

## **Assessment of Procurement System and Quality Service Delivery in Nasarawa State Public Sector, Nasarawa State**

**Author:**

Owolabi Ruth Oluwatosin

**Affiliation:**

Joseph Sarwuan Tarka  
University Makurdi,  
College of Management  
Science.

**Contact:**

Owolabiruth11@gmail.com,  
08135379063

**Dates:**

Received: 25/02/2026

Accepted: 01/03/2026

Published: 09/03/2026

**Citation:**

Owolabi, R. O. (2026).  
Assessment of  
Procurement System and  
Quality Service Delivery In  
Nasarawa State Public  
Sector, Nasarawa State.  
*Nigerian Journal of  
Sustainability Research*,  
4(1), 361-386.  
[https://njsr.com.ng/index.  
php/home/article/view/6](https://njsr.com.ng/index.php/home/article/view/69)

9

**ABSTRACT**

*This study critically examines the influence of procurement systems on quality service delivery within the public sector. Given the pivotal role procurement plays in enhancing public sector efficiency, the research specifically investigates the impact of four core components contract planning, bidding processes, contract management, and bid evaluation on the effectiveness of service delivery across selected government ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs). Employing a correlational survey design with a cross-sectional approach, out of which 98 were sampled procurement officers and relevant personnel drawn from six public institutions within the state. The data collection instrument, a structured questionnaire, was subjected to rigorous validity and reliability testing, including pilot testing and factor analysis. The findings indicate that all four dimensions of the procurement system exert statistically significant and positive effects on quality service delivery. Contract planning was shown with  $\beta .195$  to facilitate well-structured, timely, and cost-effective projects. The bidding process,  $\beta .011$  although characterized by transparency and competitiveness, faced challenges such as bid disputes and confidentiality concerns. Contract management,  $\beta .960$  emerged as a critical determinant, with the need for enhanced oversight mechanisms and integration of technological tools emphasized. Bid evaluation produced  $\beta .773$  processes*

*were perceived as fair and efficient, contributing to trust and improved project outcomes. The study concludes that effective procurement systems are essential for enhancing the quality of public service delivery.*

**Key Words:** Procurement System, Bid Evaluation, Bidding Process, Contract Management, Contract Planning, Quality Service Delivery.

## **Introduction**

Procurement systems are integral frameworks within organizations that govern the acquisition of goods and services. These systems encompass processes, policies, and technologies designed to optimize sourcing, purchasing, and payment activities. In public sectors, procurement systems serve as strategic tools, ensuring that government agencies acquire necessary resources in a manner that is efficient, transparent, and accountable. Procurement plays a pivotal role in fostering service delivery, especially in the public sector, where it directly influences the quality and efficiency of essential services such as healthcare, education, infrastructure, and other public goods (Smith, 2021).

Globally, procurement systems in the public sector are structured differently, influenced by legal frameworks, economic conditions, and institutional setups. In developed nations such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany, procurement systems are often underpinned by robust regulatory frameworks and modernized digital platforms, ensuring competitive and transparent tendering processes. These nations rely on well-established systems and technological solutions to enhance public procurement efficiency, ensuring that government contracts are awarded fairly and that public funds are utilized effectively (Jones & Harris, 2020). According to OECD (2020), the global trend toward e-procurement has transformed the way governments interact with suppliers, ensuring more efficient and transparent procurement processes. In 2019, over 70% of OECD countries had adopted electronic procurement systems, contributing significantly to reducing costs and enhancing transparency in public spending.

In developing economies, the focus has shifted toward strengthening procurement reforms to enhance public service delivery. Countries like India, Brazil, and South Africa have seen significant improvements in procurement practices as they strive to combat corruption and improve transparency. For instance, India's e-procurement platform, which was introduced in the mid-2000s, has been instrumental in reducing opportunities for corruption and ensuring a more transparent procurement process (Mohan & Radhakrishnan, 2019). Similarly, South Africa's Public Procurement Reform Program has emphasized compliance with procurement rules, improved vendor relationships, and reduced inefficiencies in public spending (Koka & Masango, 2018).

Turning to Africa, public procurement systems are increasingly being recognized as vital components of economic development, especially in resource-constrained environments. Many African countries, including Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria, have implemented procurement reforms aimed at ensuring greater transparency and reducing corruption. In Kenya, the Public Procurement and Disposal Act of 2005 was a landmark reform that aimed at promoting fairness, transparency, and accountability in procurement activities (Wanjiru & Kamau, 2020). Ghana's Public Procurement Act, enacted in 2003, also introduced guidelines that emphasize open tendering processes and accountability in procurement procedures. However, despite these legislative advances, procurement in many African nations still faces challenges related to inefficiency, lack of capacity, and corruption (Panya & Awuor, 2023).

The Nigerian procurement system, established with the passage of the Public Procurement Act (PPA) in 2007, aimed to address inefficiencies and corruption in public procurement. The PPA sought to introduce accountability, transparency, and value for money in government procurement. Despite these efforts, the Nigerian procurement system remains plagued by inefficiencies, corruption, and weak enforcement. Studies indicate that only 35% of public projects in Nigeria are completed on time, and nearly 40% exceed their budget allocations, reflecting a significant gap in procurement efficiency (Nigerian Bureau of Statistics, 2020). Corruption remains a major impediment, with an estimated 20-30% of public procurement budgets lost to fraud and mismanagement (Bureau of Public Procurement, 2018). This is particularly pronounced in Nasarawa State, where procurement challenges are compounded by limited capacity and inadequate monitoring systems. Consequently, public service

delivery in the state suffers, leading to delayed or abandoned projects and inefficiencies in the delivery of critical services.

Against this backdrop, this study titled "Assessment of Procurement System and Quality Service Delivery in Nasarawa State Public Sector, Nasarawa State" aims to explore the effectiveness of procurement systems in enhancing public service delivery in the region. This research focuses on understanding how procurement practices, such as contract planning, bidding processes, contract management, and bid evaluation, influence the quality of services delivered by public institutions in Nasarawa State. The study seeks to determine the extent to which these procurement components impact service delivery, with a particular focus on how procurement failures or inefficiencies affect service outcomes in key sectors such as education, healthcare, and infrastructure.

From the empirical studies reviewed, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

- **HO1:** Contract planning has a significant effect on the quality of service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector.
- **HO2:** The bidding process has a significant effect on the quality of service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector.
- **HO3:** Contract management has a significant effect on the quality of service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector.
- **HO4:** Bid evaluation has a significant effect on the quality of service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector.

Through this investigation, the study seeks to contribute valuable insights into how procurement systems can be improved to enhance the delivery of public services in Nasarawa State, and by extension, in similar contexts within Nigeria and other developing countries. This research will also examine the role of institutional capacity, transparency, and accountability in shaping procurement outcomes, with a view to offering recommendations for improving the efficiency of public procurement in Nasarawa State.

## **2.1 Conceptual Review**

### **2.1.1 Procurement System**

Procurement is often misunderstood as merely purchasing, but it encompasses a broader, more strategic function in organizations. Unlike purchasing, which is transactional and reactive, procurement involves proactive and relational strategies to meet business needs effectively (Johnson & Harris, 2021). It spans activities before the actual purchase, such as identifying business needs, analyzing market conditions, and selecting suppliers (Sullivan & Perez, 2019). Procurement is vital for acquiring resources that support the organization's strategy and competitive positioning, ensuring the right product, at the right price, from the right source, and at the right time (Gillespie & Wang, 2020). According to Davis (2017), the procurement process includes authorization, tender preparation, selection of contractors, and signing contracts. Effective procurement systems are essential for promoting transparency, efficiency, and accountability, particularly in public sector spending (World Bank, 2020).

### **2.1.2 Dimensions of Procurement System**

#### **i. Contract Planning**

Contract planning is essential for successful procurement as it involves drafting and managing legal agreements. This stage ensures that terms and conditions are clearly defined, risks are assessed, and the contract aligns with organizational goals (Peterson & Clark, 2018). It includes setting objectives, defining performance indicators, and identifying risks (Smith & Lee, 2020). This phase is integral to ensuring clarity, compliance, and value, ultimately preventing disputes and minimizing costs (World Bank, 2019).

#### **ii. Bidding Process**

The bidding process is a structured, competitive method used to obtain the best terms for a service or product. This involves soliciting offers from suppliers through a formal Request for Proposal (RFP) and ensuring transparency and fairness (Taylor & Green, 2021). The process begins with preparing detailed tender documents, inviting suppliers to submit bids, evaluating

offers, and selecting the best one based on price, capability, and prior performance (Nguyen & Park, 2020).

### **iii. Bid Evaluation**

Bid evaluation involves reviewing and comparing bids to determine which best meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. This process is crucial for ensuring fairness and transparency in procurement decisions (Jackson & Roberts, 2019). Bid evaluation ensures that the most advantageous bid is selected based on technical, financial, and legal criteria (World Bank, 2016).

### **iv. Contract Management**

Contract management oversees the execution of contracts, ensuring both parties meet their obligations. It spans the lifecycle of the contract, from drafting and negotiation to performance monitoring and final closure (Davis & Williams, 2020). This process ensures compliance with terms, resolves disputes, and maintains strong relationships with suppliers (Harrison & Brown, 2021). Effective contract management improves operational efficiency, reduces risk, and ensures customer satisfaction (CIPS, 2020).

#### **2.1.3 Quality Service Delivery**

Service quality is a measure of how effectively an organization meets or exceeds customer expectations. According to Collins & Moore (2020), the service quality gap arises when there is a mismatch between customer expectations and the actual service provided. High service quality leads to increased customer satisfaction, trust, and loyalty, which can provide a competitive edge in the marketplace (Jackson & Green, 2021). In public procurement, service quality ensures that public funds are spent efficiently and meet the needs of stakeholders (Gillespie & Wang, 2020).

## **2.1.4 Measures of Service Quality**

### **i. Reliability**

Reliability refers to the organization's ability to deliver services as promised consistently and accurately (Moore & Allen, 2018). It plays a critical role in shaping customer perceptions of service quality and loyalty (Taylor & Wright, 2019). Customers expect reliable services, and organizations must meet or exceed these expectations to remain competitive (Zeithaml et al., 2006).

### **ii. Tangibility**

Tangibility represents the physical aspects of service delivery, such as the appearance of facilities, employees, and communication materials (Brown & Evans, 2021). These elements contribute to customer perceptions of quality and impact the organization's overall image. Organizations that invest in tangible assets enhance the customer experience and build trust (Nguyen & Park, 2020).

### **iii. Empathy**

Empathy refers to the personalized and caring attention given to customers (Johnson & Harris, 2021). This dimension emphasizes understanding customer needs and providing tailored services, which fosters customer loyalty and satisfaction (Collins & Moore, 2020). Empathy enhances service quality by ensuring customers feel valued and heard (Davis & Williams, 2020).

### **iv. Responsiveness**

Responsiveness is the willingness and ability to assist customers promptly (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011). This dimension focuses on customer service efficiency and the organization's ability to address customer needs quickly and professionally (Zeithaml et al., 2006). High responsiveness is essential for maintaining customer satisfaction and operational effectiveness (Taylor & Wright, 2019).

## **v. Assurance**

Assurance refers to the trust and confidence customers place in the organization, based on the knowledge and professionalism of its staff (Zeithaml et al., 2006). This dimension is particularly important in industries where customers may feel uncertain about the service outcomes, such as insurance or banking (Jackson & Green, 2021). Assurance builds customer trust and ensures long-term loyalty (Gillespie & Wang, 2020).

## **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework guiding this study is grounded in three pivotal theories: Agency Theory, Institutional Theory, and Public Choice Theory. These frameworks collectively provide a strong foundation for understanding the complexities of procurement systems and their impact on quality service delivery, especially within the context of Nasarawa State's public procurement system.

Agency Theory, initially proposed by Jensen and Meckling in 1976, addresses the fundamental problem of information asymmetry between principals (the entities delegating tasks) and agents (those carrying out the tasks). The theory posits that in any relationship where one party depends on another to perform certain tasks, there exists a potential conflict of interest. This conflict stems from the agent's actions not always aligning with the principal's goals, leading to inefficiencies and higher costs. The assumption here is that both parties are rational and act in their self-interest. In application, the theory suggests the use of contracts and incentives to align the interests of both parties. Critics, however, argue that the theory oversimplifies human behavior by assuming that both parties are purely rational, overlooking the complex social and psychological factors that influence decision-making (Eisenhardt, 1989). Despite these criticisms, Agency Theory remains relevant to this study as it allows an analysis of the principal-agent relationship within the public procurement system. It highlights the importance of structuring contracts, monitoring, and incentivizing contractors to ensure that the procurement process is efficient, transparent, and ultimately delivers quality services to the public.

Building on the assumptions of Agency Theory, Institutional Theory offers a broader lens to understand the institutional structures that shape public procurement systems. Developed by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), Institutional Theory focuses on the rules, norms, and cultural expectations that govern organizational behavior. It posits that organizations are not only influenced by economic forces but also by the institutional environment in which they operate. This includes formal regulations and informal practices that shape behavior and decision-making. Institutional Theory assumes that organizations are guided by both cultural and regulative frameworks, which often influence their actions unconsciously. Applying this theory helps reveal how formal and informal rules affect the behavior of procurement agencies, contractors, and other stakeholders. Critics of Institutional Theory argue that it places too much emphasis on stability and conformity, potentially overlooking the role of individual agency and innovation in institutional change (Scott, 2004). Nonetheless, it is highly applicable to this study, as it enables an examination of how the institutional context—comprising Nigeria's legal framework, regulatory systems, and cultural norms—affects the public procurement system in Nasarawa State. It emphasizes the need for reforms to ensure that procurement practices align with formal regulations, societal expectations, and institutional changes, ultimately leading to improved service delivery.

The third theoretical lens, Public Choice Theory, further enriches this framework by focusing on the behavior of individuals within political and public sectors. It builds on the assumption that public decision-makers, like individuals in the private sector, act in their self-interest, seeking to maximize their own benefits rather than the public good. Public Choice Theory, as applied to procurement, suggests that government officials and contractors may prioritize personal or organizational interests over public welfare, leading to inefficiencies and corruption in public procurement processes. This theory applies rational choice principles to the analysis of collective decision-making in public administration. Critics of Public Choice Theory argue that it overemphasizes self-interest and overlooks the potential for altruism and ethical behavior in public sector decision-making (Mueller, 2003). However, this theory remains relevant to this study as it provides a lens to understand how political actors and institutional constraints influence procurement outcomes. It allows the researcher to examine the incentives and disincentives that shape the actions of both government agencies and

contractors in Nasarawa State, offering insights into the motivations that drive inefficiencies and poor service delivery.

In conclusion, the integration of Agency Theory, Institutional Theory, and Public Choice Theory provides a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of public procurement systems. Agency Theory addresses the principal-agent relationship, emphasizing the need for clear contracts and monitoring mechanisms to align the interests of both parties. Institutional Theory expands the analysis by considering the broader institutional context, including legal and cultural factors that influence behavior within the procurement system. Public Choice Theory highlights the impact of self-interest and political behavior in shaping procurement outcomes. Together, these theories enable a nuanced exploration of the factors that affect the quality of service delivery in Nasarawa State's public procurement system, offering a foundation for evaluating its effectiveness and recommending reforms for improvement.

### **2.3 Empirical Review**

Darma and Ali (2014) explored the quality of service offered by the Nigerian public service, focusing specifically on the six local councils in Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory. Their study, conducted over a five-year period from 2007 to 2011, applied Gap Analysis to assess the difference between the expected and actual quality of service delivered to the public. The authors found a significant gap between the official expectations of service delivery and the actual perceptions of the public. Additionally, their study revealed a noticeable discrepancy in the efficiency of public service delivery when compared to services provided by private sector agents. The authors concluded that there is an urgent need for reforms to bridge this gap, especially in terms of enhancing the efficiency and responsiveness of the public sector service delivery.

Zotoo, Zotoo, and Zhangping (2021) conducted a study on the implementation of procurement management practices in the public sector of Ghana. Their research, published in the International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, used an exploratory research design and a quantitative approach. They applied judgment sampling to select 56 employees of the Ghana Revenue Authority (GRA) for data collection. The findings

highlighted the importance of procurement practices such as transparency, accessibility of information, and efficiency in driving the procurement process. Furthermore, the study revealed a high level of compliance with procurement regulations among GRA employees. However, the study also identified several challenges facing the procurement process, including the need for increased transparency and clearer communication. The authors recommended stronger enforcement of procurement regulations and a reduction in government interference to ensure more effective procurement management in the public sector.

Panya and Awuor (2023) examined the challenges, constraints, and opportunities for improving public procurement reforms in Africa, with a particular focus on the role of procurement systems in enhancing public sector governance and economic competitiveness. Their research, published in the Strategic Journals, explored the vulnerability of public procurement systems to corruption due to weak commitment to reforms and ineffective implementation. The authors argued that an effective procurement system requires well-trained staff, clear procurement strategies, and a focus on value for money. The study also emphasized the importance of regular reviews and audits of procurement processes to ensure accountability and transparency in public sector contracts. Panya and Awuor concluded that African governments must focus on improving procurement systems to enhance governance and public financial management while minimizing corruption.

Mensah, Mawuli, Kyeremeh, and Tettey (2022) conducted a study on public procurement methods and the approval process in the Ghana Civil Service, with an emphasis on assessing the challenges facing the procurement system. The study, published in the Public Procurement Methods and Approval Process journal, used multiple case studies to examine the procurement methods applied in the Ghana Civil Service. Their findings indicated that the most commonly used procurement methods included Request for Quotation and National Competitive Tendering. The study also found that the bureaucratic structure within the ministries of Ghana significantly impeded the procurement process, with corruption identified as a key challenge. The authors recommended improving the use of procurement methods to ensure better value for money and enhancing transparency in the approval process to reduce delays and corruption.

Jackson (2018) and Kibet and Njeru (2014) found that proper procurement planning enhances efficiency, optimizes resource utilization, and strengthens procurement performance, particularly through portfolio management and logistics coordination. Rotich *et al.* (2014) and Abubakar *et al.* (2019) highlight that performance monitoring frameworks and contracting practices improve transparency, accountability, and efficiency in service delivery. Similarly, Gatha (2017) and Kiamba (2016) underscore that effective procurement processes and negotiation skills are essential in meeting delivery timelines and improving organizational outcomes.

Studies such as Idhalama and Obi (2019) and Onyemaizu and Ogunjobi (2017) focus on the acquisition and funding mechanisms in academic and research libraries, revealing that while multiple acquisition methods exist, challenges such as preservation issues, inadequate funding, and weak policy implementation limit effectiveness. Musanzikwa (2013) and Olatunji & Victoria (2000) further reveal systemic procurement challenges, including delays, corruption, political interference, and insufficient contract planning, all of which negatively affect service quality. These studies collectively stress the need for capacity building, adoption of technology (such as e-serials), and strategic contract planning to improve procurement efficiency and service delivery.

Across the literature, the dimensions of service delivery tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy are consistently linked to procurement effectiveness. The reviewed works demonstrate that procurement systems must go beyond administrative compliance to adopt a holistic approach integrating stakeholder engagement, robust monitoring, technological adoption, and continuous improvement mechanisms. Existing literature provides substantial evidence of the relationship between procurement practices and service delivery, most studies are sector-specific (construction, agricultural research, academic libraries) and geographically localized.

### **3.1 Methodology**

This study assesses the procurement system and its impact on quality service delivery within the public sector of Nasarawa State, Nigeria. The research adopts a cross-sectional design,

examining the relationship between procurement systems and service delivery at a specific point in time. The study focuses on selected ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs) within the state, including the Ministry of Works, Ministry of Education, Nasarawa State College of Agriculture, Nasarawa State Bureau of Public Procurement, and Nasarawa State Board of Internal Revenue. The model utilized for this study is adapted from the work of Jensen and Meckling (1976), which explores agency theory, and it is supported by constructs such as Contract Planning (CP), Bidding Process (BP), Contract Management (CM), and Bid Evaluation (BE), all of which influence Quality Service Delivery (QSD). The model examines how procurement systems affect service quality outcomes, including reliability, responsiveness, assurance, tangibility, and empathy, with the assumption that a more efficient procurement process positively impacts these factors.

Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire divided into two sections. Section A focused on respondents' demographic data, while Section B targeted key research variables related to the study's objectives. The study population comprises 98 public officers from the selected MDAs, with purposive sampling used to ensure that procurement officers and key personnel were accurately represented. Data was gathered from these respondents to explore their perceptions of how procurement systems are implemented and their effect on service delivery in the public sector. A multi-stage sampling approach was used to select both the institutions and the relevant staff. Reliability and validity of the instruments were tested through pilot surveys, and the data was analyzed using regression analysis to determine the relationships between procurement processes and service quality.

The model specification presents both implicit and explicit form of the models as shown below:

Implicit form:

Guided by the nexus between the variables of the study, a functional relationship is established between them. As shown below, the implicit forms of the model are as follows:

$$QSD = f(PS) \quad (1)$$

$$QSD = f(CP, BP, CM, BE) \quad (2)$$

Where:

PS = Procurement System

CP = Contract Planning

BP = Bidding Process

CM = Contract Management

BE = Bid Evaluation

QSD = Quality Service Delivery

The explicit form of the model is that stated as shown below:

$$WPE = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CP_1 + \beta_2 BP + \beta_3 CM + \beta_4 BE + U_t \quad (3)$$

$\beta_0$  = Regression intercept

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$  = Regression coefficients

$U_t$  = error terms

*A priori expectation*

(X<sub>1</sub>) = Contract Planning; *a priori* expectation is positive

(X<sub>2</sub>) = Bidding Process; *a priori* expectation is positive

(X<sub>3</sub>) = Contract Management; *a priori* expectation is positive

(X<sub>4</sub>) = Bid Evaluation; *a priori* expectation is positive

Procurement System is expected to have a positive and significant effect on the dependent variables. We expect a greater than 50% magnitude of effect since there is no theoretical and empirical consensus.

#### 4.0 Results And Discussion

The data presented were based on the demographic characteristics of the respondents and research question. A total of 98 questionnaire was distributed and 92 (94%) were returned and suitable for use in this analysis.

#### 4.1 Socio-demographic attributes of respondents

This sub section covered the data collected on the socio-demographic attributes of the respondents. These include age, educational qualification and experience of respondents. The result in the Table 6 revealed that, 16 respondents (representing 17.4%) fall in the age bracket of 18-27 years old, 11 respondents (representing 12.0 %) were within the range between 28-37 while 21 respondents (representing 22.8 %) were within the age range of 38-47 years and 22 respondents who constituted the majority (representing 26.1 %) while 48-57 years and 20 respondents 58 years and above had (representing 21.7%). This age distribution showed that the respondents were old enough to understand the subject matter of the research and thus provide a valid response to the topic under investigation.

**Table 4:1: Staff Rank / Job Title Distribution of Respondents**

| Attributes         | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 18-27 years        | 16        | 17.4%          |
| 28-37 years        | 11        | 12.0%          |
| 38-47 years        | 21        | 22.8%          |
| 48-57 years        | 24        | 26.1%          |
| 58 and above years | 20        | 21.7%          |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>92</b> | <b>100%</b>    |

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

#### 4.2 Sex or Gender Distribution of Respondents

The result in Table 4.2 also shows the distribution respondents based on sex or gender affirmation which revealed that, 71 respondents (representing 77.2 %) are males and 21 respondents are female which (representing 22.3%). Male respondents are in the majority in all the organization that was investigated.

**Table 4:2: Sex or Gender Distribution of Respondents**

| Attributes | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|------------|-----------|----------------|
| Male       | 71        | 77.2%          |
| Female     | 21        | 22.8%          |
| Total      | 92        | 100%           |

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

#### 4.3 Educational level Distribution of Respondents

This Table 4.3 shows the educational qualifications of the respondents were SSCE/GCE 2 respondents (representing 2.2%), while respondents that had either OND or NCE, 4 (representing 4.3%) and respondents that had HND are 56 (representing 60.9%) and those that has B.Sc/B. A/B.Ed. are 18 respondents (representing 19.6%) and 12 respondents had M.Sc./M.A (representing 13.0%). This shows that respondents with HND were more in number compared to with those qualifications that I administer questionnaire for this research.

**Table 4:3: Educational Level Distribution of Respondents**

| Attributes         | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| SSCE/GCE           | 2         | 2.2%           |
| OND/NCE            | 4         | 4.3%           |
| HND                | 56        | 60.9%          |
| B.Sc. /B. A/B. Ed. | 18        | 19.6%          |
| M.Sc./M. A         | 12        | 13.0%          |
| Total              | 92        | 100%           |

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

#### 4.4 Martial Status Distribution of Respondents

This Table 4.4 revealed the marital status of the respondents as follows, 76 respondents (representing 82.6%) are married and 16 respondents (representing 17.4%) single. This show that majority of the respondents are married.

**Table 4:4: Martial Status Distribution of Respondents**

| Attributes | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|------------|-----------|----------------|
| Married    | 76        | 82.6%          |
| Single     | 16        | 17.4%          |
| Total      | 92        | 100%           |

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

#### 4.5 Work Experience Distribution of Respondents

This table 4.5 revealed that, 9 respondents (representing 9.8%) had 1-3 years' work experience, 4-6 years had 31 respondents (representing 33.7%) and respondents with 7-9 years' experience has 9 respondents (representing 9.8%) and 10 years and over of work experience responded that 43.3 respondents (representing 46.7%). With this the majority of the respondents with 10 and above years of experience responded.

**Table 4:5: Work Experience Distribution of Respondents**

| Attributes         | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1-3 years          | 9         | 9.2%           |
| 4-6 years          | 31        | 33.7%          |
| 7-9 years          | 9         | 9.2%           |
| 10 years and above | 43        | 46.7%          |
| Total              | 92        | 100%           |

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

#### 4.6 Staff Rank /Job Title Distribution of Respondents

This Table 4.6 shows that, 44 respondents (representing 47.8%) were procurement manager while the accountant are 16 respondents (representing 17.3%), auditor are 18 respondents (19.5%) and admin officer are 14 respondents (representing 15.2%). This show that the procurement officer is majority in number that respondent to the questionnaire.

**Table 4:6: Staff Rank / Job Title Distribution of Respondents**

| Attributes           | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|----------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Procurement managers | 44        | 47.8%          |
| Accountants          | 16        | 17.3%          |
| Auditors             | 18        | 19.5%          |
| Admin officers       | 14        | 15.2%          |
| Total                | 92        | 100%           |

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

#### 4. 7 Regression Analysis Results

Table 4.7 show the R (0.927) indicates a strong positive correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable. R Square (0.859) shows that 85.9% of the variance in Quality Service Delivery can be explained by the four predictors: Contract Planning, Bidding Process, Contract Management, and Bid Evaluation. Adjusted R Square (0.852) is slightly lower, adjusting for the number of predictors. Durbin-Watson (0.870) is well below 2, indicating potential positive autocorrelation (i.e., the residuals are not independent).

Table 4.8The F-statistic (132.350) is highly significant ( $p < .001$ ), indicating that the model as a whole fit significantly better than a model with no predictors.

Table 19 Bid Evaluation has the strongest influence on Quality Service Delivery (Beta = 0.773,  $p < .001$ ). Contract Management also has a significant and strong positive effect (Beta = 0.960,  $p = .015$ ). Contract Planning has a moderate significant effect (Beta = 0.195,  $p = .003$ ). Bidding Process is not statistically significant ( $p = .390$ ), suggesting it does not contribute meaningfully to explaining quality service delivery in this model.

**Table 4.7 : Model Summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Standard Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | Sig. F Change | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|---------------|
| 1     | .927 <sup>a</sup> | .895     | .852              | .39935                         | .895            | 132.350  | .000          | .870          |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bid Evaluation, Contract Planning, Contract Management, Bidding Process

b. Dependent Variable: Quality Service Delivery

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

**Table 4.8: ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Sum of Square | Df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|---------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 84.429        | 4  | 21.107      | 132.350 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 13.875        | 87 | .159        |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 98.304        | 91 |             |         |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: Quality Service Delivery

b. Predictors: (Constant), Bid Evaluation, Contract Planning, Contract Management, Bidding Process

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25,2025.

**Table 4.9: Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |                     | Unstandardized<br>Coefficients<br>B | Standardized<br>Coefficients<br>Std. Error | Beta | t     | Sig. |
|-------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------|-------|------|
| 1     | (Constant)          | 4.129                               | .662                                       |      | 6.236 | .000 |
|       | Contract Management | .200                                | .064                                       | .195 | 3.106 | .003 |
|       | Bidding Process     | .082                                | .095                                       | .071 | 0.863 | .390 |
|       | Contract Management | 1.372                               | .553                                       | .960 | 2.484 | .015 |
|       | Bid Evaluation      | .786                                | .079                                       | .773 | 9.995 | .000 |

**a. Dependent Variable:** Quality Service Delivery

**Source:** Author's Computation using SPSS, version 25, 2025.

## 4. 8 Discussion of Findings

### 4.8.1 What is the effect of contract planning on quality service delivery of Nasarawa state public sector, Nasarawa state?

The study found that contract planning has a strong and meaningful effect on service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector. The regression test carried out at the 5% significance level produced a t-value of 3.106, which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This means contract planning is a significant predictor of service quality. The result agrees with earlier studies such as Thai (2004), who noted that planning is central to project success, and the World Bank (2011), which linked weak planning to cost overruns and delays. It also supports Ameyaw et al. (2012), who argued that activities like feasibility studies and risk assessments greatly shape the efficiency of public services.

Overall, the results show that strong contract planning improves service delivery and should be treated not just as a routine step, but as an important governance tool.

#### **4.8.2 What is the effect of bid evaluation on quality service delivery of Nasarawa State public sector, Nasarawa state?**

The study examined how bid evaluation influences service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector. Using regression analysis at the 5% significance level, the result produced a t-value of 0.863, which is greater than  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Stated statistically, ( $t\text{-value} = 0.863 > \alpha = 0.05$ ). Because the t-value exceeds the significance threshold, the null hypothesis was retained. This means bid evaluation does not have a significant effect on the quality-of-service delivery in the state. Although bid evaluation is meant to promote fairness and value for money, this result suggests that the expected benefits are not being achieved in practice, which reflects concerns raised by Thai (2004), Odhiambo & Kamau (2003), and Ameyaw et al. (2012) about weak implementation and limited institutional capacity in developing-country procurement systems.

The finding is that bid evaluation is not contributing meaningfully to service delivery, and improving this will require stronger oversight, better enforcement, and capacity-building to ensure that evaluation practices are transparent, competency-based, and aligned with public sector performance goals.

#### **4.8.3 What is the effect of contract management on quality service delivery of Nasarawa State public sector, Nasarawa state?**

The study examined how contract management influences service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector. Using regression analysis at the 5% significance level, the result showed a p-value of 2.484, which is greater than  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Because the p-value exceeded the significance threshold, the null hypothesis was retained, meaning contract management does not have a statistically significant effect on service delivery. This suggests that although contract management is theoretically important, the way it is currently practiced in Nasarawa State may be weak, inconsistent, or poorly enforced. This outcome is in line with Walker and Rowlinson (2008), Raymond (2008), and the World Bank (2015), who all emphasize that

without strong oversight, monitoring, and institutional capacity, contract management cannot meaningfully improve project outcomes.

The results indicate that contract management has little measurable impact on service delivery in Nasarawa State, largely because institutional weaknesses, insufficient monitoring, and ineffective implementation prevent contract management systems from functioning as intended.

#### **4.8.4 What is the effect of bidding process on quality service delivery of Nasarawa state public sector, Nasarawa state?**

The study examined how the bidding process affects the quality-of-service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector. At the 5% significance level, the regression produced a t-value of 9.995, which is less than  $\alpha = 0.05$ , written as ( $t\text{-value} = 9.995 < \alpha = 0.05$ ). Because the t-value falls below the significance threshold, the null hypothesis was rejected. This means the bidding process has a statistically significant and positive effect on service delivery in the state. In simple terms, transparent and merit-based bidding leads to better contractor selection, stronger supplier performance, and improved project outcomes, which aligns with earlier studies by Thai (2004), OECD (2007), and Ameyaw et al. (2012).

The result shows that a sound bidding process meaningfully enhances service delivery, and continued investment in training, documentation, and due-process culture will help sustain these gains.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

This study investigated the effect of procurement systems on the quality-of-service delivery in the Nasarawa State public sector, Nigeria. Using regression analysis and empirical data collected through structured questionnaires, the study assessed key components of the procurement system including contract planning, bidding process, bid evaluation, and contract management and their influence on service delivery outcomes.

The findings revealed that some components of the procurement system, particularly bid evaluation and contract planning, have a statistically significant impact on the quality-of-service delivery.

Overall, the study concludes that the effectiveness of procurement systems is essential for enhancing the delivery of public services in Nasarawa State. Transparent, accountable, and well-managed procurement processes can greatly improve the allocation of public resources, reduce waste, and build public trust.

## 6.0 Recommendation

The study recommends strengthening the procurement system in Nasarawa State by improving transparency and enforcement within the bidding process, ensuring procurement officers receive continuous training, and enhancing contract planning through proper needs assessment, budgeting, and stakeholder involvement. Although contract management was not statistically significant, the study emphasizes the need for consistent monitoring, performance tracking, and wider adoption of digital procurement tools to improve accountability and efficiency. Bid evaluation should be conducted by well-trained and independent committees using clear and standardized criteria, while procurement laws must be strictly enforced through regular audits by regulatory bodies such as the Bureau of Public Procurement to ensure compliance and improve the quality of public service delivery.

## References

- Abubakar, M. M., Suleiman, A. I., & Bello, R. K.** (2019). A framework for monitoring and evaluating the performance of procurement systems to achieve quality service delivery in the public sector of Nigeria. *Journal of Public Procurement and Performance Management*, 10(3), 245-267.
- Adamu, U. A.** (2019). Analyzing the efficiency of procurement systems in the public sector. *London Heathrow Terminal 5 and a Private Finance Initiative Hospital*, *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 15(3), 178-186.
- Aduba Weele, A. J.** (2006). *Purchasing and supply chain management: Analysis, strategy, planning and practice* (4th ed.). Australia: Thomson.

- Afolabi, A. O., & Adedeji, Y. M. D.** (2018). Accountability mechanisms in enhancing service quality through procurement practices in the Nigerian public sector. *Journal of Public Procurement and Contract Management*, 8(2), 145-162.
- Benslimane, Y., Plaisent, M., & Bernard, P.** (2005). Investigating search costs and coordination costs in electronic markets: A Transaction Costs Economics Perspective. *Electronic Markets*, 15(3), 213–224.
- Caldwell, N. D., Roehrich, J. K., & Davies, A. C.** (2009). Procuring complex performance in construction: London Heathrow Terminal 5 and a Private Finance Initiative Hospital. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 178–186. Retrieved from [www.elsevier.com/locate/pursup](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/pursup).
- Darma, N. A., & Ali, M.** (2014). An assessment of public sector service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of federal capital territory area councils, 2007-2011. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 3(8), 1756-1776.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W.** (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Eisenhardt, K. M.** (1985). Control: Organizational and economic approaches. *Management Science*, 31(2), 134-149.
- Eisenhardt, K. M.** (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 57-74.
- Gillespie, P., & Wang, L.** (2020). Procurement strategies for public sector efficiency. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Harrison, S., & Brown, T.** (2021). Managing contracts in procurement: Challenges and strategies. *Sage Publications*.

- Jackson, R., & Green, L.** (2021). Bidding processes and competitive procurement. *Palgrave Macmillan*.
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H.** (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305-360.
- Jones, R., & Harris, S.** (2020). Public procurement systems in developed nations: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 37(4), 400-415.
- Koka, J. M., & Masango, N.** (2018). Public procurement reforms and their impact on service delivery in South Africa. *African Journal of Public Administration*, 22(3), 209-224.
- Kumar, S., & Gupta, P.** (2022). Decision-making in management: Integrating AI tools for better outcomes. *Management Decision Review*, 8(1), 29-45.
- Lysons, K., & Farrington, B.** (2020). *Procurement and Supply Chain Management* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Lysons, K., & Farrington, B.** (2006). *Purchasing and Supply Chain Management* (7th ed.). Prentice Hall/Financial Times.
- Mensah, R. O., Mawuli, M., Kyeremeh, E. K., & Tettey, P.** (2022). Public procurement methods and approval process in the Ghana civil service: Review of some selected ministries in the Ghana Civil Service. *Public Procurement Methods and Approval Process*, 1(2), 149-161.
- Mohan, V., & Radhakrishnan, V.** (2019). E-procurement reforms in India: The road to transparency. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(1), 45-59.
- Mueller, D. C.** (2003). *Public choice III*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nigerian Bureau of Statistics.** (2020). *National economic performance review*. Abuja: NBS.

- North, D. C.** (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- OECD.** (2020). *Public procurement in the digital age: Trends and insights*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- OECD.** (2015, October). *Recommendation of the council on public procurement*. OECD Publishing. (Adopted 22 October 2015).
- Panya, K. O., & Awuor, E.** (2023). Challenges in African public procurement systems: A review of procurement reforms in Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria. *Strategic Journal of Business & Economics*, 10(3), 1435-1456.
- Scott, W. R.** (2004). Institutional theory: Contributing to a theoretical research program. In *Handbook of organizational studies* (pp. 460-484). Sage.
- Scott, W. R.** (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*. Sage Publications.
- Smith, R.** (2021). Procurement systems and public sector efficiency. *Journal of Public Administration*, 50(2), 132-148.
- Smith, G., & Lee, H.** (2020). *Procurement operations: Achieving value for money*. Springer.
- Sullivan, M., & Perez, A.** (2019). *Procurement systems: Modern challenges and practices*. Pearson Education.
- Taylor, C., & Wright, R.** (2019). *Measuring service quality and customer satisfaction*. McGraw-Hill.
- Wanjiru, M., & Kamau, J.** (2020). Procurement reforms in Kenya: A case study of the Public Procurement and Disposal Act of 2005. *African Journal of Public Procurement*, 31(1), 99-112.

**Zeithaml, V., Bitner, M., & Gremler, D.** (2006). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm*. McGraw-Hill.

**Zotoo, I. K., Zotoo, R. W., & Zhangping, L.** (2021). An assessment of the level of implementation of procurement management practices in the public sector. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 5(vi), 2454-6186.