

# Review of: "Facility Management Challenges of Public Educational Facilities in Nigeria"

Moses Batanda Mubiru<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kyambogo University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

## Facility Management Challenges of Public Educational Facilities in Nigeria

This paper gives important insights regarding an overarching phenomenon of facilities management and its challenges, especially in Nigeria. However, there are fundamental observations I have made which in my view would boost the effectiveness of this paper and make it ideal for publication.

### Title

-I prefer if the concept is termed as 'Facilities Management' instead of 'Facility management'.

### Abstract;

-The authors state; "the findings cannot easily be generalized". This statement is hanging. Ideally, one would expect a quantitative study to be easily generalizable, and this is achievable through a well-structured design. At least, the study must come up with components which can be adopted by some studies elsewhere. In fact, this is one of the outstanding attributes of quantitative research. Therefore, if no component of this study cannot be analysed, then there was no reason it was structured as predominantly quantitative in the first place.

-in the last sentence of abstract, the authors indicate that ... "this study contributes to the literature on FM globally and in Nigeria..." I suggest that the contribution of this paper should be limited to the global south. The global North seems to have differing FM dynamics from the global south, and therefore mixing the two will be a misnomer.

### Introduction;

-Overall, the paper lacks page numbers. It becomes quite a challenge to navigate and comment appropriately

-The first paragraph is focusing on conceptual definition of facilities management. This is inappropriate for the first paragraph of the introduction section.

It is important to 'mark the territory' by problematizing the research issue and laying ground for the discussion ahead. But currently, it creates an impression that the reader is instead exploring the conceptual/theoretical section.

-The paragraph structures in many parts do not follow the acceptable standard formats i.e. topic sentence, elaboration in the body and then a closing sentence. There is rarely any fluent linkage between paragraphs, and this makes the

discussion quite disjointed.

-some paragraphs are too small i.e. some are having just two sentences. This cannot sustain.

-The opening sentence of the second paragraph would fit a topic sentence for a new first paragraph

-when TETFUND is mentioned for the first time, it must be written in full. This helps the readers who are not familiar with the concept.

### **Methodology;**

-There is an obvious lack of scholarly rigor in the methodology, and this is the greatest weakness of the paper. In the end, it will be hard to replicate this study by another scholar given the current structure of this methodology. Detailed focus should be put of:

1. The study setting and how did you go about marking its boundary plus the nature of respondents
2. The target population and how it was identified
3. How the sample was selected
4. How data was collected and managed
5. How did you strategize on data analysis and how were ethics upheld?

-In the opening paragraph, you indicate that you sampled 55 facility managers, but later in your results (demographics section) the number miraculously changes to 44. This shifting of goal posts is characteristic of a weak design and a weak methodology.

Therefore, in its current form, it may be an uphill task for this methodology to be acceptable.

### **Results;**

-There is some content cited from Pallant, 2016 about the Cronbach's alpha that is misplaced. IT rather fits in the methodology

-The paper lacks a discussion and synthesis of results/statistics. There needs to be a positioning in the current scholarly world through the discussion of the study findings. This has not been done, and it leads the quantitative results to be inadequately discussed and less meaningful.

### **Discussion**

-The content in this section seems to be for the conclusion, yet it is titled as discussion

-The authors indicate that there are several limitations of the paper. Whereas, there are limitations, like I indicated earlier in the abstract, there should be components that scholars elsewhere could adopt from your work. At least indicate these

components in the conclusion, and this is the primary essence of quantitative studies anyway.