

## **Impact of Partnership Business on Economic Development and Growth in Ondo State: A Study of Ondo State with Pay-Attitude Company**

**Idowu Paul, Olanitori**

Paul Consult, Research and Data Analysis  
Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria

**Olaiya Hawley, Ademulegun**

Department of Business Administration and Management  
Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria

**Oluwafemi Emmanuel, Adeyefa**

Internal Auditing Unit  
Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0070>

Published: 24th December, 2022

---

**Citation:** Olanitori I.P., Ademulegun O.H., and Adeyefa O.E. (2022) Impact of Partnership Business on Economic Development and Growth in Ondo State (A Study of Ondo State with Pay-Attitude Company), *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: Business and Management Sciences 3(2),89-104*

---

**ABSTRACT:** *Over the last two decades there has been a proliferation of partnerships between business and government, multilateral bodies and/or social actors such as NGOs and local community organizations engaged in promoting development. While proponents hail these partnerships as an important new approach to engaging business, critics argue that they are not only generally ineffective but serve to legitimate a neo-liberal, global economic order which inhibits development. This study examine impact of partnership business on economic development and growth of Ondo state through Pay-Attitude Company by assigning questionnaire to the study. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistic in line with Chi-square Technique. Three hypotheses formulated were tested using chi-square technique at 0.05(5%) level of significance. Findings disclose that ascertain ways of solving problems through effective technique has impact on growth of partnership business in Ondo State and also, partnership business has impact on the life of Ondo state citizens as shown from the result P-value ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). It was evident from findings that there is the need that partners in the partnership business should be educated more on the rules of business success and business failure so that it will guide them in handling the day to day operations of their business. The research recommends that though it is not mandatory that partnership must reach an agreement by law before business commences but it is very important.*

**KEYWORDS:** Partnership, Business, Economic Development and Growth

---

## INTRODUCTION

Local partnerships play an important role in the delivery of workforce and economic development activities in the United States. Partnerships include both public and private organizations and increasingly depend on local business people for leadership. The strong role of the private sector reflects the predominance throughout the country's history of grassroots organizations in addressing local issues and in delivering services. Today, economic development activities are carried out primarily at the local level by nonprofit organizations, with help and guidance from state agencies but minimal involvement from the federal government. Workforce development efforts, on the other hand, have enjoyed a much stronger partnership with the federal government. Since the inception of the major employment programs that grew out of the economic crisis of the 1930s, state and local efforts have benefitted from the federal government's leadership, technical expertise, and superior taxing powers. During the last decade, interest in strengthening the role of local organizations in providing activities in both these areas has increased. The underlying premise is that local governments are better able to assess and respond to the specific needs of their area. In addition, they are considered to be in a better position to coordinate services from the various programs that are intended to help people within their dominions. Business has the characteristics of being involved in transfer or exchange of goods and services, as well as human activity directed towards the acquisition of wealth, which will lead to growth by increasing the National income. Apart from this, business has the aims and objectives of earning profit, manufacture goods and or render services to the society, involving payment of taxes regularly to generate income for the government, provide job opportunities for the public, improve the standard of living of everybody in the country thereby resulting in sustained growth or development. In terms of size, the private sector in the Nigerian economy is substantial. There are two components: the organized private sector and the informal sector. The organized private sector comprises public limited liability. Private limited liability companies and partnerships, whereas the informal sector consists of peasant farmers, petty traders and artisans. Nigeria, which was one of the richest 50 countries in the early 1970s: the sixth largest exporter of oil, turned to become one of the 25 poorest countries at the threshold of the twenty first century; and also there is Poverty in Nigeria in the midst of plenty. Nigeria is among the 20 countries in the world with the widest gap between the rich and the poor (Igbuzor, 2016). The World Bank in its 2001 report titled 'Attacking poverty' proposed a strategy for attacking poverty in three ways: promoting opportunity; (by Encouraging effective private investment; Getting infrastructure etc.); facilitating empowerment and enhancing security. All which are to increase business in the country. Nigeria, an Oil-rich country has been restricted by political instability, corruption, inadequate infrastructure, and poor macroeconomic management, but in 2008 began pursuing economic reforms. Lack of infrastructure and slow implementation of reforms are key impediments to growth in Nigeria. The government is working toward developing stronger public-private partnerships for roads, agriculture, and power. Nigeria's financial sector was hurt by the global financial and economic crises, but the Central Bank

governor has taken measures to restructure and strengthen the sector by imposing mandatory higher minimum capital requirements (Nigeria Economy Profile, 2013).

National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), was launched in 2003 as a major initiative to reposition the economy of Nigeria in order to meet the multifaceted challenges confronting the economy. The NEEDS is a home-grown economic programme targeted towards achieving a stable, predictable and sustainable macroeconomic environment; non-inflationary and non-oil GDP growth. It is a medium term strategy which aims at poverty reduction, wealth creation, employment generation and value re-orientation. It is a nationally coordinated framework of action in close collaboration with the State and Local governments (with their State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (SEEDS) and other stakeholders. The vision is to consolidate on the achievements in 1999-2003 and build a solid foundation for the attainment of Nigeria as the largest and strongest African economy. The NEEDS encompasses important structural reforms designed to enhance the transparency and accountability of public sector policies and institutions. The process was expected to address many of the deep-rooted macroeconomic and structural challenges in order to restore stability and promote rapid and sustainable economic growth (development). The NEEDS document implemented was to create conducive environment for business and foreign investment so as to ensure a government sector cum private sector partnership for growth. In particular, it focused on the provision of basic services, empowering Nigerians and encouraging the private sector to become the engine of growth of the economy. The empowerment was focus on the areas of health, education, the environment, integrated rural development, employment, youth development and so on as well as a weapon to reduce poverty and underdevelopment in the country.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Weak infrastructure has been a driver of rising cost of doing business in Nigeria. In order to tackle this problem, government embarked on massive rehabilitation and construction of new infrastructure reinforced by the privatization and deregulation policy for increased participation of the private sector in infrastructure development. National Council on Privatisation was set up to ensure proper implementation of the privatization programme. The policy of deregulation of major sectors of the economy which had been in place since the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in 1986 was sustained. Consequently, the communication sub-sector was the first to be privatized with the licensing of many global system for mobile (GSM) communication which led to the telecommunication business revolution (Soludo, 2007). The deregulation of the downstream oil sector enhanced private sector participation and put an end to the incessant fuel crises that plagued the economy. Thus, with the various steps taken by the government this study therefore examines the relationship between business and economic development in Nigeria to see the effect of the businesses in Nigeria on the economic development of the country. This is with the desire to examine its ability to achieve the desired objectives in the country; Nigeria.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The major objective of this study is to examine Partnership Business (PPP) and its Contribution on Economics Development and Growth of Nigeria in Ondo State.

The specific objective of the study are;

- i. To ascertain the ways of solving some problems that are hindering the growth of partnership business in Ondo State.
- ii. To identify the roles of Ondo State government towards the formation of partnership business.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were raised to guide the objectives of the study;

- i. Can ascertain ways of solving some problems that are hindering the growth of partnership business in Ondo State be possible?
- ii. Can identified roles of Ondo State government towards the formation of partnership business be achieved?

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following are research hypotheses that guard this research work which base on null form  $H_0$ ;

- i.  $H_{01}$ : Ascertain ways of solving problems that are hindering the growth of partnership business has no significant effect on Ondo State.
- ii.  $H_{02}$ : Identified roles of Ondo State government has no significant effect towards the formation of partnership business.

## **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

### **Conceptual Review**

The term “partnership” covers greatly differing concepts and practices and is used to describe a wide variety of types of relationship in a myriad of circumstances and locations. Indeed, it has been suggested that there is an infinite range of partnership activities as the “methods for carrying out such (private-public) partnerships are limited only by the imagination, and economic development offices are becoming increasingly innovative in their use of the concept” (Lyons and Hamlin, 1991, p.55). This section considers some general and policy-orientated definitions of partnership in the context of economic development and regeneration.

There are a number of assumptions underlying definitions of partnership. Firstly, the potential for synergy of some form, so ‘the sum is greater than the parts’. Secondly, the partnership involves both development and delivery of a strategy or a set of projects or operations, although each actor may not be equally involved in all stages. Thirdly in public-private partnerships the public sector are not pursuing purely commercial goals. So a criteria of partnership is the presence of social partnership (so excluding purely commercial transactions).

Partnership involves co-operation, i.e. “to work or act together” and in a public policy can be defined as co-operation between people or organisations in the public or private sector for mutual benefit (see Holland, 1984). Harding (2010) sets out a similar general definition of ‘private public partnership’ as “any action which relies on the agreement of actors in the public and private sectors and which also contributes in some way to improving the urban economy and the quality of life” (p.110), although he argues that this has limited conceptual value. Bailey (2014) provides a working definition of private-public partnership in urban regeneration as “the mobilisation of a coalition of interests drawn from more than one sector in order to prepare and oversee an agreed strategy for regeneration of a defined area” (2009). Taking an economic development perspective, Sellgren (2010) defines partnership as a scheme with involvement or funding from more than one agency. Bennett and Krebs (1994) similarly stress the joint objectives of the bodies and defines partnership as co-operation between actors where they agree to work together towards a specified economic development objective and draw the key distinction between generalised policy communities that develop a broad local vision for the area or local economy and the specific networks (or partnerships) that are necessary to support individual projects. There are a number of further definitions which take a policy perspective. One that shows the wide scope of partnerships and the contributions of partners is from the Commonwealth (State) of Massachusetts which says “(A) partnership is a collaboration among business, non-profit organisations, and government in which risks, resources and skills are shared in projects that benefit each partner as well as the community” (Stratton, 1989). Other policy definitions may try to define more closely the range of actors involved, the geographical areas covered and any power that is devolved. Within the context of urban in areas of multiple deprivation, the UK Government has defined the partnership approach as involving the “voluntary commitment by the wide range of bodies with a contribution to make to urban development or regeneration (including local communities, the local authorities, Government departments and agencies and the private sector) to an agreed comprehensive long-term regeneration strategy for their areas” (The Scottish Office, 2016). This approach incorporates a range of issues which will be further considered below. These include: the voluntary nature of the relationships; the wide range of participants, ranging from the community to the private sector (the voluntary sector is only mentioned elsewhere in their document), local government, national government departments and quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organisations; the need for an agreed strategy; the long time scale; and agreed contributions of resources (presumably in a variety of forms) to the process, although it omits the sharing of risks.

At European Union level, one of the European Commission’s three main principles in its guidelines for its structural policy was “to implement a partnership with all the parties involved in structural policy, especially the regional authorities” (CEC, 1987). It went on to define the term partnership in its framework Regulation for reforming the Community’s Structural Funds as “close consultation between the Commission, the Member States concerned and the competent authorities designated by the latter at national, regional, local or other level, with each party acting as a partner



in pursuit of a common goal". Hence this type of partnership implies both consultation and action at a local level.

Others, such as Atkinson (2019), argue that there are varying meanings of words such as partnerships and the meaning assigned to partnership in urban and rural regeneration in the UK is an exercise in power which reinforces social relations. He argues that there is no single authentic mode of assigning meaning to terms such as partnership and that their meaning is constructed in the context of power and domination where official discourses have privileges over others. However, while such analysis is useful the degree of influence of such official discourses or documents may vary in different circumstances, and what is omitted from the documents may often be fundamental to its operation. Also the real level of influence by different actors at the local level is dependent upon many factors beyond those set out in documents. It is usually the underlying relationships which develop before, during and after any strategy document is written that are more significant than the documents themselves. In addition different actors within a partnership may have different views on its purpose, operation and power structures (McQuaid and Christy, 2019). Hence, partnership remains a varied and ambiguous concept.

In order to refine the concepts underpinning differing types of partnerships it is necessary to consider some of their key dimensions or characteristics. Otherwise we may be left at one extreme with such a wide level of generality that few lessons can be learnt, or at another extreme with a series of specific case studies which do not fully consider the external environment and possible underlying principles and pressures affecting partnerships. The next sections sets out some such key dimensions which help define broad types and characteristics of partnerships.

Economic development differs from economic growth. Growth on a general term could be confined to increase in output (per unit of input) while development implies increase in output together with a change in technical and institutional arrangement involved in production. Growth can take place without development but, a nation cannot achieve economic development without having achieved economic growth. Thus, economic growth is a subset of economic development as economic development is not purely an economic phenomenon. According to Tejvan (2011), in economics, Economic growth is an increase in real GDP which means an increase in the value of goods and services produced in an economy. The rate of economic growth measures the annual percentage increase in real GDP. In the long run, economic growth is determined by factors which influence the growth of Long Run Aggregate Supply (LRAS) (the PPF of the economy). If there is no increase in LRAS, then a rise in Aggregate Demand will just be inflationary (Tejvan, 2011).

### **Types of Partnership**

This section considers a range of parameters which are useful for analysing partnerships or developing models of them, in the context of urban regeneration and economic development. Each partnership has many dimensions. In order to try to capture the richness of various forms of

partnership this section sets out a range of dimensions to partnerships which can be combined to form a set of characteristics of a partnership. Hence any individual partnership is a combined of these different dimensions and there are large differences between partnerships and within a partnership over time.

### **Potential Advantages of Partnership**

An important question is why should an organisation use a partnership rather than carrying out the activity by itself? This section considers some of the arguments in favour of forming and implementing urban economic development policies through partnerships. The main assumption for using partnerships is that the partners are not in a zero (or rather constant) sum game. By cooperating the total output is increased for a given level of resources (see section 5 for more detailed discussion). Also they are seen as allowing each partner to gain the benefits from cooperation, while still retaining their autonomy. Hence, the underlying basis for partnerships is therefore as a result of the partnership welfare in the community will be greater than otherwise. In general, partnerships can be argued to be an effective way of overcoming market imperfections that are caused by externalities. Although if the market imperfections are overwhelming and permanent, the product indivisible, economies of scale are large, externalities are enormous, information is bad or impossible, and the market becomes monopolistic then Lyons and Hamlin (2011) argue that the government should provide the good or service directly. The main advantages of partnerships can be grouped as: resource availability; effectiveness and efficiency; and legitimacy.

### **Potential Disadvantages of Partnership**

There are many problems in working through partnerships (McQuaid, 1994; Hastings, 1996), which may vary according to the form of partnership. These include unclear goals, resource costs, unequal power, cliques usurping power, impacts upon other 'mainstream' services, differences in philosophy between partners and organisational problems.

### **Goals**

A lack of clear aims or goals is often cited as a major cause of the failure of partnerships. Many partnerships have agreed broad aims, but their detailed goals may be unclear or the partners may have differing understandings of what the goals mean. This can rapidly lead to misunderstanding, lack of co-ordination, and possible conflict between the partners. This could be accentuated if some partners had undeclared, or 'hidden', agendas and were deliberately seeking to gain advantage over the other partners or seeking to achieve their own organisational goals, without supporting or reciprocating the efforts of their partners. Lack of clarity of goals and the means of achieving them may increase the likelihood or perception of other partners having a 'hidden' agenda.

In general each of the dimensions of partnership discussed earlier presents possibly difficult choices. For instance, how the term "community" is defined may have significant implications for

the distribution of power. It may be difficult to identify the appropriate nature and level at which the community or private sector, or other, participate (for instance at the strategic or operational levels). National or regional agencies or representatives of the private sector may participate at the strategic level and have greater power than more local actors if the latter only participate at the operational level.

### **Resources Costs**

Next, there are considerable resources costs, for instance in terms of staff time in discussions and making agreements, and in delays to decisions due to consultation with partners. It may be difficult to close an inefficient or unsuccessful partnership, or even one whose objective has been achieved if all partners do not agree, as this may 'sour' relations elsewhere. There can also be problems of accountability as no single partner feels fully accountable for the actions of the partnership due to the split between responsibility and control (McQuaid, 1997).

If each partner 'claims' the full success of the partnership (e.g. in terms of jobs created) but only considers its own costs then this may distort decisions. Hence the full social costs of the partnership needs to be aggregated and compared to the full social benefits, rather than each partner focusing upon its own costs and benefits

### **Unequal Power**

In most partnerships there is unequal power (as discussed above). As Syrett (2017) argues conceptualisations of partnerships often fail to recognise the unequal power relations between social partners. Cadbury (2013) argues that the terms consultation and public partnership are often used interchangeably, but that partnership is a more involved form of participation with a wide range of meanings, and implies power being shared equally among all partners. She notes that while Partnership with the Community has been a crucial part of government policy although it is not a legislative requirement (for instance with the City Challenge policy).

Bennett and McCoshan (2013) argue that the partnerships between agents may be unequal as it may be more important for one partner than the other(s) or one partner can coerce or mandate the others (for example through providing or withholding finance). This however, may cause considerable tensions as one body seeks to alter another's priority (for example to alter education provision to reflect economic needs), particularly where a non-elected partner seeks to coerce a democratically elected body<sup>5</sup>. This issue of balance of power between partners is developed further in the section on disadvantages of partnerships below.

However, the presence of unequal power should not imply that all partners should necessarily have equal power. Some may have greater legitimate claim, due for instance to their greater involvement in the area, or have greater political legitimacy in the case of elected bodies. Also who should have equal power may be difficult to determine (for instance, should the voluntary sector as a whole or



each individual voluntary organisation have equal power to, say, local government or the local community, within the partnership?). Although there are different types of power, greatest power generally rests with those controlling resources. Often this will be a body far from the urban area itself (for example the national government or the EU). They are likely to dominate those in the local area who may have the greatest understanding of what is relevant and effective, albeit from a local rather than macro-perspective, and whose feeling of ‘ownership’ can be crucial to the initiatives success.

### ***Cliques Usurping Power***

A further set of dangers lies in the operation of the partnership. For instance the objectives or operation of a partnership may be usurped by some actors, cliques or groups (e.g. professional or community groups), resulting in outcomes that increase their benefits rather than overall welfare. There is also the familiar problem of decision making difficulties in groups whereby they may make irrational or sub-optimal decisions which the individuals themselves would not have done. Similarly, there may be a problem of the partnership lacking momentum as each actor relies on the others to push activity forward, resulting in none doing so. This is often countered by having a ‘product champion’ to use management jargon or a separate or a dedicated/assigned unit to develop the project.

### ***Impacts upon other Services***

Another set of problems involves impacts upon other services. There is a wider problem for many urban economic development initiatives of marginalisation from the mainstream activities of the key agencies. Partnerships (especially those with standalone implementation units) may be seen as an alternative to re-aligning mainstream services to deal with the issues, and yet the scale of and integration between mainstream services may be far more significant, especially in the long-run. Conversely the partnership may draw resources from other mainstream services or confuse the services in the minds of users, so reducing their effectiveness (i.e. there may be a significant opportunity cost). This problem is also linked to the scope of partners with, for instance, local authorities having wide ranges of services and responsibilities, while others, such regional development agencies or community groups have much narrower responsibilities.

Indeed, the increase in numbers of agencies, often themselves formed out of partnerships, can be argued to have increased the fragmentation of services, with partnerships then being seen as the means to solve the fragmentation. For example, the rise of Enterprise Trusts, regional development agencies, LECs/TECs, trade and innovation support centers and others in providing business support services has caused confusion in the minds of some users (although once ‘inside’ the system this is often dissipated), so one solution is to set up a coordinating ‘one stop’ shop in the form of another partnership.

### ***Organisational Difficulties***

Organisational difficulties inhibiting successful co-ordination of programmes and approaches, and overcoming the specialist concerns of disparate organisations is a key implementation problem in public agencies working together. Jennings and Krane (2014) found that various barriers hindered co-ordination. These barriers were: organisational (these include differing missions, professional orientations, structures and processes of agencies); legal/technical (statutes or regulations set down by higher authority, and the technological capacity and practice of the organisation); and political (both external political environment but also internal bureaucracy politics). Managers had used a diverse variety of mechanisms to overcome these barriers. They argue that good management characteristics, particularly leadership and interpersonal relationships, are the main ingredients of effective co-ordination, but also they need to be combined with clear direction (a “vision of client service”) and a clear division over responsibility of functions.

### **Differences in Philosophy among Partners**

Finally, there may be significant differences in philosophy between the partners, such as in the degree to which they feel the market can solve urban development problems. These differences may become more apparent when difficult circumstances arise. For instance, in many local economic development partnerships there is a tension between those partners who may emphasise employment and wealth redistribution (e.g. through assisting certain groups to get better access to employment etc.) and those who emphasise employment and wealth creation<sup>6</sup>. In areas of urban deprivation or renewal the market has often clearly failed, so there is a question as to what degree can the market solve the problem, possibly leading to some conflict between their different philosophies and motivations (and need for varying incentives). This is perhaps a major reason for the generally poor contribution, in financial terms, of the private sector to many urban renewal initiatives. In initiatives to increase the growth of specific opportunities in an urban area, there may be more support for improving the workings of the market and thus less conflict. Linked to this, there may be a problem of combining public and private management practices and philosophies within one partnership organisation, or a partnership without a clear contract (see for example, Bryson and Roering, 2017). One example is in the area of ethos or stricter ethics of the public sector (for example in the interpretation of conflicts of interests etc.), or in the way aims and objectives are set. In summary, there are many potential problems in working through partnerships and which may vary by the type of partnership. These revolve around resource costs, power distribution (between bodies and over time), operational difficulties, impacts upon other services and the influence of differing philosophies of partners.

### **Theoretical Review**

#### **Game Theory**

One area of economic theory that can structure the issues of inter-relationships and interaction is Games Theory. This is a huge and complex body of theory and only a brief discussion of the basic

application to the Prisoner's Dilemma is possible here (see for instance Weibull, 2015 for more detail). Axelrod (2014) uses this Dilemma to argue that for individuals pursuing their own self-interest, incentives for co-operation will be greater than for selfish behaviour (even without central authority) under a wide variety of circumstances, including where the 'partners' are hostile. The basic story of the Prisoner's Dilemma is basically that two accomplices arrested after a crime are then interrogated separately (see Luce and Raiffa, 2017, and Axelrod, 2014, for more detail and the full assumptions). These two players have two choices: to co-operate with each other or to defect. If one confesses (defects) and the other does not, then she will get free (i.e. a high positive payoff, although note that these payoffs are endogenous to the model) but the other prisoner will get a heavy sentence (zero payoff). If both confess then they both get a medium sentence (low payoff), and if neither confesses then both get low sentences (medium payoff). The latter is the best solution for both prisoners together (they maximise their combined welfare). However, for each individual, it is in their interest to confess as: she receives the worst outcome (a heavy sentence) if she does not confess but his accomplice does; while (s)he gets the maximum payoff (goes free) if his accomplice does not confess. Hence, assuming that neither prisoner has moral qualms or fears revenge from the other prisoner, then each would choose to confess, resulting in a sub-optimal outcome for their combined welfare. However, if the process is iterated, say they are likely to be caught again, then co-operation becomes much more easy as there will be a strong incentive for both *not* to confess as in the future case they will know how the other reacted and base their behaviour (to confess or not) on what happened last time. So, the strategy for success for each depends entirely upon the strategy of their accomplice. If there is a strong central control mechanism, for example the accomplices are part of a gang which will punish anyone who confesses, then co-operative behavior between the accomplices will occur. Provided the game is repeated a number of times, which players can recognise and remember the results of previous encounters, that future payoffs are not greatly discounted, then co-operation will be mutually beneficial. Even if there is a short term cost to cooperation it will still occur if future retaliation for current defections is great enough. This forms the basis of a theory of co-operation based upon reciprocity.

### **Empirical Review**

Mutuality is considered, by Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff (2004), as being a key conceptual feature of public private partnerships, an idea similar to Bovaird's (2004) definition of public-private partnerships, as commitments above and beyond contracts. Being on the same line of thought, Haque (2004) talks about mutuality and organizational identity as being important features of the public-private partnerships, considering the organizational identity as maintenance of each partner's own identity, values, and beliefs. Klijn and Teisman (2003) argue that a public-private partnership should be an agreement between public and private actors, with a shared responsibility over products, risks, costs, benefits etc., with all the participating parties understanding and internalizing the concept of mutual added value to the whole partnership.

Mutuality is considered, by Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff (2004), as being a key conceptual feature of public private partnerships, an idea similar to Bovaird's (2004) definition of public-private partnerships, as commitments above and beyond contracts. Being on the same line of thought, Haque (2004) talks about mutuality and organizational identity as being important features of the public-private partnerships, considering the organizational identity as maintenance of each partner's own identity, values, and beliefs. Klijn and Teisman (2003) argue that a public-private partnership should be an agreement between public and private actors, with a shared responsibility over products, risks, costs, benefits etc., with all the participating parties understanding and internalizing the concept of mutual added value to the whole partnership.

### **Research Design**

The research is a survey in which the opinion of the respondents is sampled using questionnaire. The data for this project was collected from primary source, using Ondo State government, Akure as a case study with descriptive analysis. Public-Private Partnership is a name that is being applied to different types of contractual agreements between the government and the private sector for the purpose of infrastructural development and service provision within a geographical location. The infrastructure or service is funded, in whole or in part, by the private partner. Risks are distributed between the public partner and private partner and are allocated to the party best positioned to manage each individual risk.

### **Population of the Study**

The population of this research project constitute most staff of Pay-Attitude Company in Nigeria. The population numbers are workers at the company.

### **Sample and Sampling Technique**

Actually, the populations of the research project were estimated to be three hundred and fifty (430) staff of all department but due to inadequate capital, time factor and exorbitant cost and to ensure accuracy and reliability, only few of the populations will be selected by Yamane's formula as shown bellows.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N (e)^2}$$

Where n = Sample Size

N = Population = 430

e = Level of significance (0.05)

n= Sample size

And substituting the values

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \frac{430}{1 + 430(0.05)^2} \\ &= \frac{430}{2.075} \end{aligned}$$

$$n = 207$$

The sample value is two hundred and seven (207).

### Inferential Statistics

Chi-square is used because is the test of “Goodness of fit” base on the following reasons;

- i. The sample was randomly drawn from population.
- ii. Values for the variables are mutually exclusive.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Ascertain ways of solving problems that are hindering the growth of partnership business has no significant effect on Ondo State.

**Table 4; Contingency Table for Research Question One**

Frequency			
Option	Male	Female	Total
Yes	140	45	185
No	12	10	22
Total	152	55	207

Source: Field Survey 2022.

**Table 5; Computed Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) table for Question One**

Statement				
F <sub>0</sub>	F <sub>e</sub>	(F <sub>0</sub> -F <sub>e</sub> )	(F <sub>0</sub> -F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	(F <sub>0</sub> -F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup> / F <sub>e</sub>
140	136	4	16	0.117
45	49	4	16	0.327
12	16	4	16	1.000
10	6	4	16	2.667
TOTAL				4.111

Source: Field Survey 2022

Expected frequency: (Column total x Row total)

$$\frac{\text{Grand total}}{\text{Grand total}}$$

V=DF: (R-1)(C-1); (2-1)(2-1)

V= (1x1) =1

Calculated Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ); **4.111**

Chi-Square value calculated is **4.111** is greater than table value of **3.841**, (**4.111>3.841**) which is significant at **0.05%** level of significant, because P-value (**0.023**) is less than **0.05**.

**P<0.05= (0.023<0.05).**

The Chi-Square test result reveals that there is significant relationship between Ascertain ways of solving problems and growth of partnership business in Ondo State, this mean that, ascertain ways of solving problems through effective technique has impact on growth of partnership business in Ondo State. With the majority of the respondents answering yes, this means that growth of

partnership business in Ondo State through technical way will bring about genuine purpose. Therefore, null hypothesis one has been rejected on the ground of proper relationship

**H<sub>02</sub>: Identified roles of Ondo State government has no significant effect towards the formation of partnership business.**

**Table 6; Contingency Table for Research Question Two**

Frequency			
Option	Male	Female	Total
Yes	146	35	181
No	16	10	26
Total	162	45	207

Source: Field Survey 2022

**Table 7; Computed Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) table for Question Two**

Statement				
F <sub>0</sub>	F <sub>e</sub>	(F <sub>0</sub> -F <sub>e</sub> )	(F <sub>0</sub> -F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	(F <sub>0</sub> -F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup> / F <sub>e</sub>
146	142	4	16	0.112
35	39	4	16	0.410
16	20	4	16	0.800
10	6	4	16	2.667
TOTAL				3.989

Source: Field Survey 2022

Expected frequency:  $\frac{(\text{Column total} \times \text{Row total})}{\text{Grand total}}$

V=DF: (R-1)(C-1); (2-1)(2-1)

V= (1x1) =1

Calculated Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ); **3.989**

Chi-Square value calculated is **3.989** is greater than table value of **3.841**, (**3.989 > 3.841**) which is significant at **0.05%** level of significant, because P-value (**0.023**) is less than **0.05**.

**P < 0.05 = (0.023 < 0.05).**

The Chi-Square test result reveals that identified roles of Ondo State government as significant effect towards the formation of partnership business in Ondo state, this mean that, partnership business has impact on the life of Ondo state citizens. With majority said yes of effort towards the formation of partnership business in Ondo state, this means that, identified roles of Ondo State government can champion development and grow towards the formation of partnership business.



## CONCLUSION

Partnership which is said to be when two or more people come together with a common interest for the actualization of a good goal is still a good form of business. When the partners share in the management and control of the organization it is referred to as in legal term as general partnership. In this study, Ondo state government involvement in Public Private Partnerships is not the cause of ineffective projects delivery in the state. Corruption however, is a stain that needs to be thoroughly cleansed from the system in order to birth more building projects as a result of Public Private Partnerships and an overall progress of the state. A sound financial package is very essential to establishing a project, hence it should be established before project commencement, and favourable government policies would encourage private investors who wish to go into partnership with the government in housing projects delivery. Ultimately, it was established that government participation encourages efficient use of resources for improved service delivery at an affordable cost and this reinforces the fact that a Public Private Partnership is often time the solution to affordable housing. Hence, it should be giving due regard and all parties involved should contribute not only towards a successful conceptualization but also towards the actualization of the project.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations were made for this work;

- i. There should be effective pursuit of workforce and economic development efforts at the state and local levels tests the depth and strength of a community's civil assets. The ability to link businesses, governments and other stakeholders into effective partnerships depends upon an area's "civic entrepreneurs." Such individuals must come from government, business, and the broader community and be willing to work together through partnerships to address their local issues.
- ii. Though it is not mandatory that partnership must reach an agreement by law before business commences but it is very important.

## REFERENCES

- Adebayo, S. and Anifowose, M. (2017). Partnership in the finance economy. Keynote Address by Ministry of Finance, Kano State, Nigeria.
- Atkinson, N. (2019). Public finance in developing countries. Edo, Nigeria: University Press.
- Moore, S. D. (1995). The basic practice of statistics. New York: W.H. Freeman and Co.
- Axelrod, K. (2014). Financial accounting for students and managers. Benin: Mindex Publishers.
- Bailey, B. (2014). *What Should the Federal Government Be Doing about Urban Economic Development?* Working paper, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
- Bennett, C. and Krebs, K. (1994). "The Role of the Employment Service." In *Unemployment Insurance in the United States: Analysis of Policy Issues*, Christopher J. O'Leary and

- Stephen A. Wandner, editors, Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, pp. 457-501.
- Bennett, V. and McCoshan, N. (2013). "A Path to Smarter Federal Leadership in Economic Development: Learning, Leveraging and Linking." *Economic Development Quarterly* 12(4), pp. 291-298.
- Brinkerhoff, O. and Brinkerhoff, C. (2004). Cross-sector alliance learning and effectiveness of voluntary codes of corporate social responsibility. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16, 211–234
- Cadbury, P. (2013). The Impact of Nigerian Business Environment on the Survival of Small-Scale Ceramic Industries Case Study of South Western Nigeria.
- Haque, J. (2004). "A Path to Smarter Federal Leadership in Economic Development: Learning, Leveraging and Linking." *Economic Development Quarterly* 12(4), pp. 291-298.
- Harding, F. (2010). "Location, Competition, and Economic Development: Local Clusters in a Global Economy." *Economic Development Quarterly* 14(1), pp.15-34.
- Hastings, I. (1996). "Matching the Disadvantaged to Job Opportunities: Structural Explanations for the Past Successes of the Center for Employment Training." *Economic Development Quarterly* 12(1), pp. 3-11.
- Igbuzor, S. (2006). "Technology in the Garden: Research Parks and Regional Economic Development." Final Report to the Ford Foundation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- Klijin, V. and Teisman, L. (2003). "The Role of the Employment Service." In *Unemployment Insurance in the United States: Analysis of Policy Issues*, Christopher J. O’Leary and Stephen A. Wandner, editors, Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, pp. 457-501.