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

Shirish Raibagkar[1]

1 Savitribai Phule Pune University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper discusses an important issue of maintenance of public educational facilities. Infrastructure is an important dimension of learning. Its regular maintenance is of significance for an effective learning environment.

INTRODUCTION

Author is suggested to add a paragraph on the importance of maintenance of public educational facilities in the Introduction section to provide some background. Problems faced due to poor maintenance can also be highlighted in the Introduction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The first paragraph in the Literature Review would be better placed in the Introduction section. Shift this paragraph to Introduction from Literature Review:

“Public Educational facilities in Nigeria are mostly built-up with a Federal Government bond otherwise known as Tertiary Education trust fund TETFUND. The TETFUND act 2011 repeals the Education tax fund of 2004 and the education tax fund of 2003 and establishes TETFUND to manage the collection and disbursement of the funds accruing from the educational tax levy. This fund is specifically for the provision and maintenance of physical infrastructure and equipment, instructional material and equipment, research and publication, academic staff training and development and general quality improvement and maintenance of standards in the public educational institutions. The TETFUND ratio is 2:1:1 for Universities, Polytechnics and Colleges of education spread uniformly across the geo political zones of the country (TETFund, 2011).”

Another paragraph in “Funding Structure” of the literature review needs to be shifted to Introduction section:

“Soft maintenance and facility management services are generally outsourced to third parties. These generally include security outfits and cleaning agencies in day to day service provision. In other climes, however, technology has taken over some of these services especially security with close circuit monitoring systems and access control facilities such as card readers and internet of things (IoT) / biometric access controls have been incorporated into the built facility system. These can also control the access and usage of available facilities such as lecture rooms, offices, libraries, laboratories, computer rooms and other facilities housed within the higher educational institution facility. This promotes the utility of these facilities against damage and theft as it provides undue access restriction to sensitive areas after active work hours.”

This paragraph has no in-text citation and is more of a general information which is suited in Introduction.

Oraka, Ogbodo & Ezejiofor (2017) can be better written as Oraka et al. (2017) since it has more than two authors.

End the literature review by identifying “research gap”. Please communicate the unaddressed areas which this study is trying to address.

METHODOLOGY

Author has stated – “sample size being approximately 55 facility managers employed within the services of five higher educational institutions (HEIs) in Ekiti state, Nigeria”. But how much is the population? Please provide estimates of population with relevant sources. Then work out the sample size at a 95% confidence level and 5% confidence interval using standard sample size tables like Krejcie and Morgan (1970). A scientifically worked out sample size is an important dimension especially for a quantitative study. Hence author has to clearly provide these basic details to make the results carry some weightage.

Another missing critical component of the methodology is hypotheses formulation. Author should construct and write the null and alternate hypotheses and test them as it is a very basic standard procedure for a scientific research.

The author is suggested to use the following method to test the hypotheses:

1. Take averages of the mean of the ten sub-constructs under each of the two sections (Table 2 and Table 3).
2. Compare the sectional mean with a hypothesized population mean of 3 which is the mid-point of the scale and can be considered as an event by chance.
3. Use a t-test to compare the sample mean with that of the hypothesized population mean, and obtain t-statistic and p-values for both the two sections. (As is a regular practice whenever standard deviation of the population is not known, a t-test is preferred over a z-test).
4. Test the hypotheses at 95% confidence level, that is, alpha of 0.05.

CONCLUSION

This section is missing altogether. Author should tie-up the results with research questions providing the basis of hypotheses testing. Please add a limitation due to use of sampling.

Overall the paper needs major improvements especially in the methodology part in the form of scientific calculation of sample size, setting-up of hypotheses, and its proper testing.