Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

ASSESSING STATE INFLUENCE ON SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUILDING CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA (2006 -2016)

[1]Rose Chinyere Okoro and [2]Joseph Ugochukwu Ogbuefi,
[1]Senior Lecturer, Dept. of Estate Management, Cross River University of Technology (CRUTECH), Calabar And
[2]Professor, Dept. of Estate Management, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Enugu campus, Enugu.[2]

Abstract: *Despite the provisions of the Land Use Act (LUA), cap L5 of 2004, to make land available for all stake holders, Federal Government has continuously found it difficult to access land in the States for her developmental projects. Does this influence successful implementation of her building construction projects in South-South Nigeria significantly? To what extent does the State where the project is domiciled influence successful project implementation? In order to provide answers to these questions a survey approach was used in three States (Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa and Cross River) in South-South Nigeria, randomly selected with two projects in each State. Structured questionnaire was used to elicit data from screened 179 respondents for the study. One hypothesis was formulated to guide the research work. The dependent variable studied was successful project implementation while the State where the projects were domiciled was the independent variable. The analytical tools used included simple percentages, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Least Significant Difference (LSD) test. The hypothesis was tested at .05 level of significance. Findings revealed that State where the projects were domiciled had significant influence on successful project implementation due to land accessibility problems and that Cross River State was significantly different only from Akwa Ibom State. The research proffers that for project implementation to be successful, land for the project must be accessed on time. To achieve this, Federal Government should enshrine in the Nigerian* Operating *Land Policy the customs, traditions and beliefs of the locals, take center stage in all levels of Land administration and educate her land administrative personnel in respect of government rights in land matters*.

Keywords: successful project implementation, land accessibility, indigenous people, Land Use Act (LUA), Federal Government Construction Projects and South-south Nigeria

Introduction

One of the major reasons for the Nigerian Land Nationalization was for ease of land acquisition either for private individuals, company, government or quasi government for project developmental purposes. To achieve this, the Act makes the following provisions: Section 28 (3) a and b; Section 28 (4) b "where land is required by Federal Government for public purposes, the (military) Governor may revoke the right of occupancy on the affected land." Section 28 (4) a permits the government to revoke right of occupancy for overriding public interest and mining purpose or oil pipelines or any

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

purpose connected therewith. The effectiveness of the practicability of these provisions leaves much to be desired. With the nationalization of Nigerian land by the Land Use Act (LUA), No. 6 of 1978, now cap L5 of 2004, many problems emerge in the event of accessing land for federal government building project implementation in the states. Zero Draft National Land Policy (2014) reports that some 40 years after the promulgation of the Act, the laudable objectives of the Act in making land available for Nigerians (including the federal government) is not realizable. Several factors, arising from the operation of the LUA account for this, including delay in granting of consent by State Governors, exorbitant processing costs, deliberate refusal to release land to "opposition" political parties in the states, non-composition of the Land Use and Allocation Committee (LUAC) in the states, fraudulent practices of appropriating public land for personal and close associates businesses by state governors, (Zero Draft National Land Policy, 2014), prolonged court cases for compensation, non-reliability of Land Information System (LIS, GIS) on land titling, activities of powerful cartel on land matters to hinder government developmental strides, fraudulent representation by government land officers in compensation negotiations, revocation of already allocated lands for federal government projects by the State governors, multiple land claimants and pluralism of legislation (indigenous land law operating side by side the LUA) (Mabogunje, n.d). The forces of these factors differ from State to State thereby dictating the pace by which the Federal Government accesses land in the States for her projects. These factors and many others can have significant influence on land accessibility and successful project implementation.

Projects implementation success criteria are time, budget and technical quality standard. About 80% of government projects globally, are usually completed beyond scheduled date or abandoned out rightly (Amade et. al. 2015, Okott, 2016 and Otieno, 2015), culminating to project's time-overrun which will result to budget-overrun thereby making any envisaged benefits from such projects unachievable. Several factors usually account for this including: factors related to the project itself, the project manager/his team members, the Organization (owners of the project) and the external environment, including political, physical, economic, social and administrative environments of the project (Pinto and Slevin,1989; Martin,1996; Locke,1984; Cleland and King(1983), Moris and Hough(1987), Belassi and Tukel (1996), Akpan and Igwe (2001), Haughey (2014) Alinaitwe and Ayesiga(2013)). No study has been done on access to land being a possible critical success/failure factor in public building project implementation, irrespective of the numerous problems associated with it as mentioned above. The problem of land accessibility assumes different magnitudes in different States therefore this research is a pioneer study in this specific area and is undertaken to assess the influence of the State where the project is domiciled on access to land and successful implementation of Federal Government building construction projects in South-South Nigeria for the period between 2006 and 2016.

The aim of the study is to examine the influence of the State where the project is domiciled on successful project implementation of Federal Government construction projects in South-South Nigeria (2006 -2016), while the study objective is to determine if successful implementation of Federal Government projects differs significantly among States in South-South Nigeria. The study area comprises the capital cities of three, (Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa and Cross River), out of six states making up the South-South geopolitical region of Nigeria (nairaland, 2015). The cities are Uyo, Bayelsa and Calabar respectively.

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Land Nationalization (State sovereignty over land)

Land Nationalization is simply the process of transforming private land into public land by bringing them under the ownership of a national government or a State (Wallace, 1892 and Oshio, 1990, Great Soviet Union Encyclopedia (1979). Nationalization may occur without compensation to the original owners. It is at variance with socialization, privatization and redistribution in the sense that the government retains the ownership, control and management of land and gives use rights to individuals, families and communities. Land nationalization forbids sale, alienation, and transfer by any other means, and mortgages of land.

Several countries of the world adopt Land Nationalization wholly or partially in solving the problem of public inaccessibility of land for developmental projects. Under Land Nationalization land is not alienated by those holding the use right without the consent of the custodian of the ownership right (Governor or President or Government) in writing. The same principle transcends customary land ownership (Oluyede, 1978 and Nwabueze, 1976). Use right is given to individual members of the community for all purposes for definite or indefinite durations. The community reserves the right to repossess the land when it is needed for overriding interest of the community, so also is the Government under land Nationalization.

Envisaged benefits/problems of land nationalization (State sovereignty over land)

The benefits of Land Nationalization as put forward by UAC-AfDB-ECA (2011) and Mabogunje (n.d) include: easy accessibility to and equal land right for all including investors and indigenes for all purposes, security of land right, curb urban land speculation and ligations, enhance land security even for the poor masses, grant unlimited access and control of land to governments for developments, curb astronomical rise in land prices, stop multiple sales of one plot of land to different individuals at the same time, reduce high cost of compulsorily acquired land for public developments and stem inequality in land ownership among citizens.

Carson (2002), ECA (2011), Oshio (1990); Lasabi (2014), Igbintade and Oyeweso (2013), and Ambaye, (2012) enunciate the problems of land Nationalization.

Land nationalization in West African nations and beyond

In Nigeria**,** the LUA vests all lands in each State in the respective State governors (and NOT in the President) to hold such in trust for the Nigerian people. By Liberian 1850 law, land is majorly the property of the State (ECA, 2011). The Land Nationalization Act No. 75 of 1953 (last amended as No.49 of 1957) places the ownership, control and management of all agricultural land in Union of Burma in their President. Article 40(3) of Ethiopian Proclamation 1/1995 declared all rural and urban land as the property of the State and the Ethiopian people, vesting its ownership of urban land in the President and the management of rural land in the regional governors (Ambaye, 2012). In Benin and Guinea Bissau, land is nationalized with ownership right vested in the State, while use rights are given to individuals. In many of the Francophone countries, land is controlled by the State while private grants of ownership rights are given to individuals for private developments through the process of "immatriculation" (Chauveau et. al., 2006). The State also retains and exercises the power of expropriation over land so granted for public interest (Ambaye, 2012; Mulugeta, 1999). In the Anglophone countries, the State has access to land through exercising her power of eminent domain. In Nigeria, the Land Use Act of 1990 is a replica of the northern Nigeria Land Tenure Law of 1962 and the state Law of 1915 applied earlier on in Ghana as the Ghanaian Land and Native Rights Ordinance of 1931 which vested all lands in the northern part of Ghana in the colonial administration in trust for all

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

Ghanaians (AUC-ECA-AfBD, 2011). In Burkina Faso their 1984 Agrarian Land Reform established a national domain over the entire national territory. (AUC-ECA-AfBD, 2011).

.**Project defined**

A Project is defined by the Project Management Institution (PMI) Guide of the United States of America as "a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product or service"(www.pmi.org,1996). Cleland (1995); Davis (1951); UNIDO (1986) and Baum and Tolbert (1978) give the definitions of Project to be a one-time endeavor which has a definite starting date with unique characteristics.

Public developmental projects are usually undertaken for social or political reasons. Ogbuefi (2011) advises that in appraising public-sector projects before execution social related matters should be taken into serious consideration. These include socio-cultural norms, beliefs, customs, and subsistence of the people thereby guaranteeing or otherwise of the acceptability of the intending projects by the host community. This thought is echoed by Belassi and Tukel (1996), Goodman (1988) and Ramlee et. al (2016). On the feasibility and viability sides, the authors advocate that the variables that must be studied are varied and include: physical variables - availability and suitability of appropriate site in good location and possibility for future expansion. The site characteristics should include: soil texture, water contents, water table levels, fauna and flora, climatic conditions, geographical layout (topography), the population of the local dwellers, their occupation, reception of the intending project by the locals, the ease of and cost of procuring the site, the envisaged acquisition costs are to be examined (Ogbuefi, 2011 and Goodman, 1988).

It should be noted that site availability is the starting point of any project and except this indicator is procured no project can start. The verification of site indicators can be made easier if there is good geographical information of the neighborhood (Castle, 1998)).

Project success/failure – What is it?

Generally a project is *termed* successful if it satisfies stakeholders groups, meets functional requirements, meets quality expectations and requirements, within costs, within deadline, delivers sustained and actual benefits and provides the team with professional satisfaction and learning (Thomsett, 2002). A project fails when all the success points are unmet.

There can be an ambiguity in judging whether a particular project is a success or a failure. The reason for this is because the stakeholders to any particular projects are many and their yardsticks for appraising a project's success or failure are also different (Belassi and Tukel, 1996). In the construction project field four basic success criteria had long been established. These bother on completion of projects on time, within pre-determined budget (cost) and meeting quality or technical performance which satisfy top management, clients and end users (Ramlee et. al.2016; Amade et. al.2015). To achieve the success criteria, there are some factors that are critical and they are x-rayed subsequently.

What are critical Success/Failure factors (CSFFs) in project implementation?

This term in project management arena, first used by Rockart (1982), are those factors which are capable of predicting the success or failure of a project (Baccarini, 2009) quoted in Amade et. al. (2015). Summarily critical success factors in construction projects are those factors which the Project Manager (PM) must identify and monitor closely in order to achieve the success criteria of the envisaged project (Baccarini and Collins, (2003); Alinaitwe and Ayesiga (2013) and Rockart (1982))

CSFFs in public construction project management

The variables under this broad framework include a strong monitoring and evaluation system (Alinaitwe and Ayesiga, 2013 and Baccarini, 2009), effective

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

communication management (Omran et. al.,2012) effective project scheduling and budgeting, adequate team selection, training, development and motivation, project manager's competence and decision making skills (Saqib, et. al., 2008, and Slevin and Pinto, 1987), adequate planning (Haughey, 2014, and Akpan and Igwe (2001), procurement related factors (Ghazali , 2011; Adnan, et. al.,2014 and Barasa, 2014), external factors (Belassi and Tukel, 1996; and Tan and Ghazali, 2011), realistic estimates of schedules and costs (Nasir and Sahibuddin, 2011 and Omaje, 2014), project stake holders related factors (Young and Mustaffa,2012 and Dolan,2010)

Other factors raised in other authors' works are contractor's ability to manage the design (Saqib et. al., 2008; Ika et. al. 2012), provision of adequate finance by the client (Yong and Mustaffa, 2012), and leadership skill of the Project Manager (Belassi and Tukel, 1996; Slevin and Pinto, 1987).

In a concluded study by Amade et. al (2015) during when sixteen variables (critical success factors were analyzed; seven component factors were adjudged critical for successful public sector construction projects. These include efficient and effective procurement process/method, effective communication management, adequate planning, leadership skill of the project manager, weather conditions, and effective co-ordination of project activities. Belassi and Tukel's (1996) critical success factors are grouped to show their interrelationship and cause-effect. They opine that most critical success factors in construction projects are those related to the environment such as economic and weather, followed by the Project Manager's related factors such as co-ordination and competence, next to it being project team members' related factors such as technical background and commitment. Again they postulate that when time is used as the criteria for measuring project success, the critical factor is the project manager's skills and communication between the team members. If quality is the measuring criteria, they offer that this can be achieved by identifying and eliminating factors that cause poor project performance. None of these previous works adjudged land as a possible CSFFs.

The criticality of land to public project implementation

It is noteworthy that all that man needs for his existence come from land, he being originally created from its components. Kingdoms fall or rise based on their access to and proper utilization of land resources in their disposal. The Asian Tigers (Japan, South Korea, China and Taiwan) thrived economically and were reckoned in the first half of the 20th century as the world fastest growing economies because they could manage their land resources successfully (Boyce, Rosset, Stanton, 2005). East Timor in Southern Asia was in crisis economically because of its chaotic land tenure arrangements occasioned by its government's corrupt practices regarding land matters (Carson, 2007). Zimbabweans suffered untold economic hardships due to its Prime Minister, Robert Mugabe's style of redistributing the nations acquired lands amongst his kit and kin, to the detriment of the poor landless of Zimbabweans (Carson, 2007). In Uganda, out of the 18 documented projects of Uganda National Road Authority (UNRA), as at 2015/16 financial year, it was discovered that the 51km Kampala-Entebe Expressway valued at $479 gulped the highest land acquisition bill of $10ml. A claimant who has a stone quarry in a land area of 10 acres demanded $14million as against a valuation figure of $1.1million issued by the chief government valuer. This problem delayed the execution of the civil works in some sections of the road for months and the UNRA officials diverted the road project from the costly land to a cheaper land along the project route (theeastafrican, 2016). A 17-km, second phase Kampala northern bypass valued at $75.7million, cost $5.2milion in cost of land acquisition by close of 2015/16. The 104-km Mubende-Kakumiro-

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

Kagadi road valued at $141.6 million, gulped $2.9ml in land compensation. It was delayed over disagreement about valuation figures by claimants. Land is needed by the different tiers of government for construction projects; its inaccessibility spells doom in different dimensions to nations' developmental projects.

Materials and Methods

A survey case study approach, in three randomly selected States (Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa and Cross River) out of the six south-south Nigerian States was adopted. Two projects were randomly selected in each of the three States. The projects studied included: Mbierebe Ibesikpo Site and Service Scheme and New Housing Scheme at Ikot Ntuen Nsit/Afia Nsit, North West of Uyo metropolis, Akwa Ibom State; Federal Housing Authority (FHA) Estate, Odukpani and New Housing Scheme, Ikot Ekpo, North East of Calabar Municipality, Cross River State; and New Housing Scheme, Otuoke located outside the State capital and the Federal Secretariat Complex, Swali in Yenagoa, Beyelsa State. This involves a case study of the independent (State) as well as the dependent variable (Successful project implementation) for the period (2006 to 2016). The population of the study was 213 personnel consisting of different State Controllers of the Federal Ministries of Power, Works and Housing in the States studied, the directors and/or heads of different units in the Ministry including their in-house Architects, Quantity Surveyors, Land Surveyors, Estate Surveyors and Valuers, Civil Engineers, Electrical Engineers, Urban and Regional Planners and other departmental staff, all levels of construction contractors and residents of one of the partially completed projects. The Ministry staff doubled as the State-level government project managing team with Controller-Architect at the apex of the team. For the 2016 New National Housing scheme, there was a 5-man consortium Project Management monitoring team from Abuja. Since the study population has different characteristics, they were stratified, sampled and drawn for study (Osuala, 1982), as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1 Study Sample

S/No. 1	Stratum	Population	Sample size
	Stratum 1 Ministry staff: Project Supervisor/Managers (architects, Quantity surveyors, land surveyors and team members in the state Ministry of the three States including members of the Abuja monitoring Consortium Project	46(all states, inclusive of 5-man consortium)	51
2	Stratum 2 Contractors and sub-contractors	82 – (all states and all projects inclusive)	53*
3	Stratum 3 Residents of FHA Estate, Odukpani, Calabar	80 end users	80

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

	Total	213	184

*These are all the contractors who actually reported for and took up the project works.

The analytical tool used was one-way ANOVA which adopted F-distribution statistical test at .5 level of significant which is an extension of the student t-test which measures the means of two populations (Asika, 1991). One-way ANOVA was used to analyze the influence of location (State) (independent variable) on successful project implementation of the federal government projects studied.

Data Presentation and analysis

Table 2 Successful/Timely Acquisition of project sites by State

State	Project sites	Timely/successful acquisition of site			
		Yes	%	No	%
Akwa Ibom	Mbierebe Obio site/service scheme	-	0	35	100
	2016 New Housing scheme	20	54.1	15	45.9
Bayelsa	Fed. Secretariat Complex	-	0	13	100
	2016 New Housing scheme	13	100	-	0
Cross River	Fed. Housing Authority Res. Estate	70	63.1	61	36.9
	2016 New Housing Scheme	-	0	131	100
Total		103	29	255	71

Table 2 above tells a simple story: land is available but not easily accessible for project implementation. Aggregately, 71% of the respondents held that the project sites were not successfully and timely acquired to make room for the commencement of project implementation. 29% say the sites were successfully and timely acquired. From the table, the sites which were successfully acquired are shown to be those of the ongoing New National Housing scheme across the nation. Field investigation revealed that State governments were given timeline to make land available, failing which the States would forfeit the projects. What most governors did was to take already acquired un-utilized land and donated such for the implementation of the project (Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, and Cross River FHA projects). Even at that, entries into the already acquired lands were still problematic due to fresh demands by the locals.

The research Hypothesis

H0:

State has no significant influence on successful implementation of the projects studied.

To test the hypothesis, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was adopted with State, where the projects are domiciled, as factor (independent variable) and successful implementation of Federal government construction projects as dependent variable. The descriptive statistics of the dependent variable by States are presented in table 3 below:

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

Table 3 Descriptive statistics of variable (dependent) by State

Variable	State	N	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. error	Minimum	Maximum
Successful Prjct Implementation	Akwa Ibom	35	18.51	5.404	.913	5	25
	Bayelsa	13	17.69	4.270	1.184	13	25
	Cross River	131	15.11	5.227	.455	5	25
	Total	179	15.96	5.366	.400	5	25

From the above results in table 3, Akwa Ibom had the highest mean ($\bar{x}$=18.51), followed by Bayelsa State ($\bar{x}$= 17.69) while least was Cross River State ($\bar{x}$ =15.11).

The ANOVA table below presents the results of the test of significance differences between States:

Table 4 One-way ANOVA of dependent variable - Successful Project Implementation of Federal Govt. Construction project by State

Variable	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Value	P-Value
Successful Project Implementation	Between groups	363.617	2	181.809	6.718*	.002
	Within groups	4790.027	177	27.062		
	Total	**5153.644**	**179**			

*Significant at .05 level. P<.05

The results as presented in table 4 above indicate that the P-value (.002) of the dependent variable associated with the computed F-value (6.718) is less than the alpha value (.05), the level of significant, set for the study. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative retained. This means that the States where the different projects are located have significant influence on successful implementation of the construction projects studied.

To identify the pair of means that was responsible for the observed significant result, the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was computed. The results are presented in table 5 below:

Academic Journal of Current Research
Vol.8, No.1; January-2021;
ISSN (2343 – 403X);
p –ISSN 3244 - 5621
Impact factor: 6.92

Table 5 Pair wise comparison of the dependent variable - Successful Project implementation of Federal Government by State

Variable	State	Akwa Ibom	Bayelsa	Cross River
Successful Project Implementation	Akwa Ibom	18.51**	.822	3.408*
	Bayelsa	.627	17.69	2.586
	Cross River	.001	.089	15.11

*Significant at .05 level. P<.05. **values along main diagonal are States' means, above it (the diagonal) are States' mean differences and below it (the diagonal) are corresponding P-values.

The result of table 5 show that for successful implementation of projects studied, Cross River is significantly different from only Akwa Ibom State.

Discussion of Findings

The test of the study hypothesis was to discover whether the State where the projects are located had any significant influence on the dependent variable of successful project implementation of the projects studied.

The results showed that States where the different projects were domiciled had significant influence on successful project implementation. For successful implementation (Greer,1999 and Shenhar,2001 and Ramlee et. al, 2016) of the projects studied, Akwa Ibom State came first in project time, quality standard and predetermined project budget (Belassi and Tukel, 1996). This is because, for the 2016 National Housing scheme, the Consortium Project Monitoring Team kept track on the project implementation, making sure the quality standard in workmanship, materials and equipment was strictly adhered to (Belassi and Tukel 1996). It was common place to see poorly constructed portions of the structures pulled down and subsequent qualitative ones constructed in strict adherence to pre-determined standard. This was possible because the team had quiet possession of the site, void of disturbances from the locals (Ogbuefi, 2011 and Goodman, 1988). Machines were also mounted on site for block molding using specified grade of sands and other materials. Project time table (Ramlee, et. al.2016 and Amade et. al. 2015) was exceeded but not as other States – Cross River and Bayelsa. Following Akwa Ibom was Bayelsa State, Cross River came last due to land accessibility and acquisition problems (Zero Draft National Land Policy, 2014). For the FHA housing project, the supervising Engineer was operating from Abuja and was scarcely seen on site (Alinaitwe and Ayesiga, 2013; Baccarini, 2009; and Belassi and Tukel,1996). The person whom he asked to stand in for him was not forthcoming. The result of the non-monitoring is seen in structural cracks on the walls of almost all the completed buildings on site. Majority of the buildings are standing in pools of water during the rains and cannot be accessed (Ogbuefi, 2011). For the 2016 National Housing scheme, the disturbances of the indigenous people made it impracticable for the 5-man monitoring team to enter site and monitor the contractors. The indigenes insisted on supplying any substandard materials for the buildings and they were allowed to in order to allow the contractors access to site and carry out their works undisturbed (Ogbuefi, 2011 and Goodman, 1988). In the whole, quality standard was compromised in labor, construction, materials and equipment.

The test results of the Least Significant Difference (LSD), as presented in table 5 showed that Cross River was only significantly different from Akwa Ibom State (.001) and different from Bayelsa, insignificantly. Summarily from

the test result, it is discovered that Cross River State had the greatest problem in relation to access to land, which had a significant negative influence on successful project implementation in that State.

Conclusion from the Findings

On the basis of the findings it can be concluded that Cross River had greatest problem in successful projects implementation of Federal Government projects located in the State due to land accessibility problems. This led to building project implementation failure on predetermined project time, budget and technical standard. It is therefore safe to conclude that access to land is a critical factor in successful project implementation. For project implementation to be successful, land for the project must be accessed on time. To achieve this, Federal Government must enshrine in the Land Use Act the customs, traditions and beliefs of the locals, take center stage in all levels of Land administration and educate her land administrative personnel in respect of government rights in land matters.

REFERENCES

Adnan, H., Yusuwan, N. M., Yusuf, F., & and Bachik, F. (2014). Critical factors for contractors. *International Journal for engineering and Technical Research , 2* (2), 107 - 113.

Akpan, E., & Igwe, O. A. (2001). A methodology for determining Price variation in Project Execution. *Journal of Construction and Management of the American Society of Civil Engineers ASCE) , 127* (5), 367-373.

Alinaitwe, H., & Ayesiga, R. (2013). Success factors for the implementation of of Public-Private Partnership in the Construction Industry in Uganda". *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries , 18* (2), 1-14.

Amade, B., Ubani, E. C., Omajeh, E. O.-M., & Njolu, U. P. (2015). Critical Success Factors forpublic sector construction project delivery - A case of Owerri, Imo state. *International Journal of Researchin Management, Science & Technology , 3* (1), 2321-3264.

Ambaye, D. (2012). Land Rights in Ethiopia:Ownership, Equity, and Liberty in Land Use Rights. Being a paper presented in a Conference. *FIG Working Week 2012* (pp. 1/27 - 27/27). Rome, Italy: TS02D - Customary and Group Land Rights, 5521.

Anyannzwa, J. (2016, September 4). *Changes to Kenya's Land Law to Tame Cost of Public Projects and Developments.* Retrieved March 11, 2017, from http:wwwtheeastafrican.co.ke>news>2558.

AUC-ECA-AfBD. (2011). *Land Policy in Africa: West Africa Regional Assessment.* Adis Ababa: ECA Publications and Conference Management Section (PCMS).

Baccarini, D. (2009). *"Critical Success Factors in ConstructionEngineering Projects. A CaseStudy".* AIPM09 Refereed Paper.

Baccarini, D., & Collins, A. (2003). Critical Success Factors for Projects in Brown, A. (ed), Surfing the Waves: Management Challenges; Management Solutions" Proceedings of the 17th ANZAM Conference. *17th ANZAM Conference.* Western Australia: Fremantle..

Barasa, H. W. (2014). Procurement Practices affecting EffectivePublic Projects Implementation in Kenya: A Case study of Kenya Civil Aviation Authority. *European Journal of Business Management , 6* (6.www.iiste.org), 49-67.

Baum, W., & Tolbert. (1978, December Issue). The Project Cycle. *Finance and Development Journal* .

Belassi, W., & Tukel, O. I. (1996). A new framework for determining critical success/failure factors in projects. *InternationalJournal of Project Management , 14* (3), 141-151

Boyce, Rosset, & Stanton. (2005). *Land Reform and Sustainable Development, being a Working Paper series 98.* Retrieved 5 2, 2014, from Umas. edu: http:www/ umas.edu/peri/programs/development/naturalassets.htm.

Camilleri, E. (2013). *Project Success Critical Factors and Behaviours.* Famham, Surrey, England: Gower.

Carson, A. (2007). East Timor Land Tenure Problems: A Consideration of Land Reform Programs in South Africa and Zimbabwe. *IND.INT'LCOMP. L. REV.* , 395-430.

Castle, H. B (1998). *GIS in real Estate: Intergrating Analyzing, and Presenting Location Information.* Appraisal Institute in association with Adams Business Media/GIS World. United States of America.

Chauveau, J., Colin, ,. J., Jacob, ,. J., Delville, ,. P., & and Le Meur, ,. P. (2006). *Changes in Land access and governance in West Africa:Markets, Social mediations and Public policies, Resultats du recherche CLAIMS, Londres.* LONDON: InternationalInstitute for Environment and Development, GRET, IUED and IRD.

Cleland, L. C. (1995). *Project Managment.* New York: McGraw Publishers.

Davies, C. T. (2002). The "real" Success factors on Projects. *International journal of Project Management* , 185 to 190.

Dolan, K. (2010). *Addressing Project Failure throughPRINCE2.* The Stationery Office, White Paper.

Ejaz, N., Hussain, J., Shabbir, F., Shamim, M. A., Naeem, , U. A., & Tahir, , M. F. (2013). Assessment of most Critical success factors for mega construction projects in Pakistan. *Life Science Journal , 10* (10 www.lifesciencesite.com), 255-261.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN). (1990). *Land Use Act (No. 2 of 1990) LFRN.* .

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2004). *Land Use Act No. 6 of 1978 now (Land Use Act Cap L.5 2004 LFN.*

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1962). *Northern Nigeria Land Tenure Law.*

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1976). *Public Land Acquisition (Miscelaneous Provision), Decree No. 33.*

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1958). *Public Lands Acquisition (Miscellaneous Provisions Act).*

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1917). *Public Lands and Acquisition Act, Cap 167.*

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1968). *State Lands (Compensation) Decree.*

Federal Reublic of Nigeria. *State Lands Act. (Cap45).*

Government of Nigeria (GoN). (1953). *Land and Native Rights Proclaimation 1910.*

Goodman, Louis, J.P.E. (1988). *Project Planning and Management: An Intigrated System for Improving Productivity.* New York: VAN NOSTRAND REINHOLD COMPANY Inc.

Great Soviet Union. (1979). *Great Soviet Union Encyglopedia.*

.Haughey, D. (2014). *Eight Key Factors to Ensuring Project Success.* Project Smart.

.Ika, L. A., Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2012). Critical Success Factors for world Bank Projects: An Empirical Investigations. *International Journal of Project Management* , 105-116.

Land Use Panel. (1977). *Report of the Land Use Panel 5.* Lagos.

Lasabi, B. (2014, March). *Governors abuse powers underthe Land Use Act.* Retrieved July 21, 2014, from Daily Independent web site: http://dailyindependentnig. com/2014/03/governors-abuse-powers-under-land-use-act-lasabi.

Locke, D. (1984). *Project Management.* New York: St. Martins Press.

Mabogunje, A. (n.d). *Land Reform in Nigeria: Progress, Problems and Prospect.* Lagos: -.

Martin, C. (1996). *Project Management.* New York: Amaco.

Morris, P., & Hough, G. H. (1987). *The Anatomy of Major Projects. A study of the reality of Project Management.* Chichester: John Willey & Sons.

Mulugeta, S. (1999). Public Ownership of Urban Land and Low-Income Ownership in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *EASSRR , XV* (1), 79-96..

Nairaland. (2015, June 15). *South-south Region Guide.Politics-Nigeria-Nairaland.* Retrieved December 12, 2016, from Nairaland website: http://www.nairaland. com>south-south-region.

Nasir, M. H., & Sahbuddin, S. (2011). Critical Success factors for Software Projects: A comparative study. *Scientific Research and Essays , 6* (10), 2174-2186.

National Population Commission of Nigeria. (2016, 3 21). *Akwa Ibom State* . Retrieved 9 21, 2018, from National Population Commission of Nigeria: https://www.citypopulation.de/php/nig-admin.php.

National Population Commission of Nigeria. (2016, 3 21). *Bayelsa State*. Retrieved 9 21, 2018, from National Population Commission of Nigeria: https://www.citypopulation.de/php/nigeria - admin.php

National Population Commission of Nigeria. (2016, 3 21). *Cross River State*. Retrieved 9 20, 2018, from National Population Commission of Nigeria: https://www.citypopulation.de/php/nigeria - admin.php

Nigeria and Lagos. (1976). Public Lands Acquisition (Miscellaneous Provisions Decree No.33 of 1976. *Public Lands Acquisition (Miscellaneous Provisions Decree No.33 of 1976* . Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria.

Nigeria and Lagos. (1958). Public Lands Acquisition Act chap 167;Laws of Western Nigeria, ch.105(1959);. Lagos, Western, Nigeria.

NigeriaGalleria. (2015). *NigeriaGalleria.* Retrieved March 29, 2017, from NigeriaGalleria website: http://www.nigeriagalleria.com, Bayelsa state, Nigeria

Nigerian Land Use Panel. (1977). *Report of Land Use Panel.* Lagos, Nigeria.

Nwabueze, B. (1972). *Nigerian Land Law.* ENUGU: NWAMIFE, Oceanic PublicationsInc.Dobbs Ferry, New York10522.

Ogbuefi, J. U. (2011). *Aspects of Feasibility and Viability Studies.* Enugu, Nigeria: Institute for Development Studies, Univ.of Nigeria, Enugu Campus.

Okott, E. (2016, November 22). *Daily nation.* Retrieved February 19, 2017, from Daily nation web site: http:www.nation.co.ke

Omajeh, E. O.-M. (2014). Analysis of factors responsible for Project Cost Underestimation. An unpublished MSc dissertationof the Federal Univ.of Technology, Owerr, Nigeria.

Omran, A., Abdulbagei, M. A., & Gebril,, A. O. (2012). An Evaluation of the Critical Success Factors for Construction Projects in Lybia. *International Journal of Economic Behaviour , 2*, 17-25.

Oshio, P. E. (1990). The Indigenous Land Tenure and Nationalization of Land in Nigeria, 10 B.C. *Third World Law Journal , 10* (1), 43-62.

Osuala, E. C. (1982). *Introduction to Research Methodology.* Onitsha: Africana - FEB Publishers Ltd.

Otieno, J. (Oct.3,2015). *Kenya proposeslaw to cap payment for land for compulsory project.* Kenya: www.theeastafrican.co.ke.

Pinto, J. K., & Slevin, D. P. (1987). Critical factors in successful project implementation. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management , EM - 34* (1), 22-27.

Pinto, J. K., & Slevin, D. P. (1988). Project Success: Definition and Measurement techniques. *Project Management Journal , XIX* (1), 67-72.

Project Management Institute. (1996). *Project Management Institute.* Retrieved February 18, 2017, from Project Management Institute website: http://www.pmi.org.1996.

Ramlee, N., Tammy, N. J., Raja Mohd Noor, R. N., Ainun, A. M., Abdul, N. K., Chan', H. B., et al. (2016). Critical Success factors for construction project. *AIP conference Proceedings 1774, 030011 - http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4965067.* America: American Institute of Physicsh

Republic of kenya. (2016). *Kenya Gazette Supplement No.149 (Acts No.28)* . Nairobi: The Govt. Printer.

Rockart, M. (1982). *Factors Affecting Business Growth.* New York: Wiley.

Saqib, M., Farooqui, , R. U., & Lodi, S. H. (2008). Assessment of Critica lSuccess Factors for Construction Projects in Pakistan. *First International Conference on Construction in Developing Countries* (pp. 392-404). Pakistan: Karachi.

Shenhar, A., Dvir, D., Levy,, O., & Maltz, A. C. (2001). Project Success: A multidimensional Strategic concept. *Journal of Long range planning , 34* (6), 699-725.

Sutton, B. (2005). *Why Projects Fail - Mastering the Monster (part 2).* Retrieved March 26, 2017, from itarchittect.co-uk website: http://www.itarchittect.co-uk/articles/displayasp?d=224/

Tan., D. J.-Z. Ghazali (2011). Critical Success factors for Malaysian Contractors in international constructionprojects using Analytical Hierachy Process. *EPPM , 20-21*, 127-138.

Theeastafrican. (2016, September Saturday). *theeastafrican.co.ke*. Retrieved March 7, 2017, from theeastafrican.co.ke web site: http://www.theeastafrican.co. ke/image/view/-

Thomsett, R. (2002). *Project Pathology, causes,patterns and symptoms of project failure*. Retrieved March 14, 2017, from thomsett.com website: http.//www.thomsett.com.au/main/articles/path/toc.htm

UNIDO. (1986). *Guide to practical Project Appraisal: SCBA in Developing countries.* Viena: UNIDO.

Union of Burma Government. (1954). *The Land Nationalization Act, No. 22* .

Union of Burma Government. (1957). *The Land Nationalization Act, No. 49.*

Union of Burma Government. (1955). *The Land Nationalization Act. No. 54.*

Wallace, R. (1892).Land Nationalization-Personal/Profession/People. Retrieved Nov. 15, 2016, from Charles Smith Wallace website: http://www.wku.edu>charles.smith>wallace

Yong, Y. E., & Mustaffa, N. E. (2012). Analysis of Factors Critical to Construction Project Success in Malaysia. *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management , 19* (5), 1-13.

Zero Draft National Land Policy. (2014). *Zero Draft National Land Policy.* ABUJA: MABUSHI.