

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCE OF ELECTRICITY SERVICE DELIVERY PRIVATISATION IN NIGERIA: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Olamide Eniola Victor (PhD) and Agboola, Joseph Taiwo
Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning,
E-mail: victorolamide@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The quest for the quality of life for people should be the ultimate desire for good governance. This is to relieve the poverty condition in pursuit of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). More so that the era of MDGs has ebbed out to give way for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) transformative 2030 agenda, it is imperative that whatsoever economic model, strategy and approach, embraced in this determination must not be at the expense of the citizens' quality of life. Privatisation benefits the lives of citizens in the developed countries, where the provisions of goods and services deliveries succeeded and fostered equitable and egalitarian society. The reason for this was independent regulatory frameworks for proper monitoring and political transparency put in place to form enabling background for private investors to operate in. Nevertheless, the consequences of privatisation in Nigeria are not as intended, as the costs of services superseded its benefits, owing to some reasons the paper is out to discuss. As a literature review paper with its discussions predominantly based on secondary data sources on the conceptual issues, the paper seeks to explain the socio-economic consequence of electricity service delivery privatisation in Nigeria. Privatisation policy has been claimed to have adversely impinged on the quality of life of the populace, aggravating the poverty condition of people. Based on identified policy gap of non-harmonising of policies with the actual situation on the ground, this paper argues that the issues of social-economic impact were occasioned by the privatisation policy, identifying the inadequacies of this approach to service delivery of electricity. The paper finally recommends the necessity of comprehensive planning that takes into consideration certain factors that are fundamental to decision making, policy resolution and implementation in Nigeria.

Keywords: Socio-economic, Quality of life, Electricity Service-delivery Privatisation, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

The consequence of electricity service delivery privatisation in Nigeria on socio-economic is borne out of the impact of the outcomes of policy implementation and planning on social well-being and quality of life of the people. This paper is primarily concerned with the pattern of resources distribution and seeks to understand who gets what, where, how and when in the course of policy implementation and service delivery to the people. The category of individuals and groups within the society refers to "who" while delivering good and services to the people are referred to 'what' the location denotes 'Where'. When refers to the time frame. The process of equitably, fairly and justly sharing of the resources between people and places regardless of religion, status, sex, ethnic or linguistic connections referred to "how", (Adebayo, 2012).

The essence of living and growth depends on the extent a person's ability to find necessities such as food, water, clothing, and shelter. However, finding basic life necessities requires accessibility to some other facilities among which is electricity service delivery. The service delivery of electricity is fundamental to quality of life. However, this basic facility is not adequately distributed among the people. Public utilities such as electricity supply and its effective service delivery are so essential and fundamental to the overall welfare of people (Okoye and Onwuka, 2014; RBI/Vinod Kothari, 2014; Investopedia, 2015; Kahn, 1979). Distribution of basic utilities which adhere to spatial planning principles would directly or indirectly reduce the spate of poverty and socio-economic inequality most especially in an emerging and growing economy nation like Nigeria (Aderamo and Aina, 2011; Sullivan and Sheffrin 2003; Jeffrey, 2009; Olayiwola, et, al. 2005).

However, the poor condition of electricity service delivery, while under public control and the failure of the privatisation approach to solving the poor service delivery of electricity has directly and indirectly caused economic backwardness. There is the creation of unemployment pool as manufacturing industries are folding up on a daily basis. There is poor entrepreneurial development and low income leading to a poor standard of living, as observed by (Kanayo, 2014). Increase poverty and increase in the cost of living through mass retrenchment, removal of industrial democracy; loss of benefit, often accompanied by lack of social safety nets and functioning labour market" as observed by (Chotten, 2000; 229 in Peterside, and Brown, 2014). The foregoing, impact on socio-economic in Nigeria and reflects the poverty level, (Edukugbo, 2014; Obasi and Ayansina, 2013; Leech, 2011). Increasing social economic impact are also becoming notable amidst the generality of people having a wide gap between rich and poor within the neighbourhoods where in most situations, some are socially relegated as submitted by, Kühn (2015). Hence, the imperative of spatial planning to guide effective delivery of electricity to ensure sustainable development as (Wächter, 2013), Klein et al., (2012) and Josephat et al. (2014) averred availability of spatial data as a panacea to the socio-economic problem

LITERATURE REVIEW-CONCEPTUAL/THEORETICAL ISSUES

The concept of Privatisation Policy to public utility service delivery

Privatisation connotes different meanings given the divergent methods and approaches in various nation adopting it (Nightingale and Pindus, 1997). Privatisation is the process of transferring ownership of a business, enterprise, agency, public service or public property from the public sector to the private sector, (In the Public Interest, 2015); Investopedia, 2015; Sepehr, 2013; England, 2011; Poole, 2008). Margaret Thatcher's regime in the early 1980s in the UK happened to be the pioneer adopting privatisation of the state-owned enterprise following the origination of the ideological movement of the neo-classical and neo-liberal economists 'wealth of nations' by Adam (1937) and Milton Friedman. Subsequent to this was the spread of the economic policy to both advanced

countries like; Canada, USA, France, Italy, Spain, Western Europe and developing Asia and some African countries. These countries privatised some areas of their public service delivery based on different economic reasons and needs of each nation (Hussain, 2014; Sepehr, 2013; Flynn and Asquer, 2013; McKenzie and Mookherjee, 2013; Salimi et al, 2012; Gilroy, 2010; Kosar, 2006; Rondinelli and Iacono, 1996).

The word privatisation originates from the Latin word '*private*'. The term became prominent at the end of the first global empire of human history. The Roman Empire with Greek civilization has formed for the first time, a Western approach to implement a public law centred on individuals and their rights. Several meanings of the word *private* literarily and genetically range from "to bereave", "to deprive someone of something", "to disseize", "to take away", "to steal from others" and "to hi-jack something" with all terms in between included. Among the intermediate meanings are "to keep something for oneself (or for a defined group) by detracting it to others", "to withdraw something from the commonwealth for one's own benefit", "to take care for something by personal ownership", "to occupy something" as well as "to enjoy something for oneself, by disregarding the enjoyment of others." The foregoing connotations redefine the individualistic tendency of the term privatisation and the probability to engender inequalities in the distribution of resources and brew socio-spatial poverty among the people in the country since ownership to properties and resources are personalized or among a group of people.

The concept of Socio-spatial Inequality

Social inequality is a reflection of the distributive pattern of available resources within the whole society. When certain resources become exclusively preserved for a certain group of people in society, it leads to socio-inequality. These resources could be income distribution, access to basic public services such as water and electricity among others. Available information on the level of inequality is instrumental for the consideration of the extent and depth of poverty level in any particular society (EAPN, 2015). It is observed that generally where high levels of inequality exist in the nation; it is likely for high levels of poverty to increase. This is an indication that "the problem of poverty is fundamentally linked to the issue of how resources are distributed and redistributed in a country" (EAPN, 2015). Historically, in the Nigerian context, social inequality dated from the dawn of colonial administration during the one hundred years colonial period in the country. There was segregation between the indigenes and the colonial master in the spatial organisation and the residential plans to the colonial master's advantage (Aderamo and Aina, 2011; Nnoli, 1978 in Aka, 1995, Ayeni and Mabogunje 1982 in Aka, 1995). This segregation in the spatial organisation right from the inception was further strengthened by subsequent political leaders who took over from the Colonial Master thereby deepening the socio-spatial inequality in the arrangement and distribution of

public utilities and service deliveries. This account for the extent to which people became capital and assets owner of one sort or another such as in properties, shares and investments (EAPN, 2015).

Peripheralisation another conceptualised offshoot of socio-spatial inequality

The term ‘Peripheralisation’ was derived from the word ‘periphery’ which originated from the field of mathematics, related to the description of the perimeter of a circle. It is similarly used as ‘parametric turning’ in the study of space physics (Vogt, 2009 in Kuhn, 2015) In the description of site and situation as ‘radius’ or ‘fringe’, and definition of outskirts from their distance to the center, the term periphery has found its appropriateness for space relationship description in some disciplines like geography, sociology among others. The understanding of this description of distance from the centre that gives credence to appropriate descriptive nomenclature within the spatial research is known as Peripheralisation. While ‘periphery’ provides a description, the term ‘Peripheralisation’ explains the act and the occurrence of disparity in terms of political, social, economic or communicative processes in a particular settings and hence its appropriateness to be used for explanation of socio-spatial inequality, (Fischer-Tahir and Naumann, 2013; Lang, 2012; Herrschel, 2011; Keim, 2006; Nitz, 1997 in Kuhn, 2015).

The summary of the distinctive connotations of periphery and Peripheralisation in Table 1

Table 1. Periphery and Peripheralisation in comparison

Periphery	Peripheralisation
<i>Pre-given spaces—with social implications</i> Fringes, edges, outskirts, borders	<i>Social relations—with spatial implications</i> “Production” of peripheries
<i>Status: static</i> Distance to centers Remote location Sparse population	<i>Processes: dynamic</i> Political Economic Social Communicative
<i>Fields of application: non-urban</i> Rural regions Border regions Suburban fringes	<i>Fields of application: open</i> Developing countries Urban regions and cities Rural (non-metropolitan) regions Urban Neighbourhoods
<i>Conditions for actors: fixed</i> Determined by structural deficits Periphery as “destiny”	<i>Conditions for actors: changeable</i> Role of the periphery in a system changes Actor networks matter

Source: Kuhn, 2015

Socio-spatial inequality from the concept of marginalisation

Closely related to the tenets and explanation of Peripheralisation is the notion of ‘marginalisation’ as explained by (Danson and De Souza, 2012 in Kuhn, 2015). The concept has a multidimensional description of socio-spatial inequality from the notion of insufficient integration, poorer development and economic, social, political and cultural disparity (Jones, Leimgruber and Nel, 2007 in Kuhn, 2015). The understanding of marginalisation gained prominence in sociological

research which attempts to explain the social differences of some groups at the fringe of the society but not essentially at the peripheries of a city, a region or a country (Kuhn, 2015). Here, social and structural marginality is explained in relation to exclusion, non-access to power and participation (Bernt and Colini, 2013 in Kuhn, 2015). In short, the above-explained the disparity in between urban and rural electricity supply in Nigeria, (Oguzor, 2011).

Social Exclusion: A conceptualised index of socio-spatial inequality

The understanding of social exclusion has been broadened in the research project, Poverty and Social Exclusion in the United Kingdom (PSE, 2012). It has also formed the basis of the wider understanding of current poverty and social exclusion research study (Mack and Lansley, 1985). Social exclusion is a multi-dimensional and complex process, involving the lack of or denial of resources such as access to public and private goods and services, social resources, material or economic resources, rights, and participation in the usual basic social relationships and activities available to the majority of people. In this regard, both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole are affected (Levitas, 2006; ILS, 1998 in Mathieson, 2008). To corroborate the foregoing, Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix, or B-SEM develop a matrix with three domains of potential importance: Resources, Participation, and Quality of life, (Teriman, & Yigitcanlar, 2011). Social exclusion is referred to as the 'persistent and systematic multiple deprivations, as opposed to poverty or disadvantage experienced for short periods of time', (Walker, 1997).

Imperative of Spatial Dimension of electricity service delivery: The Research Theoretical Gap

The importance of electric facilities and service delivery in shaping the social and economic progress cannot be underestimated. Ale et al. (2011) opine that the availability of these resources serve as the forerunner of economic development and is capable of revamping the economy and transforming the nation if diversified. Similarly, it is increasingly appreciated from different perspectives as its availability is synonymous to the development and stimulates growth in all sectors of any nation's economy (Oguzor, 2011; Oisasoje and Ojeifo, 2012). From another perspective, effective facility distribution such as electricity is inherent with developmental qualities that if provided in any nation, would lead to the development of all other sectors of the nation's economy thereby enhancing growth in all realms of life (Calderon, 2009; Egbetokun, 2009)

The need to consider spatial dimensions in the equitable service delivery of electricity cannot be under-estimated. Klein et al. (2012) posit that appropriate electric facilities distribution is a factor of the outlook of a city, with the shapes and forms of the city is solely dependent on the extent of its

availability and its articulate planning, due to its implications on the sustainability, effectiveness and involvement of the city right from its micro level to the macro-local scale. Hence, the main focus of this paper, which advocates for connection between electricity service delivery and spatial planning, should become imperative. The indispensability of spatial planning to avert skewed distribution of prosperity and ensure sustainable development was opined by Wächter, (2013). Josephat et al. (2014) submitted that the availability of spatial data would serve as a guide to the decision-makers or the private corporate body's decision making in planning for public service delivery of electricity. In order to actualize the linkage between the spatial dimensions and the provision of electric facilities, a coalesce of technical skill, professional expertise, and wide range of knowledge of all fabrics of public utility service delivery mechanisms and all the requirements for its provision, the institutional dimensions, its operational dimensions and its spatial dimensions becomes imperative (Klein et al. 2012).

In the light of the above, it has been argued at various quarters that privatisation of public utilities is sensitive issues that deserve due diligence in its processes. This is because it has to do with the basic need of society and a lot of variables and indices are needed to be taken into consideration to ensure the socioeconomic welfare of the people. Non-consideration of these necessary details among which is related to a basic utility like electricity service delivery to social welfare are the consequences of the failure of electricity delivery privatisation as observed by (Nichols, 2010; World Bank, 2004) Nightingale and the Pindus, 1997). For governments that forgo due diligence, choose ill-equipped contractors and fail to monitor progress, however, outsourcing deals can turn into costly disasters. It is like, "You're outsourcing a problem to a company that has limited control over the root cause of the problem which is bound to fail to monitor development contracts", (Nichols, 2010). Similarly, insufficient information about the technical competence and quality of the investors to handle public service delivery efficiency and the lack of information about people's socioeconomic background coupled with inadequate spatial data have been attributed as the inhibiting factors of privatisation of service delivery to address the issue of spatial inequality (Afify, 2001). Afore-explained formed the background of the problem statement. Hence, a comprehensive approach, that is all-encompassing and symbiotically link decision making on economic planning policy with spatial planning concepts forms the theoretical gap the thrust of the paper. The tenet of the gap was in line with the submission of American Society of Civil Engineer (ACSE, 2013) that a well-nurtured infrastructure will enable us to remain as a healthy, strong, financially successful, and wealthy nation, provided there are collaborative effort of all the stakeholders, right from a visionary leader, harnessing the nation's resources with the full support of the government functionaries and relevant institutions coupled with the public support and participation. The work of Jahan and McCleery, (2005) and Olaseni and Alade (2012) respectively were all in consonance with the theoretical gap to address the above-explained problem statement of the paper.

Review of Relevant Literature

Past literature averred that power reform has failed to address the issues of rural electrification and urban poor, as observed by Karekezi and Kimani (2002). Socio-spatial inequality in Nigeria could be attributed to the foregoing, as it leads to deprivation of the less privileged from access to electricity supply. The privatisation of utility services like electricity generally in Sub-Saharan Africa and especially in Nigeria has been associated with shortcomings having a biting effect on the less privileged (Pavanelli, 2015). The skewed distribution pattern of electricity service delivery has not only account for its malfunctioning and records of incessant power outages, but its poor performance has led to the impoverishment of the nation's economy as observed by Okekale (2015), Aminu, and Peterside, (2014) and Mahmoud (2005). "Privatisation and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria", a paper presented at a two-day meeting of on Pro-Poor Growth in Nigeria, Overseas Development Institute, London [How is this paper related to this article?]. Many of the big time enterprises have since packed up and moved to another country where electricity is relatively more stable. The implication was a massive layoff of workers thereby adding to already swelled up a pool of unemployed in the country (Aminu and Peterside, 2014; Okafor, 2008; Meyerman, 2004). The rest of the populace that could have engaged in small scale enterprises to boost their standard of living is also being hampered by the poor electricity service delivery leading to an increase in the poverty rate in the country (Etieyibo, 2011; Adeyemi, 2007 in Okafor, 2008).

Privatisation Policy as Indirect Causes of Socio-Spatial Inequality in Nigeria

Income has always been the socio-economic yardstick of measuring poverty and inequality (Alesina and Rodrik, 1994; Persson and Tabellini, 1994), without much consideration of the sources of that income, which is an outcome of potential products and productivity that is dependent on and a reflection of driving force of electricity supply. The foregoing discourse forms the research and theoretical gap. The effectiveness of the equitable distribution of these fundamental issues of electricity service delivery is indispensable of the physical planning approach to rightly address inequality, once there is a breach in this trend of socio-spatial order, then socio-spatial inequality sets in. The issue of poor electricity supply in Nigeria had already widened this socio-economic gap where close to 30 per cent of manufacturing industries already closed down, almost 60 per cent were ailing and 10 per cent managed to live above board as averred by Adeyemi (2007). The implications of the above scenario portend; laying off of workers and enhancing the increase in the labour market/unemployment which would invariably lead to joblessness, inability to meet up with basic needs, poverty and socio-spatial inequality since the source of livelihood is hampered by a poor power outage indirectly. On the other hand, those that could have embarked on small or medium scale business are also being hindered by poor electricity supply. Therefore, in such a low-income ridden

country like Nigeria, privatisation of electricity service delivery is detrimental to socio-welfare and socio-spatial equality (World Bank, 1987 in Etieyibo, 2011).

Prior to privatisation, a large percentage of the Nigerian populace mostly in rural areas and the urban poor do not have access to power supply. However, in privatisation, the literature averred that the deplorable, ineffective service delivery of electricity has neither change nor improved, (IseOlorunkanmi, 2014). Socio-spatial inequality would be eased when the above negative issues and challenges of power supply are addressed. This is posited by Oyelami and Adewumi (2014) that adequate supply of electricity would bring about economic development and national growth where industries would thrive well to employ a larger percentage of the teaming labour. People would similarly become easily empowered and possibly self-employed as they are able to embark at domestic level on various economic activities even to industrial level thereby enhancing the nation's economic development from small scale to medium and to large scale level.

The privatisation of electricity and its social-inequalities outcomes in Nigeria

Electricity service delivery in Nigeria is in a deplorable condition, this has virtually affected all facets of life since economic development and the growth of any nation is solely dependent on its effectiveness as observed by (IseOlorunkanmi, 2014; Oghogho, 2014; Amoo and Fangbale 2013; Newsom, 2012; Oyedepo, 2012). While a good number of industries and establishments have packed up due to poor electricity supply, the majority of other functioning industries are running their activities using the generator on daily bases, (Edukugbo, 2013; Obasi, and Ayansina, 2013; Leech, 2011). The negative implication of this kind of economy is hydra-headed; ranging from high production cost, downsizing and rightsizing of labour, outright lay off of workers, increase in unemployment rate, pauperization and poverty development leading eventually to social inequality (Briceno-Garmendia,&Shkaratan, 2011).

It has been observed that the outcome of privatisation further impoverishes the poor and widen socio-spatial inequality in the nation (Aminu and Peterside, 2014 and Tetteh, 2013). Deprivation and social exclusion, (Economic and Social Inclusion Corporation, 2015) of some social groups from access to some public and private services such as light, among other indicators of poverty mentioned by Townsend (1979), has been observed as one of the outcomes of privatisation causing socio-spatial inequality in Nigeria.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

The social implication of the privatisation approach to electricity service delivery in Nigerian context has formed the background for its major criticism as it has no social face, not having an inclination for people's welfare. The reason for this is the skewed distribution of electric facilities over the space, long time disinvestment in electric facilities. Moreover, the arrangement of these facilities was not in consonance with the neighbourhood setting and also do not follow the developmental trend. These lead to deterioration of these facilities and overstretching of available ones thereby leading to a total breakdown of the facilities. Privatisation approach to electricity service delivery without an initial solution to this deplorable condition of the facilities forms a veritable ground for its abysmal failure. In this case, Investors in the electricity service delivery, who are profit-minded have no interest in the social implications of their operations as they are only concerned with how to recoup their money back within the time frame of their investment.

Hence, the government has the onus to find a solution to the proper arrangement of electric facilities for effective service delivery in order to bridge the gap between the different social groups. The resultant effect of this is that manufacturing industries would thrive well to give room for employment, and opportunity for cottage and small scale industries to spring up. With this improvement, the nation would not only witness unprecedented economic development and growth but would also have the gap between the rich and the poor bridged as an eventual solution to socio-spatial inequality.

Recommendations

- Development policies and decision making of the sort of privatisation of electricity service delivery should not be independent of social welfare and equity.
- A comprehensive strategy that will integrate implementation of electric facilities distribution alongside with different social groups should be embarked upon.
- It is therefore required that a level playing ground for everyone from the poorest to the wealthiest individual within the society be given equal right and opportunities when it comes to service delivery of public utility such as electricity supply.
- Carrying out the procedure of privatisation of public utilities service deliveries like electricity with due diligence as against the disjointed, muddling through, trial-by-error kind of planning and policy implementation of the kind of power reform process should be embraced. In doing so, every fabric of society would be given equal consideration.
- Socio-spatial inequality would be easily addressed, where human-centered policy, realistic tendency, and social welfare undertone, forms the fundamental focus of the policymakers and are guided in the course of implementing its privatisation approach, such as public utility like electricity supply.

References

- Adam, S. (1936). *The Wealth of Nations: The most comprehensive analysis ... a form of Keynes's General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money.*
- Adedayo, A.O. (2012). *How the Other Half Live. The One Hundred And Nineteenth (119th) Inaugural Lecture.* The Library and Publications Committee University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria: Unilorin Press.
- Aderamo, A.J. & Aina, O.A. (2011). Spatial Inequalities in Accessibility to Social Amenities in Developing Countries: a Case from Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(6), 316-322.
- Adeyemi, B. (2007). Eight years of Obasanjo: Foundation laid for Industrial Revival *.the Guardian.*
- Afify, A.S. (2001). Privatization: problems of implementation in Egypt. PhD thesis, Aston University. Mrs Alison Lobo Deposited On: 04 Mar 2011 09:23
- Ale, M. O., Abisuwa, T. A., Olagunagba, F. O. & Ijarotimi, O. (2011). Rural infrastructural development, food security and city congestion in Nigeria. *Journal of research in national development (JORIND)*. 1(9).
- Alesina, A., Rodrik, D., 1994. Distributive Politics and Economic Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109, 465-490. In; Erdogdu, E. (2013). *Essays on Electricity Market Reforms: A Cross-Country Applied Approach.* Girton College, University of Cambridge. This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
- Alkire, Roche and Seth, 2011 in United Nations, (2013). *Inequality Matters.* Department of Economic and Social Affairs Report of the World Social Situation. United Nations publication, New York 2013. Available from, <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/reports/InequalityMatters>.
- Aminu, I., & Peterside, Z. B. (2014). The Impact of Privatization of Power Sector in Nigeria: A Political Economy Approach. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(26), 111–118. <http://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n26p111>
- Amoo, O.M., and Fangbale, R.L., (2013). Renewable municipal solid waste pathways for energy generation and sustainable development in the Nigerian context. *International Journal of Energy and Environmental Engineering*. 4(42), 2. In; Nwofe, P.A. (2014). *Utilization of Solar and Biomass Energy- A Panacea To Energy Sustainability In A Developing Economy*, *International Journal of Energy and Environmental Research* Vol.2, No.3, pp.10-19, September 2014. Published by the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)
- ASCE. (2013). Report card for America's infrastructure by America Society of Civil Engineers. The USA. <http://www.asce.org/Infrastructure/Why-is-Infrastructure-Important/>
- Ayeni & Mabogunje (1982) "Political Processes and Regional Development Planning in Nigeria", UNCRD Working Paper No 82-7, (January), United Nations Center for Regional Development, Nagoya, Japan. In Aka, E. O. (1995). *Regional Inequalities in the Process of Nigeria's Development: Socio-Political and Administrative Perspective.* *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, (1995), 10, 2, 61-80

- Bernt & Colini, (2013) in Kuhn, 2015 Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Briceno-Garmendia C. & Shkaratan M. (2011), Power Tariffs: Caught between Cost Recovery and Affordability (December 1, 2011). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series, Vol., pp. -, 2011. Available at SSRN: [HTTP://ssrn.com/abstract=1970145](http://ssrn.com/abstract=1970145)
- Calderón, C. (2009). Infrastructure & Growth in Africa, Policy Research Working Paper 4914, the World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Cotton, Panda, 2000; 229 in Aminu, I., & Peterside, Z. B. (2014). The Impact of Privatization of Power Sector in Nigeria: A Political Economy Approach. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(26), 111–118. <http://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n26p111>
- Danson & De Souza, (2012) in Kuhn, 2015 Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- EAPN. 2.015. Designed by Joomla! Art.com. Joomla! is Free Software released under the GNU General Public License
- Economic and Social Inclusion Corporation 2015, Government of New Brunswick. All rights reserved
- Edukugbo, E. (2014, March, 1st). Power Sector Reform: Electricity mess persists as consumers lament extortion. *Vanguard*. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/03/power-sector-reform-electricity-mess-persists-consumers-lament-extortion/>
- Egbetokun, O. A. (2009). Provision of rural infrastructures in the Oyo State of Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Sustainable Practice*. 1 & 2: 69-70.
- England, E. (2011). Privatization: Analyzing the Process of Privatization in Theory and Practice. *Student Pulse*, 3(8). Retrieved from <http://www.studentpulse.com/articles/566/privatization-analyzing-the-process-of-privatization-in-theory-and-practice>
- Etieyibo, E. (2011). The Ethics of Government Privatisation in Nigeria Thought and Practice: A Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya (PAK) New Series, Vol.3 No.1, June 2011, pp.87-112
- Eyles, (1996) in Aderamo, A.J. & Aina, O.A. (2011). Spatial Inequalities in Accessibility to Social Amenities in Developing Countries: a Case from Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(6), 316-322
- Fulmer, Jeffrey (2009). "What in the world is infrastructure?". *PEI Infrastructure Investor* (July/August): 30–32.
- Fischer-Tahir & Naumann, (2013) in Kühn, M. (2015). Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Flynn and Asquer, (2013). In Tetteh, K. (2013). The Pros and Cons of Privatization: A Critical Assessment, Munich, GRIN Publishing GmbH. Available at: <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/263720/the-pros-and-cons-of-privatization>
- GCCC, 2007 in Teriman, Tan Yigitcanlar, (2011), Social Infrastructure Planning and Sustainable Communities: Example from South East Queensland, *Australia World Journal of Social Sciences* Vol. 1. No. 4. September 2011. Pp. 23-32]
- Gilroy, L. C. (2010). Local Government Privatization 101. Policy Brief 89. Reason Foundation. retrieved from <http://reason.org/news/show/local-government-privatization-101>
- Herschel, (2011) in Kühn, M. (2015). Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Hussain, A., (2014). State Owned Enterprises and Private Firms in A Competitive Environment: A Case of Pakistan. *City University Research Journal*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://www.cityuniversity.edu.pk/curj/Journals/Journal/Jan%202014/08%20Arif%20Hussain.pdf>
- In the Public Interest (2015) 1825 K St. NW, Suite 210, Washington, DC 20006, 202-429-5091 info@inthepublicinterest.org
- International Institute for Labour Studies (IILS) (1998). Annexe I: issues for discussion. In: Figueiredo, J.B. & de Haan, A. eds. Social exclusion: an ILO perspective. International Institute for Labour Studies Research series 111. Geneva: International Labour Organisation. in Matheison,

- J. et al, (2008). Social Exclusion Meaning, measurement and experience and links to health inequalities A review of the literature.
- Investopedia, (2015,) *Privatization*. Retrieved from <http://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/privatization.asp>
- IseOlorunkanmi O. Joseph (2014) Issues and challenges in the Privatized Power Sector in Nigeria *Journal of Sustainable Development Studies* ISSN 2201-4268 Volume 6, Number 1, 2014, 161-174 © Copyright 2014 the authors. 161
- Jahan, S., & R. McCleery. (2005). Making infrastructure work for the poor, UNDP. [Online] Available:www.undp.org/poverty/docs/fpage/Synthesisreport.pdf.In; Ogun, T. P. (2010) Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction Implications for Urban Development in Nigeria. United Nations University, UN-WIDER, World Institute for Development Economics Research. Working Paper No. 2010/43
- Jones, Leimgruber, & Nel, (2007) in Kuhn, 2015 Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Josephat Okuku, Arnold Bregt, Lucas Grus,(2014). Assessing the Development of Kenya National Spatial Data Infrastructure (KNSDI), *South African Journal of Geomatics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, January 2014:95
- Kahn A. (1979). *Social Policy and Social Services*. 2nd Ed. New York: Random House.p28
- Kanayo, O., (2014) Poverty Incidence and Reduction Strategies in Nigeria: Challenges of Meeting 2015 MDG Targets.*J Economics*, 5(2): 201-217 (2014).© Kamla-Raj 2014
- Karekezi, S. & Kimani, J. (2002). Status of Power Sector Reform in Africa: Impact on the Poor. *Energy Policy*, 30(11-12). doi:10.1016/S0301-4215(02)00048-4
- Keim, (2006) in Kühn, M. (2015). Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Klein, G, Klug, N, & Todes, A, (2012). Spatial planning, infrastructure and implementation: Implications for planning school curricula. Garth Klein, Neil Klug & Alison Todes. Peer reviewed and revised... *SSB/TRP/MDM 2012* (60). 20 development programmes <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/trp/article/download/88075/77717> 18 Nov 2010.
- Kosar, K. R. (2006). *Privatization and the Federal Government: An Introduction*. Congressional Research Committee (CRS) Report for Congress. Retrieved from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33777.pdf>
- Kühn, M. (2015). Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Lang, 2012 in Kühn, M. (2015). Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Leech, N. (2011). *Privatization: The Public Policy Debate*. Washington DC, USA: League of Women Voters. Retrieved from <http://lwv.org/content/privatization-public-policy-debate>
- Levitas, R. (2006). The concept and measurement of social exclusion. In C. Pantazis, D., Gordon, & R. Levitas (Eds.) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Mack, J. & Lansley, S. (1985). *Poor Britain*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Mahmoud D (2005). “Privatization and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria”. Paper presented at a two-day meeting of on Pro-Poor Growth in Nigeria, Overseas Development Institute, London
- McKenzie, D. & Mookherjee, D. (2002). *The Distributive Impact of Privatization in Latin America: Evidence from Four Countries*. Retrieved from <http://www.bu.edu/econ/files/2012/11/dp128.pdf>
- Meyerman, (2004) in Mahmoud D (2005). “Privatization and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria”. Paper presented at a two-day meeting of on Pro-Poor Growth in Nigeria, Overseas Development Institute, London
- Newsom, C., (2012). The Sungas Project, International Institute for Environment and Development. In; Nwofe, P.A. (2014).Utilization of Solar and Biomass Energy- A Panacea To Energy Sustainability In A Developing Economy, *International Journal of Energy and Environmental Research* Vol.2, No.3,pp.10-19, September 2014.Published by the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)
- Nichols, R. (2010). The Pros and Cons of Privatizing Government Functions. *Management & Labour*

- Nightingale, D.S. & Pindus, N.M. (1997). *Privatization of Public Social Services: A Background Paper*. Washington DC, USA: Urban Institute. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.urban.org/publications/407023.html>
- Nitz, (1997) in Kühn, M. 2015. Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Nnoli, Okwudiba (1978) *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria* Fourth Dimension Publishers, Enugu. In Aka, E. O. (1995). Regional Inequalities in the Process of Nigeria's Development: Socio-Political and Administrative Perspective. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, (1995), 10, 2, 61-80
- Obasi, S & Ayansina, C (2014, January 28). Nigeria: Power Supply Worsens in Q4 2013 – NOIPolls. Vanguard. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/01/power-supply-worsens-q4-2013-not-polls/>
- Oghogho, I., Sulaimon, O., Adedayo, B.A., Egbune, D., Kenechi, A.V., (2014). Solar energy potential and its development for sustainable energy generation in Nigeria: a road map to achieving this feat. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences*. 5(2), 61.
- Oguzor, Nkasiobi Silas. (2011:26). A spatial analysis of infrastructures and social services in rural Nigeria. *GeoTropico*, 5 (1), Artículo 2: 25-38 .ISSN 1692-0791 Artículo 2 <http://www.geotropico.org/> A peer-reviewed online journal
- Okafor, E.E. (2008). Development Crisis of Power Supply and Implications for Industrial Sector in Nigeria. *Studies of Tribes and Tribals*, 6(2), 83-92. New Delhi: Kamla-Raj.
- Okekale, M. Governance, (2015). Pains of epileptic power supply Nigeria's Largest Newspaper Directory January 2015 <http://www.opinions.ng/pains-of-epileptic-power-supply/>
- Okoye, C. O., Onwuka, S. U., (2014) Basic Physical Infrastructure Facilities in Awka Public Housing Estates • Vol 6, No 4 (2014) PDF. 61-71.
- Olaseni, M., & Alade, W. (2012). Vision 20: 2020 and the challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 5(2).
- Olayiwola, L., M; Adeleye, O. and Adeleke, O. (2005). Spatial Variation in Residential Land Value Determinants in Lagos Nigeria. 5th FIG Regional Conference Accra, Ghana, March 8-11, 2006
- Oisasoje, O. M. and Ojeifo, S. A. (2012). The Role of Public Infrastructure in Poverty Reduction in the Rural Areas of Edo State, Nigeria. *Research on Humanity and Social Sciences* Volume 2(7).
- Oyedepo, S. O. (2012) “On energy for sustainable development in Nigeria,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 2583–2598, 2012.
- Oyelami, B.O. & Adewumi, A.A. (2014). Models for Forecasting the Demand and Supply of Electricity in Nigeria. *American Journal of Modeling and Optimization*, 2(1), 25-33. doi: 10.12691/ajmo-2-1-4
- Oyerinde, (2006) in Aderamo, A.J. & Aina, O.A. (2011). Spatial Inequalities in Accessibility to Social Amenities in Developing Countries: a Case from Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(6), 316-322
- Pavanelli, R. (2015). Public Services International. Last modified on Wednesday 18 March 2015 09
- Persson, T., Tabellini, G., 1994. Is Inequality Harmful to Growth? *The American Economic Review* 84, 600-621. In; Erdogdu, E. (2013). *Essays on Electricity Market Reforms: A Cross-Country Applied Approach*. Girton College, University of Cambridge. This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD).
- Poole Jr., R. W. (2008). Privatization. *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*. Library of Economics and Liberty. Retrieved from <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Privatization.html>
- Poverty and Social Exclusion-PSE (2012). *PSE UK Working papers*. Retrieved from <http://www.poverty.ac.uk/pse-research/pse-uk-2012>
- RBI/Vinod Kothari, (2014). Vinod Kothari & Company corplaw@vinodkothari.com on January 6, 2014.
- Rondinelli, D. A., & Iacono, M. (1996). Strategic management of privatization: a framework for planning and implementation. *Public Administration & Development (1986-1998)*, 16(3). doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-162X(199608)16:3<247::AID-PAD880>3.0.CO;2-O
- Salimi, M., Soltanhosseini, M., Padash, D., & Khalil, E (2012). Prioritization of the Factors Affecting Privatization in Sports Clubs: With AHP & TOPSIS Methods - Emphasis in Football. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(2). ISSN: 2222-6990.

- Sepehr, V. (2013). The impact of privatization on the macroeconomic variables. *Advances in Environmental Biology*, 7(9), 2341-2347. ISSN: 1995-0756
- Economic and Social Inclusion Corporation, 2015
- Sullivan, Arthur; Steven M. Sheffrin (2003). *Economics: Principles in action*. UpperSaddle River, New Jersey 07458: Pearson Prentice Hall. P.474. ISBN 0-13- 063085-3.
- Teriman, S. & Yigitcanlar, T. (2011). Social Infrastructure Planning and Sustainable Communities: Example from South East Queensland, Australia. *World Journal of Social Sciences* Vol. 1. No. 4. September 2011. Pp. 23-32
- Tetteh, K. (2013). *The Pros and Cons of Privatization: A Critical Assessment*, Munich, GRIN Publishing GmbH. Available at: <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/263720/the-pros-and-cons-of-privatization>
- Townsend, P. (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. London: Allen Lane and Penguin Books.
- United Nations (2013). *Inequality Matters*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs Report of the World Social Situation. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/reports/InequalityMatters.pdf>
- Vogt, (2009) in Kühn, M. (2015), Peripheralisation, Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(2), 367–378, doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.862518
- Walker, A. (1997). Introduction: the strategy of inequality. In A. Walker & C. Walker (Eds.). *Britain Divided: The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s*. London: Child Poverty Action Group. Ref: Muddiman, D. Theories of Social Exclusion and the Public Library Dave Muddiman
- Wächter, Petra (2013) The Impacts of Spatial Planning on Degrowth Open access Sustainability 2013, 5, 1067-1079; doi: 10.3390/su5031067 sustainability ISSN 2071-1050 www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability Published: 7 March 2013
- World Bank, (1987), in Etieyibo, E. (2011). The Ethics of Government Privatisation in Nigeria Thought and Practice: A Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya (PAK) New Series, Vol.3 No.1, June 2011, pp.87-112
- World Bank, (2004), an Assessment of Privatization, *World Bank Research Observer* 2004 19:1, 87-118

