrastructure management and maintainability | 4.09 | 4.27 | 4.21 | Agreed |
| Provide incentive to new market penetration | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.19 | Agreed |
| Enhances government integrated solution capacity | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.19 | Agreed |
| Resolve inactiveness in traditional procurement of public infrastructure | 4.00 | 4.28 | 4.18 | Agreed |
| Minimised public fund fixed in capital project | 4.06 | 4.20 | 4.15 | Agreed |
| Enhances local's capacity technologically and otherwise | 3.95 | 4.19 | 4.11 | Agreed |
| Better service delivery | 3.93 | 4.02 | 3.99 | Agreed |
| Time and cost predictability | 3.76 | 4.10 | 3.98 | Agreed |

However, among the factors evaluated, the five highly rated factors motivating the government to adopt PPP for infrastructure provisions are the procurement capacity to resolve budget limitations in the public sector with a mean score of 4.50, its benefits for local economic development with a mean score of 4.49, better risk-sharing benefits with a mean score of 4.48, facilitate creative and innovative approach with a mean score of 4.47 and accelerate infrastructure provision with a mean score of 4.38. The two least factors identified as the government’s motives for PPP implementation include the procurement ability to improve service delivery and the capacity to better predict time and cost in construction project delivery, with mean scores of 3.99 and 3.88, respectively.

To further expound the findings on the government’s motives in implementing PPP for social and economic infrastructure delivery, the factors are summarised for a clearer understanding of the characteristics using factor analysis. Therefore, principal component analysis using the Varimax rotation method was executed. The factorability of the data was tested with Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity. The KMO measure sampling adequacy was 0.636, which is above the minimum acceptable value of 0.6 (Pallant 2010) for good factor analysis. Bartlett’s test of Sphericity is considered to be significant as it falls within the acceptable significant range of 0.00–0.05. The results from KMO and Bartlett’s Sphericity test show that the data gathered are suitable for factor analysis.

The three factors extracted are shown in Table 3. The component factors were fixed and extracted based on the factor loading of 0.40, which is the minimum acceptable factor loading for extraction (Pallant 2010). The three component factors extracted were above the benchmark of 0.40. The three component factors extracted are titled public sector infrastructure maintenance and its economic benefits, improved discipline in contractual relationships and predictable path in infrastructure delivery and integrated innovative approach in enhancing infrastructure delivery. Hence, the components of each of the three principal factors are depicted in Table 3.

Hence, the three-dimensional factors that define the government’s motives in PPP were further used to test its relationships with private sector service commitments (finance, management technical and operational inputs) under the PPP arrangement in infrastructure provision.

4.3 Null hypothesis H_0 : The government’s motives in PPP adoption do not have a significant relationship with the private sector services commitment in PPP

The study proposed a hypothesis to test the relationships between factors measuring government’s motives in PPP adoption and private partner’s service commitment in PPP implementation. The principal factors measuring the government’s motives are public sector infrastructure

Tab. 3: Factor loading on government’s motives for public–private partnership adoption

| | Component | | |
|---|-----------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Public infrastructure maintenance, financial and economic benefits | | | |
| Minimise public fund fixed in capital infrastructure projects | 0.759 | | |
| Improve public infrastructure management and maintainability | 0.654 | | |
| Resolve public sector administration cost | 0.627 | | |
| Guarantee local economic development | 0.523 | | |
| Enhanced local’s capacity technologically and otherwise | 0.482 | | |
| Improved discipline in contractual relationships and predictable path in infrastructure delivery | | | |
| Invoked discipline in infrastructure provision | | -0.651 | |
| Trust in risk sharing | | 0.538 | |
| Time and cost predictability | | 0.484 | |
| Integrate innovative approach in enhancing infrastructure delivery | | | |
| Facilitate creative and innovative approach | | | 0.514 |
| Saves time in delivering public projects | | | 0.479 |
| Accelerate infrastructure provision | | | -0.477 |

Extraction method: Principal component analysis.

Tab. 4: Pearson correlation on relationship between government's motives and investors' commitment

| Government's motives | | Technical service | Management service | Finance service | Operational service |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Public infrastructure maintenance, finance and economic benefits | Pearson correlation | 0.167** | 0.142* | 0.125* | 0.194** |
| | Sig. (two-tailed) | 0.006 | 0.018 | 0.038 | 0.001 |
| | <i>N</i> | 274 | 274 | 274 | 274 |
| Trust and improved discipline in contractual relationships and predictable path in infrastructure delivery | Pearson correlation | 0.270** | 0.193** | 0.250** | 0.062 |
| | sig. (two-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.303 |
| | <i>N</i> | 274 | 274 | 274 | 274 |
| Integrate innovative approach in enhancing infrastructure delivery | Pearson correlation | 0.136* | 0.021 | 0.097 | 0.074 |
| | Sig. (two-tailed) | 0.025 | 0.724 | 0.110 | 0.225 |
| | <i>N</i> | 274 | 274 | 274 | 274 |

The bold value is value below 0.05 and it dictate the significant of the Variables.

*Signify strength and direction of the significant relationship between variables. Also, Pearson correlation value for the relationship of "public infrastructure maintenance finance and economic benefits" with "operational service."

maintenance and its economic benefits, improved discipline in contractual relationships and predictable path in infrastructure delivery and integrated innovative approach in enhancing infrastructure delivery. Also, the factors measuring the private investor's services under the PPP arrangement are finance, management, technical and operational services. Hence, the hypothesis was tested with the Pearson correlation analytical tool, and the result is presented in Table 4. According to Pallant (2010), the acceptable significant value is within the range of 0.00–0.005. Therefore, the significant values of 0.00–0.05 are accepted, why values above 0.005 are rejected. The result showed that the first principal government's motives in PPP, which is public infrastructure maintenance, financial and procurement economic benefits, have a positive significant relationship with all the factors on the private sector services, which are finance with 0.038, technical skills with 0.006, management skills with 0.018 and operational skills with 0.001.

Also, another government motive for the adoption of PPP, which is centred on the procurement option capacity to improve discipline in contractual relationships and to ensure a predictable path in infrastructure delivery, has a positive relationship with three of the four factors measuring the private sector services in PPP: technical input (0.000), financial input (0.001) and management input (0.000). The third government motive in PPP implementation, which is due to the procurement capacity to engender innovative approach and enhance infrastructure delivery, only shows a positive significant relationship (0.025) with private sector technical input in infrastructure provision. The implications of the positive relationship in practice indicate that government's motives and investor's services

commitment are triggers that can encourage sustainable relationships under a PPP arrangement.

5 Discussions

The study uncovered three critical government motives for the adoption of public–private partnerships in the delivery of social and economic infrastructure in Nigeria. The study revealed that one of the government's motives for PPP is focused on public infrastructure maintenance, finance and economic benefits. Roehrich et al. (2014), Osei-Kyei et al. (2014), Jones et al. (1996) and Walker and Smith (1995) supported the findings by indicating that the pivotal motives for the adoption of PPP by the government are due to the procurement route capacity to create alternative finance for infrastructure provisions and the system's capacity to accommodate infrastructure maintenance and contribute to economic development through job creation. The government's motive in PPP further shows a significant relationship with the commitment of private investors to technical, financial, management and operational services in infrastructure provision. The established relationships indicate that among the government motives for PPP implementation, the motive for creating alternative finance for infrastructure provisions and the system's capacity to accommodate infrastructure maintenance and contribute to economic development in PPP is not only critical to attracting private investors but also influences their commitment under the procurement arrangement.

Furthermore, the study unveils another government motive in PPP to be linked to the procurement system's

ability to engender trust and improve discipline in contractual relationships and a predictable path in infrastructure delivery. The finding is supported by Cheng et al. (2021), Wang et al. (2017), Jefferies and McGeorge (2009) and Arewa and Farrell (2011). The authors disclosed that the government's choice of PPP is due to the procurement system's trust in risk-sharing, firmness in contractual relationships and guarantee of predictability in the time and cost of infrastructure delivery. The government motive shows a significant relationship with investors' commitment to technical, financial and management services under a PPP arrangement. The implication of the relationship connotes that the government motive is important because it is a trigger to private investor's willingness and readiness to commit their resources.

Lastly, the study uncovered the government's motive in PPP, which included the procurement system's capacity to integrate innovative approaches in enhancing infrastructure delivery. Liu et al. (2024) attested that PPP procurement system innovation has contributed to value for money in government projects. Also, the government's motive for the PPP procurement system innovation capacity shows a positive relationship with investor's technical service. The implication of the significant positive relationship between the government motives in PPP and the commitment of private sector services established mutual dependency on each other. The mutual dependence on the government motives and private partner services commitment in PPP connotes positive partnership, which is critical to the smooth execution of the procurement system in infrastructure delivery.

The findings from the study hinged on the theory of motivation and commitment. Meyer et al. (2004) stressed the existing relationship between motivation and commitment by indicating that commitment is a component of motivation. (Gollwitzer and Oettingen 2001; Eccles and Wigfield 2002) pointed out that motivation is a force that inspires commitment and vice versa. Hence, both commitment and motivation have been viewed as forces that influence behaviour. The relationship between the government's motivations in adopting PPP and its influence on the investor's service commitment underscores the theory of motivation and commitment. The positive relationships between the motivation and commitment variables in the study indicate a positive behaviour between the government and private partners to initiate a partnership under the Public Private Partnership arrangement due to their shared values.

The findings can assist governments in developing a policy that is capable of avoiding poor relationships

among parties in a PPP arrangement leading to project disengagement in infrastructure provision. The policy can prioritise critical shared values among parties that are capable of sustaining relationships in the PPP arrangement. Hence, a successful partnership will encourage more investment in a PPP arrangement and guarantee the execution of more construction projects, which offers jobs for construction practitioners and boosts the nation's infrastructure strength.

6 Conclusion

The study unveiled the relationships between government motives and partner commitments in the adoption of the PPP procurement system. The study revealed existing relationships between some variables measuring government motives and private partner's commitments. The government's motive for public sector infrastructure maintenance and its economic benefits showed a strong relationship with the four factors measuring the partner's commitments, which include finance, technical, management and operational services. Also, the government's motive for trust and improved discipline in contractual relationships and predictable path in infrastructure delivery showed a strong relationship with finance, technical and management services. Lastly, an integrated innovative approach to enhancing infrastructure delivery motive showed a strong relationship with only private partners' technical services.

Hence, in a bid to boost relationships between the government and investors in PPP, the study recommends that governments consider prioritising factors that are capable of attracting private partners' commitment to infrastructure provisioning. These factors could be used in developing policies that help to improve collaboration under PPP procurement implementation. Also, private investors should ensure that government values align with their requirements before investing in infrastructure provisions under the PPP arrangement.

Future research can focus on knowledge management in advancing relationships among all stakeholders in a PPP procurement system.

Acknowledgement

The study was supported by Covenant University Centre for Research, Innovation and Discovery (CUCRID).

References

- Afolabi, A., Ibem, E., Adunwo, E., Tunji-Olayeni, F., & Oluwunmi, O. (2019). Critical success factors (CSFs) for e-procurement adoption in the Nigerian construction industry. *Buildings*, 9(47), pp. 1-18. doi: 10.3390/buildings9020047
- Afolabi, E. Q. (2011). Examining Public Private Partnership in Nigeria: Potentials and Challenges. Being a Long Essay Submitted to the Faculty of Law, University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria.
- Arewa, A., & Farrell, P. (2011). The private finance initiative: Why value for money remain elusive. In: *CIB.TG72/ARCOM Doctoral Research Workshop*, University of Central Lancashire, United Kingdom. Available at <https://pureportal.coventry.ac.uk/en/publications/the-private-finance-initiative-pfi-why-value-for-money-remains-el> [accessed 15 December, 2020].
- Babatunde, S. (2015). Developing public-private partnership strategy for infrastructure delivery in Nigeria. Doctoral thesis, Northumbria University, UK.
- Babatunde, S. O., Opawole, A., & Akinsiku, O. E. (2012). Critical success factors in public private partnership (PPP) on infrastructure delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 10(3), pp. 212-225. doi: 10.1108/14725961211246018
- Bello, A. T. (2017). Public Private Partnership in Nigeria: Algorithm and the Templates. Available at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3010135 [accessed 28 December, 2024].
- Berkley Legal Management. (2020). The role of public private partnerships (PPP) in bridging infrastructure deficiencies in Nigeria. Available at <http://www.berkeleylegal.com.ng/2017/07/04/the-role-of-public-private-partnerships-ppp-in-bridging-infrastructure-deficiencies-in-nigeria/> [accessed 5 December, 2020].
- Castelblanco, G., Marco, A. D., & Casady, C. B. (2025). A system dynamics approach to concession period optimization in public-private partnerships (PPPs). *Public Works Management & Policy*. doi: 10.1177/1087724X251314427
- Cheng, M., Liu, G., Xu, Y., & Chi, M. (2021). Enhancing Trust Between PPP Partners: The Role of Contractual Functions and Information Transparency. *Sage Open*, pp. 1-16.
- Cheung, E., Chan, A. P. C., & Kajewski, S. (2010). Suitability of procuring large public works by PPP in Hong Kong. *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management*, 17, pp. 292-308. doi: 10.1108/09699981011038088
- Deep, S., Gajendran, T., Jefferies, M., & Jha, K. N. (2023). Developing subcontractor-general contractor relationships in the construction industry: Constructs and scales for analytical decision making. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 149(12), p. 04023136. doi: 10.1061/JCEMD4.COENG-13630
- Deep, S., Singh, S., Jha, K. N., Uggina, V. S., & Vishnoi, S. (2024). Critical challenges in execution of hybrid annuity model construction projects: Understanding the contractor's perspective. *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 30(3), p. 04024012. doi: 10.1061/JITSE4.ISENG-2395
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, pp. 109-132. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153
- English, M. L. (2006). Public Private Partnerships in Australia: An Overview of their Nature, Purpose, Incidence and Oversight. *Law Journal*, 29(3), pp. 250-262.
- Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., Gallear, D., & Viney, H. (2004). *Private-Public Partnerships: policy and Experience*. Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, England.
- Gollwitzer, P. M., & Oettingen, G. (2001). Motivation: History of the concept. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. pp. 10109-10112. doi: 10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/00134-0.
- Gunnigan, L., & Rajput, R. (2010). Comparison of Indian PPP Construction Industry and European PPP Construction Industry: Process, Threshold and Implementation. *Proceedings of CIB World Congress*, Salford, May 10-13.
- Hamilton, G., & Holcomb V. (2013). Public Private Partnership for sustainable development. Available at: <http://www.commonwealthministers.com/articles/public-private-partnerships-for-sustainable-development/>. (Accessed on 3rd February, 2020).
- Hermans, J., Slabbinck, H., Vanderstraeten, J., Brassey, J., Dejardin, M., & Ramdani, D. (2017). The power paradox: Implicit and explicit power motives, and the importance attached to prosocial organizational goals in SMEs. *Sustainability*, 9, pp. 1-26. doi: 10.3390/su9112001
- Ibem, E. (2010). An assessment of the role of government agencies in public private partnerships in housing delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 15(2), pp. 23-48.
- Jamali, D. (2004). Success and failure mechanism of public private partnership for infrastructure projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 20, pp. 107-118. doi: 10.1108/09513550410546598
- Jefferies, M., & McGeorge, W. D. (2009). Using public-private partnerships (PPPs) to procure social infrastructure in Australia. *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management*, 16, pp. 415-437. doi: 10.1108/09699980910988348
- Jintamanaskoon, S., & Chan P. W. (2011). Changing in reform agendas and public private partnerships (PPP). In: *Being a 3rd Proceedings of the CIB.TG72/ARCOM Doctoral Research Workshop*, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom.
- Jones, I., Zamani, H., & Reehal, R. (1996). *Financing models for new transport infrastructure*. Rue Mercier, Luxembourg, Luxembourg Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Kavishe, N., & Chileshe, N. (2018). Motivational factors for adoption of public-private partnerships (PPPs) in housing projects in Tanzania: A qualitative study. In: Gorse, C., & Neilson, C. J. (eds.), *Proceeding of the 34th Annual ARCOM Conference*, 3-5 September 2018, Belfast, U.K., Association of Researchers in Construction Management, pp. 445-454.
- Kehr, H. M. (2004). Integrating implicit motives, explicit motives, and perceived abilities: The compensatory model of work motivation and volition. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, pp. 479-499. doi: 10.2307/20159055
- KPMG. (2010). PPP procurement review of barriers to completion and efficiency in the procurement of PPP projects. Available at www.kpmg.com/NZ/en/issuesAndInsights/Articlespublications/SmarterProcurement/Documents/Review-of-barriers-to-competition.pdf [Accessed 20 April, 2020].
- Kukah, A. S. K., Badu, E., Owusu-Manu, D. G., & Edwards, D. J. (2023). Motivations for engaging in PPP power projects in Ghana: Comparison of the public and private sectors. *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*, 17(1), pp. 187-205. doi: 10.1108/IJESM-09-2021-0002

- Kukah, A. S. K., Owusu-Manu, D. G., Badu, E., Edwards, D. J., & Asamoah, E. (2025). Modelling critical success factors (CSFs) for Ghanaian public-private partnership (PPP) power projects using fuzzy synthetic evaluation (FSE). *Journal of Facilities Management*, 23(1), pp. 71-97. doi: 10.1108/JFM-08-2022-0096
- Kulasingam, R. (2012). Developing Nigerian PPP industry. A paper presented at Nigeria development and finance forum policy. Available at www.myndff.com/policyDialogue/Dialogue.acpx?Edition=2B [accessed 15 November, 2019].
- Lee, H. S. (2013). A study on the public-private partnership to global health issues in Korea. *Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives*, 4(6), pp. 308-315. doi: 10.1016/j.phrp.2013.10.003
- Li, B. (2003). Risk management of construction public private partnership projects. Ph.D. thesis, Glasgow Caledonian University, U.K.
- Li, B., Akintoye, A., Edwards, P. J., & Hardcastle, C. (2005b). Perceptions of positive and negative factors influencing the attractiveness of PPP/PFI procurement for construction projects in the U.K.: Findings from a questionnaire survey. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 12(2), pp. 125-148. doi: 10.1108/09699980510584485
- Liu, L. X., Clegg, S., & Pollack, J. (2024). The effect of public-private partnerships on innovation in infrastructure delivery. *Project Management Journal*, 55(1), pp. 31-49. doi: 10.1177/87569728231189989
- Liu, T., & Wilkinson, S. (2011). Adopting innovative procurement techniques: Obstacles and drivers for adopting public private partnerships in New Zealand. *Construction Innovation*, 11(4), pp. 452-469. doi: 10.1108/14714171111175918
- McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., & Weinberger, J. (1989). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? *Psychological Review*, 96(4), p. 690. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.96.4.690
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), pp. 991-1007. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.991
- Monibot, G. (2010). The UK'S odious debts: Many PFI deals are undemocratic, it's time we stop honouring them. Available at <http://www.monbiot.com/2010/11/22/the-uks-odious-debts/> [accessed 15 October, 2020].
- Ojelabi, R. A., Fagbenle, O. I., Afolabi, A. O., Tunji-Olayeni, P. F. & Amusan, L. M. (2018) Appraising the barriers to public-private partnership as a sustainable tool for sustainable development of infrastructures in developing economy. In: *2nd International Conference on Environmental and Energy Engineering (IC3E), IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, Vol. 146, 1-3 March 2018, Xiamen, China, pp. 1-6.
- Onyemachi, P., Sammy, M., & Pollard, D. (2015). An examination of the critical success factors for public-private partnership in housing project in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 17(3), pp. 1-20.
- Osei-Kyei, R., & Chan, A. P. C. (2017). Implementing public-private partnership (PPP) policy for public construction projects in Ghana: Critical success factors and policy implications. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 17(2), pp. 113-123. doi: 10.1080/15623599.2016.1207865
- Osei-Kyei, R., & Chan, A. P. C. (2018). Comparative study of governments' reason/motivations for adopting public-private partnership policy in developing and developed economies/countries. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 22(5), pp. 403-414. doi: 10.3846/ijspm.2018.5223
- Osei-Kyei, R., Dansoh, A., & Ofori-Kuragu, J. K. (2014). Reasons for adopting public-private partnerships (PPP) for construction projects in Ghana. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 14(4), pp. 227-238. doi: 10.1080/15623599.2014.967925
- Owusu-Manu, D., & Kukah, A. S. (2017). Motivation Factors of Public and Private Sectors Engaging in Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Construction Projects in Ghana. *Journal of Built Environment*, 1(1), pp. 57-85.
- Oyebanji, A. O., Akintoye, A., & Liyanage, C. (2011). Public-private partnership: A panacea to urban housing inequalities in developing countries. A case of Nigeria. In: *Being a 3rd Proceedings of the CIB.TG72/ARCOM Doctoral Research Workshop*, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using the SPSS Program*, 4th edn. Allen and Unwin Publishers, Australia.
- Robinson, H., Carrillo, P., Anumba, C. J., & Patel, M. (2010). *Governance & Knowledge Management for Public-Private Partnerships*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.
- Roehrich, J. K., Lewis, M. A., & George, G. (2014). Are public-private partnerships a healthy option? A systematic literature review. *Social Science and Medicine*, 113, pp. 110-119. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.03.037
- Roumboutsos, A., Aleman, A. S., & Agren, R. (2017). Construction firms in public private partnerships: A place to grow. *Construction Management and Economics*, 35(10), pp. 627-640. doi: 10.1080/01446193.2017.1319573
- Sallberg, H., & Numminen, E. (2022). Key drivers for infrastructure public-private partnership adoption in Sweden. In: *WEI International Academic Conference, Proceedings*, Rome, Italy, pp. 19-31.
- Sambrani, V. N. (2014). PPP for Asia and African perspective towards infrastructure development: A case study of Greenfield Bangalore International Airport, India. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 157, pp. 285-295. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.11.031
- Skietrys, E., Raipa, A., & Bartkus, E. V. (2008). Dimensions of the efficiency of public-private partnership. *Engineering Economics*, 3, p. 45. doi: 10.5755/J01.EE.58.3.11542
- Sun, Q., Zhang, Q. S., Ke, Y., Ma, X., & Galvin, S. (2021). Comparative analysis on the PPP research in Chinese and International Journals: A bibliometric perspective. *International Journal of Construction Management*. 23(2). 307-318 doi: 10.1080/15623599.2020.1866431
- The Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission. (2009). The national policy on public private partnership. Available at <https://www.estateintel.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/National-Policy-on-Public-Private-Partnership.pdf> [accessed 25 December, 2020].
- Vandenberg, P. (2015). 'Engaging the Private Sector in Public-Private Partnerships. *ADB Institute*, 4, pp. 1-8.
- Walker, C., Mulcahy, J., Smith, A., Lam, P. T. I., & Cochrane, R. (1995). *Privatized Infrastructure*. Thomas Telford, London, UK.
- Walker, C., & Smith, A. J. (1995). *Privatized Infrastructure: The BOT Approach*. Thomas Telford, London, UK.
- Wang, H., Xiong, W., Wu, G., & Zhu, D. (2017). Public-private partnership in Public Administration discipline: A literature

- review. *Public Management Review*, 20(2), pp. 293-316. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2017.1313445
- World Economic Forum, (2016). The Global Competitiveness Report 2016-2017. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Competitiveness_Report (Accessed on 13th June, 2017).
- Xu, H. (2023). Does government support affect private partners' profitability in public-private partnerships? Evidence from China. *Journal of Humanity Social Science and Communication*, 10, p. 223. doi: 10.1057/s41599-023-01723-w
- Zhang, X., & Cheng, S. (2013). A systematic framework for infrastructure development through public private partnerships. *International Association of Traffic and Safety Sciences (IATSS) Research*, 36, pp. 88-97. doi: 10.1016/j.iatssr.2012.11.001
- Zhang, X., Liu, J., & Bu, Z. (2025). Control rights incentive mechanism for PPP projects considering financial institutions' Early Intervention. *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 31(2), p. 04025001. doi: 10.1061/JITSE4.ISENG-2380