

Public Procurement Act: An Assessment of Implementation and Compliance in Yobe State, Nigeria

Machina M. A.¹, Machina M.M.², Lawal Y. S.³, Ibrahim A. M³

¹Department of Building, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri-Nigeria.

²Department of Architecture, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri-Nigeria.

³Department of Building, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11030065>

Received: 22 March 2026; Accepted: 28 March 2026; Published: 10 April 2026

ABSTRACT

Following the World Bank's recommendation, the Federal Public Procurement Act was enacted in Nigeria in 2007 to ensure transparency, competition, and value for money in the procurement of goods, works, and services, with all states mandated to adopt a local model. In 2016, Yobe State implemented the Yobe State Public Procurement Law to achieve these goals. This study examines the implementation and compliance of the Yobe State law, utilizing structured questionnaires from 160 stakeholders selected through a purposive, maximum variation sampling approach. The participants included 40 procurement officers, 40 accounting officers, 50 contractors, 15 civil society organization officials, and 15 staff of the Yobe State Bureau for Public Procurement. Analysis of field data on five key procurement drivers, showing strong internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.864$), revealed an overall weighted mean score of 2.31 on a 4-point Likert scale, indicating widespread dissatisfaction with the law's implementation and compliance. The study concludes that the law is not currently achieving its desired goals and recommends, among others, establishing a statutory commission comprising judges, prosecutors, and engineers, with full authority to prosecute and try violators.

Keywords: Public Procurement, Assessment, Implementation, Compliance. Yobe State.

INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

Public procurement, the process by which governments purchase goods, services, and infrastructure, accounts for a substantial percentage of annual budgets in developing countries (Kipo-Sunyehzi et al, 2024; Solomon, 2024; Masoud, 2023; Uwaoma, 2025). It typically represents 30% to 50% of total government expenditure and approximately 15% - 20% of GDP (Nnebuife et al, 2025; Solomon, 2024). The impact of public procurement expenditure in developing economies is profound; beyond providing essential infrastructure, it generates significant employment opportunities for the citizens (Nnebuife et al, 2025; Solomon, 2024). Indeed, no other sector, including multinational organizations, matches the scale of public procurement spending in these regions (Kipo-Sunyehzi et al, 2024; Masoud, 2023; Uwaoma, 2025). In these economies, the efficiency and transparency of procurement management directly influence budgetary stability, with significant impact ranging from high fixed savings to systematic leakages caused by corruption (Asogwa & Obetfa, 2022; Nnebuife et al, 2025). Collaborating this, Uwaoma (2025) said: "*there are very few activities that present higher temptations or provide more opportunity for high fixed savings and corruption than public procurement.*"

Public Procurement Law in Nigeria

Prior to 2007, Nigerian public procurement was not formally regulated, as no specific laws governed the process at either the federal and state levels (William-Elegbe, 2015). During this period, procurement

processes were opaque, resulting in a lack of accountability. Public contracts were frequently awarded through non-competitive, discretionary processes that favored politically connected individuals over qualified bidders. This led to inflated contract prices, abandoned projects, and poor-quality infrastructure (Afolabi et al, 2022). The 1999 World Bank Country Procurement Assessment Report (CPAR) identified the ‘absence of regulatory oversight’ as the primary cause of Nigeria’s procurement challenges. Consequently, the country was urged to implement a robust and stringent legal framework (Uwaoma, 2025; William-Elegbe, 2015; World Bank, 2000).

In response, the Federal Government of Nigeria enacted the Public Procurement Act in 2007 to instill transparency, competition and value for money in public procurement of goods, works and services (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2007; Uwaoma, 2025; William-Elegbe, 2015). The Federal Government further mandated all states to adopt a state-level model of the Act (Florence, 2018; Omagbon, 2016). In compliance, the Yobe State government passed the Yobe State Public Procurement Law in 2016 (Yobe State Government, 2016).

Aim and Objectives

The aim of this study is to enhance the implementation of, and compliance with, the Yobe State Public Procurement Law. This will be achieved through the following objectives:

1. **Investigate** the field-level implementation of the Law to identify areas requiring corrective action,
2. **Examine** practical compliance with the Law to identify gaps and weaknesses.
3. **Analyze** the findings from the first two objectives to propose corrective institutional strategies.
4. **Recommend** strategies to improve both the implementation of and compliance with the Law.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The 2007 Federal Public Procurement Act

The enactment of the Public Procurement Act (PPA) in 2007 marked a pivotal shift in Nigeria’s procurement practices. It was introduced to address inherent flaws in the system by establishing a standardized framework for transparency, accountability, and competitiveness (Shalliams & Andrew, 2021; Omagbon, 2016; Jibrin et al, 2014). Central to the PPA’s implementation was the establishment of the National Council for Public Procurement (NCP) to oversee the overall implementation of the Act, and the Bureau of Public Procurement (BPP), an independent regulatory body tasked with enforcing its provisions (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2007).

The PPA mandates that procurement processes be open, transparent, and competitive, with clear rules for procurement thresholds, tendering, and award procedures (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2007). These reforms aimed to eliminate corruption, improve competition, and ensure the proper use of public funds in line with best practices (Ingram, 2023; Igwe et al, 2021). Key aspects of the Act include:

Scope: Applies to all federal government entities, ministries, departments, and agencies, as well as organizations that receive funds from the federation account (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2007).

Procurement Methods: Defines authorized methods for acquiring goods, works, and services (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2007).

Compliance & Penalties: Sets out strict procedures for bidding and evaluation, with penalties for violations (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2007).

The 2007 Public Procurement Act comprises thirteen distinct parts (provisions), each addressing critical structural issues that historically impacted the public procurement system in Nigeria (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2007). Table 1 outlines the various provisions of the Act.

Table 1: Provisions of the 2007 Federal Public Procurement Act

S/N	Part	Title of Provision	S/N	Part	Title of Provision
1.	I	Establishment of National Council on Public Procurement	8.	VIII	Procurement of Consultant (Services)
2.	II	Establishment of the Bureau of Public Procurement	9.	IX	Procurement Surveillance and Review
3.	III	Scope of Application	10.	X	Disposal of Public Property
4.	IV	Fundamental Principles for Procurement	11.	XI	Code of Conduct
5.	V	Organization for Procurement	12.	XII	Offences
6.	VI	Procurement Methods (Goods and Services)	13.	XIII	Miscellaneous
7.	VII	Special and Restricted Methods of Procurement			

Source: Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).

Every provision of the 2007 Federal Public Procurement Act has its own sections and sub-sections numbered serially within each provision.

The Yobe State 2016 Public Procurement Law

The Yobe State Public Procurement Law was enacted in 2016 in compliance with the national call for all states of the federation to pass a state-level model of the 2007 Federal Public Procurement Act. The Law establishes the regulatory framework for public procurement at both the state and local government levels. It ensures transparency, accountability, and value for money in the procurement of goods, works, and services across government agencies, covering procurement methods, planning, and compliance (Yobe State Government; 2016 Aji et al, 2023). Other key aspects of the Law include:

Scope: Applies to procurement of goods, works, and services carried out by state and local governments in Yobe state (Yobe State Government, 2016).

Approving Authority: Establishes the Yobe State Council on Public Procurement (YSCPP) to consider and approve policies on public procurement in the state (Yobe State Government, 2016).

Regulatory Authority: Establishes the Yobe State Bureau of Public Procurement to oversee, regulate, and harmonize procurement processes (Yobe State Government, 2016).

Objectives: Designed to eliminate corruption, irregularities, and excessive costs in government contracting (Yobe State Government, 2016).

Principles: Mandates that all procurement must be transparent, fair, competitive, and efficient (Yobe State Government, 2016).

Documentation: Requires the preparation of procurement plans and adherence to established procurement methods (Yobe State Government, 2016).

The 2016 Yobe State Public Procurement Law is a replica of its counterpart at the federal level in terms of the number of provisions and their respective titles, except that the sections of the state Law are numbered serially throughout the Law, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The Various Sections of the 2016 Yobe State Public Procurement Law

Part	Sec-tion	Title	Part	Sec-tion	
I	1	Citation		31	Validity Period of Bids, Modification and Withdrawal of Tenders

II	2	Interpretation	VI	32	Opening of Bid
	3	Establishment of the Bureau		33	Examination of Bid
	4	Establishment of the Council		34	Evaluation of Bids
	5	Function of the Council		35	Acceptance of Bid
	6	Objectives of the Bureau		36	Domestic Preference
	7	Function of the Bureau		37	Mobilization Fee
	8	Powers of the Bureau		38	Contract Performance Guarantee
	9	Director-General of the Bureau		39	Record of Procurement Proceedings
	10	Principal officers of the Bureau	VII	40	Two stage Tendering
	11	Other Officers of the Bureau		41	Restricted Tendering
	12	Staff Regulations		42	Request for Quotation
	13	Pension of the Bureau		43	Direct Procurement
	14	Funds of the Bureau		44	Emergency Procurement
	15	Financial Year and Annual Report		45	Expression of Interest to Provide Services of Ascertained Needs
	16	Legal Proceedings		46	Request for Proposal to Provide Services of Ascertained Needs
	III	17	Scope of Application	VIII	47
IV	18	Fundamental Principles	48		Clarification and Modification of Request for Proposal
V	19	Approving Authority	49		Submission of Proposal
	20	Procurement Planning	50		Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal
	21	Procurement Implementation	51		General Selection Procedure
	22	Accounting Officers	52		Procedure for Selection of Proposal where Price is a Factor
	23	Procurement Planning Committee	53		Selection Procedure where Price is not a Factor
	24	Tenders Board	IX		54
25	Prequalification of bidders	55			Administrative Review
VI	26	Open Competitive Bidding	X		56
	27	Invitation Bidding		57	Planning of Proposal
	28	Bid Security	XI	58	Code of Conduct for Public Procurement
	29	Submission of Bid	XII	59	Offences Relating to Public Procurement
	30	Objection of Bid	XIII	60	Miscellaneous

Source: Yobe State Government (2016)

Transparency, Competitiveness and Fair-play in the Award of Procurement.

The Yobe State Public Procurement Law has severally emphasized in its content, the need for transparency, accountability, competitiveness, and fair-play in the award of procurement contracts. For example, Section 26 (1) indicated that:

“Except as provided by this law all procurement of goods and competitive works by all procuring entities shall be conducted by open competitive bidding.”

Section 18, Subsection 1(d-g), further mandated that this open competitive bidding in the award of public procurement contracts should be conducted:

- “(d) in a manner which is transparent, timely and equitable for ensuring accountability and conformity with this law and regulations made there from;*
- (e) with the aim of achieving value for money and fitness for purposes;*
- (f) in a manner which promotes competition, economy and efficiency; and*
- (g) in accordance with the procedures and timeline laid down in this law and as may be specified by the Bureau from time to time.”*

Section 21 also directed that, procurement entities should:

- “(a) advertise and solicit for bids in accordance with the provisions of this law and guidelines as may be issued by the Bureau from time to time;*
- (b) invite two credible persons as observers in every procurement process, one person each representing a recognized;*
 - (i) private sector professional organization whose expertise is relevant to the particular goods or services being procured; and*
 - (ii) non-governmental organization working in transparency, accountability and anticorruption areas and the observers shall not intervene in the procurement process but shall have right to submit their observation report to any relevant agency or body including their own organizations or associations;*

Although the foregoing section mandates procuring entities to invite two credible representatives of Civil Society Organizations (CSO) as observers in every procurement process, interested CSO representatives may on their own accord can attend and observe the procurement proceedings, except bid evaluation, by virtue of section 34(8) of the Law (Yobe State Government, 2016; Aji et al, 2023). The Law requires that the CSOs shall be those “recognized” by enabling law or registered by an appropriate authority. For example, the Nigeria Society of Engineers, the Nigerian Institute of Building, The Architects Association of Nigeria, which are recognized by the law and registered with the Corporate Affairs Commission, a regulatory authority that registers and supervises corporate organizations in Nigeria (Yobe State Government, 2016; Aji et al, 2023).

Quality and timely completion of Procurement.

One of the major objectives of the 2016 Yobe State Public Procurement Law as indicated in Section 6(b) is to:

- “.....ensure the application of fair, competitive, transparent, value for money standards,,,,,”*

The Law therefore succeeded in safeguarding the quality, cost and timely delivery of all procured goods, works, and services in Section 18, Subsection 6, thus:

“18. (6) All bidders, in addition to the requirements contained in any solicitation documents, shall:

(a) possess the necessary:

(i) professional and technical qualifications to carry out particular procurements;

(ii) financial capability;

(iii) equipment and other relevant infrastructure;

(iv) shall have adequate personnel to perform the obligations of the procurement contract;

(b) possess the legal capacity to enter into the procurement contract;

(c) not be in receivership, the subject of any form of insolvency or bankruptcy proceedings or the subject of any form of winding up petition or proceedings;

(d) have fulfilled all its obligations to pay taxes, pensions and social security

contributions;”

It can be observed from the foregoing that, in addition to certifying their professional and technical capabilities, all suppliers, contractors, and service providers must be financially fit before they are engaged in any procurement contract (Yobe State Government, 2016). Section 38 of the Law further stressed on the presentation of ‘contract performance guarantee’ from a reputable bank before any procurement contract is formally approved, stating that:

“The provision of a Performance Guarantee shall be a precondition for the award of any procurement contract upon which any mobilization fee is to be paid, provided however it shall not be less than 10% of the contract value in any case or an amount equivalent to the mobilization fee requested by the supplier or contractor, whichever is higher.”

To further ensure hitch-free delivery of every procurement, the Law, in Sections 18 and 21, stresses the need for procuring entities to be issued with ‘Certificate of No Objection’, by the State Bureau for Public Procurement, before formally awarding any procurement contracts. The Bureau can only issue this certificate after due and thorough scrutiny of the contract for compliance with all stipulated requirements of the Law (Yobe State Government, 2016; Aji et al, 2023).

Offences Relating to Public Procurement

Section 59 of the Law is specifically devoted to offences and accompanying penalties for the contravention of laws relating to the award and execution of public procurement contracts. Three categories of offenders are stipulated under the section with various punishments upon conviction. They include any private person (suppliers, contractors and service providers), officers of the Bureau or of a procuring entity, and a legal person (company). Subsection 1 provides punishment for a private person, subsection 5 provides punishment for an officer of the Bureau or of a procuring entity, while subsection 6 and 7 provide punishment for a legal person and its directors, respectively. However, penalties for contravention of provisions of the law range from (1) Debarment from all public procurements for a period of not less than 2 years for suppliers, contractors, and service providers; (2) A term of imprisonment of not less than 2 years but not exceeding 5 years, with an option of fine to a minimum of N200,000 or both; and (3) Suspension from office or termination of appointment for State Bureau staff and other public office holders (Yobe State Government, 2016).

Research Gap

Literature has featured the Nigerian Public Procurement system since the enactment of the Federal Public Procurement Act in 2007. This literature can broadly be classified into two schools of thought. The first school

includes literature that tend to applauds the emergence of the Act, claiming that it is a laudable step towards sanitizing the public procurement system in Nigeria, such as Florence (2018), Omagbon (2016), Jibrin et al (2014), William-Elegbe (2018), Ifejika (2024), with majority of them belonging to the time range of 10 years from enactment of the Act.

The second school of thought consist of literature that portrays the Act in a bad light. They claimed that the Act has failed to achieve the intended goal of mitigating the multitude of negative vices that plague the Public Procurement system in Nigeria, such as Solomon (2024), Asogwa & Obetfa (2022), Nwatu et al (2022), Masoud (2023), Igwe et al (2021), and Augutine et al (2024). Even though, many reasons were proposed for this failure, unfortunately however, no literature has viewed the problem in the perspective of implementation and subsequent compliance with the Act, especially at the state government level. This paper is intended to bridge this research gap.

METHODOLOGY

Distribution and Collection of Questionnaires

The study employed a purposive sampling approach to select 160 respondents across Yobe State, Nigeria for the study. This approach was adopted as it appears to be best suited for exploring sensitive political subjects where deep, contextual understanding is prioritized over statistical generalization. Due to the sensitive nature of public procurement, random sampling was not feasible as trust-building is crucial for participant engagement. Therefore, key informants were selected based on their deep experience, expertise, and direct involvement in the implementation of and compliance with the Yobe State Public Procurement Law.

To mitigate potential selection bias, specifically the risk of over-representing a single perspective, the study utilized maximum variation sampling within the purposive framework, intentionally seeking out individuals from differing backgrounds and roles within the political sphere. Furthermore, data collection continued until thematic saturation was achieved, meaning no new insights were gathered from additional interviews. Acknowledging that participants self-selected into the study, the researcher triangulated interview data with documentary analysis to ensure the findings were not skewed by volunteer response bias.

The selected respondents were divided into five groups:

Group A: Procurement Officers from Ministries, Departments and Agencies, and Local Government Areas.

Group B: Accounting Officers, including Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Agencies and Parastatal Organizations, and Local Government Chairmen and Secretaries.

Group C: Contractors from both the State and Local Government levels.

Group D: Officials of civil society organizations in Yobe State, including the Nigerian Institute of Building (NIOB), the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS), the Nigerian Institute of Architects (NIA), the Nigerian Society of Engineers (NSE), the Nigerian Institute of Estate Surveyors and Valuers (NIESV), the Nigerian Institute of Surveyors (NIS), and the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners (NITP).

Group E: Staff of the Yobe State Bureau for Public Procurement (YSBPP).

Survey research design was employed, using questionnaires specifically designed for the study as the main research instrument. Respondents were administered a homogenous questionnaire focused mainly on the following five areas of implementation of and compliance with the Yobe State Public Procurement Law:

1. Attainment of Transparency, Openness, Fairness, and Equity in Procurement Process.
2. Achievement of Competitiveness, Efficiency, and Standard of Procurement Process.
3. Achievement of Value for Money, Effectiveness, and Quality of Procurement.
4. General Level of Attainment of Compliance with Procurement Regulations.
5. General Level of Implementation of the Law

The questionnaires included final questions asking respondents to rate their satisfaction with each of the five areas of procurement management mentioned above. Ratings were provided on a 4-point Likert scale: Very Satisfied (4), Satisfied (3), Dissatisfied (2), and Very Dissatisfied (1).

Data reliability will be validated using Cronbach’s Alpha, with thematic saturation ensuring depth and documentary analysis mitigating potential selection bias.

The Cronbach’s Alpha is a statistical measure of internal consistency or reliability, indicating how closely a set of survey items (like Likert scale) are as a group. Ranging from 0 to 1, a higher value suggests the items reliably measure the same underlying construct, with 0.70 or higher usually indicating acceptable reliability (Moser & Kalton’s, 2023).

Table 3: Distribution and Collection of Questionnaires

No. of Questionnaires	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	Group E	Total	Percentage (%)
Administered	40	40	50	15	15	160	100
Received	30	32	39	10	11	122	76

Table 3 illustrates the distribution and subsequent collection of the questionnaires. Out of 160 questionnaires distributed, 122 were retrieved, representing 76% response rate. This return rate is sufficient for statistical analysis, aligning with Moser and Kalton’s (2023) assertion that survey results may be biased or of negligible value if the response rate falls below 30-40%.

Data Presentation

As noted in the preceding subsection, a 4-point Likert scale was employed to measure respondent satisfaction regarding the implementation of and compliance with the 2016 Yobe State Public Procurement Law. Table 4 details the response pattern across the five primary factors associated with the implementation and enforcement of this legislation.

Table 4: Distribution of Responses

FACTORS	ASSESSMENT	CATEGORY OF RESPONDENTS					Total Resp
		Procurement Officers (Group A)	Accounting Officers (Group B)	Contractors (Group C)	Civil Society Organization Officials (Group D)	Bureau Staff (Group E)	
Transparency, Openness, Fairness, and Equity	Very Satisfied	0	2	6	0	8	16
	Satisfied	4	10	16	0	1	31
	Dissatisfied	17	6	12	6	1	42
	Very Dissatisfied	9	14	5	4	1	33
	Total Response	30	32	39	10	11	122
Competitiveness, Efficiency, and Standard	Very Satisfied	1	2	8	0	7	18
	Satisfied	3	6	17	0	2	28
	Dissatisfied	18	11	13	2	1	45
	Very Dissatisfied	8	13	1	8	1	31
	Total Response	30	32	39	10	11	122
Value for Money, Effectiveness, and Quality of	Very Satisfied	6	5	9	2	7	29
	Satisfied	15	9	18	5	2	49
	Dissatisfied	6	7	8	2	1	24
	Very Dissatisfied	3	11	4	1	1	20

Procurement	Total Response	30	32	39	10	11	122
General Level of Attainment of Compliance with Regulations	Very Satisfied	0	0	6	0	7	13
	Satisfied	3	6	9	0	2	20
	Dissatisfied	18	16	16	5	1	56
	Very Dissatisfied	9	10	8	5	1	33
	Total Response	30	32	39	10	11	122
General Level of Implementation of the Law	Very Satisfied	1	1	5	0	7	14
	Satisfied	5	8	15	1	2	31
	Dissatisfied	14	9	10	7	1	41
	Very Dissatisfied	10	14	9	2	1	36
	Total Response	30	32	39	10	11	122

Data Analysis

As shown in Table 4, respondents rated their perception of the five factors regarding the implementation of and compliance with the 2016 Yobe State Public Procurement Law. Responses were categorized as Very Satisfied (4), Satisfied (3), Dissatisfied (2), or Very Dissatisfied (1), based on the practical duties and responsibilities conferred upon them by the Law. Since the responses are ordinal, the weighted Mean (Likert scale analysis) was used as the appropriate statistical tool to determine the overall perception of each group, as well as the perception of the entire sample population on the implementation and compliance. The steps used in the analysis are as follows:

The Likert scale for analysis is coded as: Very Satisfied (4), Satisfied (3), Dissatisfied (2), and Very Dissatisfied (1). Total respondents (N) = 122:

Step 1: Calculation of Mean Scores per Factor

The mean score for each factor is calculated by:

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum (\text{Score Value} \times \text{Frequency})}{\text{Total Response (122)}}$$

(i) Attainment of Transparency, Openness, Fairness, and Equity

$$\sum = (4 \times 16) + (3 \times 31) + (2 \times 42) + (1 \times 33)$$

$$\sum = 64 + 93 + 84 + 33 = 274 \quad \text{Therefore, Mean} = 274/122 = \mathbf{2.25}$$

(ii) Achievement of Competitiveness, Effectiveness, and Standard

$$\sum = (4 \times 18) + (3 \times 28) + (2 \times 45) + (1 \times 31)$$

$$\sum = 72 + 84 + 90 + 31 = 277 \quad \text{Therefore, Mean} = 277/122 = \mathbf{2.27}$$

(iii) Achievement of Value for money, Effectiveness, and Quality

$$\sum = (4 \times 29) + (3 \times 49) + (2 \times 24) + (1 \times 20)$$

$$\sum = 116 + 147 + 48 + 20 = 331 \quad \text{Therefore, Mean} = 331/122 = \mathbf{2.71}$$

(iv) General Level of Compliance with Regulations

$$\sum = (4 \times 13) + (3 \times 20) + (2 \times 56) + (1 \times 33)$$

$$\Sigma = 52 + 60 + 112 + 33 = 257 \quad \text{Therefore, Mean} = 257/122 = \mathbf{2.11}$$

(v) General Level of Implementation of the Law

$$\Sigma = (4 \times 14) + (3 \times 31) + (2 \times 41) + (1 \times 36)$$

$$\Sigma = 56 + 93 + 82 + 36 = 267 \quad \text{Therefore, Mean} = 267/122 = \mathbf{2.19}$$

Step 2: Mean Score of the Entire Procurement System

The mean score of the entire system is the average of the five factor means:

$$\frac{2.25 + 2.27 + 2.71 + 2.11 + 2.19}{5} = \frac{11.53}{5} = \mathbf{2.31}$$

Step 3: Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Calculation

Cronbach’s Alpha measures the internal consistency (reliability) of the 5 factors (items) used to assess the procurement system.

Formula:

$$\alpha = (k/k-1) (1 - \sum S_i^2 / S_T^2)$$

Where k (Number of items) = 5 and (S_i²) (Variance of each item) has Var (Item 1) = 1.156; Var (Item 2) = 1.258; Var (Item 3) = 1.637; Var (Item 4) = 1.250; and Var (Item 5) = 1.348

$$\sum S_i^2 \text{ (Sum of item variances): } 1.156 + 1.258 + 1.637 + 1.250 + 1.348 = \mathbf{6.649}$$

S_T² (Variance of the total score): Calculated based on the total response, the variance of the 5-item sum is **21.55**

Final Calculation: $\alpha = (5/5-1) (1 - 6.649/21.55)$; $\alpha = (1.25) (1 - 0.3085)$; $\alpha = 1.25 \times 0.6915$; $\alpha = \mathbf{0.864}$

Final Answer: The Cronbach’s Alpha is **0.864**

Interpretation Of Results

Likert Scale Analysis

Decision Rule: Very Satisfied = 3.50 to 4.00; Satisfied = 2.50 to 3.49; Dissatisfied = 1.50 to 2.49; Very Dissatisfied = 1.00 to 1.49.

The results obtained in the preceding section and their accompanying interpretations can therefore be summarized as shown on Table 5:

Table 5: Summary of Results and Their Accompanying Interpretations

Factor Assessment	Very Satisfied + Satisfied	Dissatisfied + Very Dissatisfied	Mean Score	Interpretation
Transparency, Openness.....	47 (38.5%)	75 (61.5%)	2.25	Dissatisfied
Competitiveness, Efficiency.....	46 (37.7%)	76 (62.3%)	2.27	Dissatisfied
Value for Money, Quality.....	78 (63.9%)	44 (36.1%)	2.71	Satisfied/Moderate

Compliance Regulations	33 (27.0%)	89 (73.0%)	2.11	Dissatisfied
Implementation of Law	45 (36.9%)	77 (63.1%)	2.19	Dissatisfied
Entire Procurement System			2.31	Dissatisfied

Attainment of Transparency, Openness, Fairness, and Equity in Procurement Process (Mean Score = 2.25).

- **Overall:** The majority of respondents (61.5%) are either “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied” with the transparency of the process.
- **Group Perspective:** Group A (Procurement Officers) and Group B (Accounting Officers) show higher level of dissatisfaction, suggesting internal bottlenecks in transparency.
- **Interpretation:** The procurement process is viewed as having significant issues with transparency and fairness.

Achievement of Competitiveness, Efficiency, and Standard of Procurement Process (Mean Score = 2.27).

- **Overall:** Similarly low, with 76 out of 122 respondents (62.3%) expressing dissatisfaction.
- **Group Perspective:** Contractors (Group C) show higher satisfaction (25) compared to others.
- **Interpretation:** The competitive process is considered inefficient or not meeting professional standards.

(iii) Achievement of Value for Money, Effectiveness, and Quality of Procurement (Mean Score = 2.71).

- **Overall:** This is the highest-rated factor as 78 out of 122 respondents (63.9%) are “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied”.
- **Group Perspective:** Contractors (Group C) and Procurement Officers (Group A) feel that the final output provides good value, even if they dislike the process leading to it.
- **Interpretation:** While the overall process (Transparency & Competitiveness) is disliked, the final outcome (Value for Money) is generally perceived as acceptable.

General Level of Attainment of Compliance with Procurement Regulations (Mean Score = 2.11).

- **Overall:** The lowest scoring factor. Over 70% of respondents (89 out of 122) are “Dissatisfied” or “Very dissatisfied” with compliance.
- **Group Perspective:** Almost all groups show high dissatisfaction, especially Groups A, B, and C, highlighting poor adherence to the established procurement laws.
- **Interpretation:** There is a critical lack of compliance with procurement regulations across the board.

General Level of Implementation of the Law (Mean Score = 2.19).

- **Overall:** The majority are unsatisfied, with 77 of 122 respondents (63.1%) holding a negative view.
- **Group Perspective:** While Contractors (Group C) finds implementation satisfactory (5 + 15 = 20), the Accounting Officers (Group B) and Bureau Staff (Group E) are largely pessimistic about the implementation, despite being the ones who should be implementing it.
- **Interpretation:** The procurement law is not being effectively implemented or enforced.

Overall System Performance

Analysis of the procurement system indicates an overall below-expectation operation (mean = 2.31), driven by low compliance (2.11) and weak legal implementation (2.19), despite acceptable value for money (2.71).

4.3 Cronbach's Alpha Interpretation

The Cronbach's Alpha is interpreted as follows:

$\alpha \geq 0.9$ = Very high reliability; $0.8 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ = High reliability; $0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.8$ = Reliability;

$0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$ = Marginally/minimally reliable; and $\alpha < 0.6$ = Unacceptably low reliability

A Cronbach's Alpha of 0.864 indicates high internal consistency and strong reliability among the factors assessed. Therefore, the items reliably measure the overall perception of the procurement system.

DISCUSSION

Results of the study indicate that major stakeholders in the public procurement sector in Yobe State are generally dissatisfied with the overall mode of implementation and compliance regarding the Yobe State Public Procurement Law of 2016. This revelation foretells a gloomy future for the public procurement system in Yobe state. It is therefore unsurprising that William-Elegbe (2015), recounting the challenges of the policy at both the federal and state levels, stated:

“However, in spite of the passage of the procurement policy at both federal and state levels, and the establishment of a procurement cadre in government ministries, departments, and agencies, the procurement system in Nigeria is not functioning as it ought to and public procurement in Nigeria is still riddled with corruption, fraud and irregularities.”

Three major reasons are proffered in most literature for the setbacks in the current implementation and compliance with the public procurement policy at both federal and state levels.

1. **Differential capacity of procurement officials:** It is reported that there is a clear difference in the level of understanding of procurement functions among officials of procurement entities, with some entities possessing staff with higher degrees of understanding than others (Uwaoma, 2025; William-Elegbe, 2015). In addition, the resources available to procurement officials to carry out procurement functions also differ from one procurement entity to another (Solomon, 2024; Masoud, 2023). This lack of capacity is believed to be a major hindrance in the ability of procurement entities to properly follow procurement rules, resulting in sub-standard procurement procedures,
2. **Involvement of politicians in the procurement process:** It is also reported that politicians frequently influence the outcome of procurement processes, exerting undue pressure on government officials to manipulate the award of contracts to persons or firms of their interest (Nwatu et al, 2022; Nnebuife et al, 2025). This, according William-Elegbe (2015), has led to: *“Several uncompleted projects, in which contractors were paid up-front and absconded with federal and/or state funds, or which were completed at prices high in excess of the original contract price.”*
3. **Mismatch between budgetary appropriations and actual release of funds:** Procurement entities often find it difficult to meet financial obligations to contractors when funds appropriated in budgets are not released. The situation can lead to the cancellation of contracts or the diversion of funds from other sources (Nwatu et al, 2022; Igwe et al, 2021).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study utilized secondary source of information to overview the legislative instrument employed in public procurement procedures in Nigeria. The Federal Government of Nigeria passed the Federal Public

Procurement Act in 2007, while a state-level model, the Yobe State Public Procurement Law (YSPPL), was enacted by the Yobe State Government in 2016. Based on empirical data gathered from major stakeholders, this study reveals widespread dissatisfaction with the implementation of and compliance with the Yobe State Public Procurement Law. Consequently, the study concludes that the Law has largely failed, as it has not achieved its desired goals.

Although the Yobe State Public Procurement Law was designed as a veritable legal instrument to curtail the lingering menace of corruption and other irregularities that pervaded the public procurement system in Yobe state prior to 2016, the YSPPL has failed to effectively eliminate these vices. This calls for urgent, robust, and viable recommendations to salvage the situation.

To this end, the study recommends the following:

1. The Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) should establish a specialized, well-resourced unit dedicated to investigating and prosecuting corrupt practices in public procurement across all levels of government.
2. The Yobe State Bureau for Public Procurement should implement a comprehensive e-procurement system to ensure the effective online availability of procurement information, including tender notice, bidding procedures, contract awards, and performance reports, to the general public.
3. The Yobe State House of Assembly should pass a law establishing an independent, statutory commission to oversee, approve, and enforce procurement decisions and disciplinary measures. This body will ensure strict adherence to the procurement Law to enhance accountability and transparency, shield procurement activities from political interference, and prosecute violators. The commission must be staffed by high-caliber judges, lawyers, and engineers and include designated courtrooms for trials.
4. Procurement entities handling numerous concurrent construction projects, such as Ministries of Education and Health, should be authorized to establish dedicated procurement units staffed by engineers, architects, quantity surveyors, accountants, and Lawyers drawn from other ministries. This approach brings procurement activities closer to the respective entities.
5. Priority should be given to the appointment of high-caliber procurement officers to manage every procurement process within an entity.

REFERENCES

1. Afolabi A., Ibem E., Aduwo. E, & Tunji-Olayeni, P. (2022). Digitizing the grey areas in the Nigerian public procurement system using e-procurement technologies. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 22(12), 2215-2224. <https://dio.org/10.1080/15623599.2220.1774836>
2. Aji, S.S., Zadawa, A.N., & Muktar, M. M. (2023). Critical Factors Affecting Public Procurement Policy Implementation for Effective Project Delivery in Yobe State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (IJISRT)*, Vol. 8, Issue 8, pp. 45–54. www.ijisrt.com
3. Asogwa, M. O., & Obetta, K. C. (2022). The 2007 Public Procurement Act and public accountability: A Case Study of University of Nigeria, Nsukka. *Journal of Development and Educational Studies (JUDES)*, Vol.1, No1, February,2022. <https://share.google/oh8hHF00ghCWJIKDD>
4. Augutine, A., Aliqba, B. A., & Amehojo, D. (2024). Assessment of the Implementation of 2007 Public Procurement Act in Service Delivery of National Insurance Commission, Abuja, Kashere *Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 2(1)65-73. <https://journals.fukashere.edu.ng/index.php/kjpir/article/view/180>
5. Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007). Public Procurement Act, 2007. Retrieved from <http://www.bpp.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/public-procurement-Act-2007pdf>.

6. Flovence, F. O. (2018). Implementation of Public Procurement Act and Government Performance: Evidence from Nigeria. *South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics*, 1(4), 1–9. Available at: <https://journalsajsse.com>
7. Ifejike, S. I. (2024). Transparency and Fight Against Public Procurement Act 2007. *Asian journal of African studies*, (47),55-95. <https://share.google/9u2YSVsiQskxRKKd>
8. Igwe, N.N., Ude, A. O., & Chukwu, C.U. (2021). Public Procurement, Transparency and Accountability in Nigeria. *Dissecting the Benefits and Challenges of Anti-corruption War*. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 9(1), 306-323. <https://eprints.gouni.edu.ng/id/eprint/29>
9. Ingram, L. M. (2023). Public Procurement and Public Trust. In: *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance* (pp.10842-10847). Cham Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3_1592
10. Jibrin, M. S., Ejura, S. B. & Augustine, N. I. (2014). The Public Procurement Reforms in Nigeria: Implementation and Compliance Challenges. *Journal of Asian Business Strategy*, 4(11), 149.<http://presswebs.com/journal-detail.php?jid=5006>
11. Kipo-sunhyezi, D. D. & Ababakari, A. Banchani (2024). Public Procurement Policies of Nigeria and Ghana: An Analysis of the Administrative Challenges in Achieving Value for Money. *Journal of public procuremen*, 2024. 24 (2); 193-209. <https://www.emerald.com>
12. Masoud Y. (2023). The effect of political interference on procurement performance in Dares Salaam Region. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Sciences*, (2147-4478),12(2), 158–169 <https://share.google/2O8UUysyDp1443aTT>
13. Moser C. A. and Kalton G. (2023). *Survey methods in social investigation*. (8th Ed) Heinemann Educational United Kingdom. ISBN-14: 945-2248684756
14. Nnebuife, E., Anayochukwu, O. B., Emmanuel U. C. & Promise U. C. (2025). Impact of the Nigerian 2007 Public Procurement Act 2007 on Organisations: Enhancing Transparency and Accountability. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Sciences (IJRISS)*, Vol. IX, Issue 1, 651–659. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9010056>
15. Nwatu, S. T., Nwokike I.R., & Anya S. N. (2022).Impact of the Public Procurement Act 2007 on the Functions of Governing Councils of Federal Universities in Nigeria. *The Nigerian Juridical Review*, Vol.17 (1-22) <https://doi.org/10.56284/tnjr.v17i1.25>
16. Omagbon, P. (2016). An assessment of compliance with the Public Procurement Act by Nigerian local government. *Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*. 2(4), 1-11. Academia.edu <https://share.google/5KCKsXu0oaRsq3crs>
17. Shalliams, O. & AndrewT. E. (2021).Public procurement practices, transparency, and service in African tourism. *African Journal of Business Management*. 15(1), 41-48. <https://www.jopafll.com>
18. Solomon O. B. (2024). Nigerian Public Procurement Act and the War Against Corruption: Identifying the Missing Link. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, Issue 31/2024 pp. 319–332. <https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafll>
19. Uwaoma U. U. (2025).An appraisal of public procurement process in Nigeria: A case study of the Public Procurement Act 2007. *International journal of political science and governance*. Vol.7, issue7, Part A. pp.17-12 <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/126646021.2025.v15.i4>
20. Williams-Elegbe S. (2015). A Comparative Analysis of the Nigerian Public Procurement Act Against International Best Practice. *Journal of African law*. Vol.59, Issue1, pp.85-98. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002185531400087>
21. William Elegbe S. (2018). Systemic corruption and Public Procurement in Developing Countries: Are There Any Solutions? *Journal of Public Procurement*, 18(2), 131–147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOPP-06-2018-009>
22. World Bank (2000). *World Bank. Country Procurement Assessment Report, volume 1: Summary of Fundings and Recommendations Lagos 2000*
23. Yobe State Government (2016). *Yobe State Public Procurement Law 2016*. Retrieved from: Yobe state BPP. https://share.google/f4j*frqv7duLebBWO.