



WWJMRD 2020; 6(10): 27-34
www.wwjmr.com
International Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal
Refereed Journal
Indexed Journal
Impact Factor MJIF: 4.25
E-ISSN: 2454-6615

Edward Aondona Apken-Ageh
Center for Food Technology
and Research (CEFTER)
Benue State University
Makurdi, Nigeria.

An Appraisal of the Socia-Economic Impact of Privatization on Rural Communities in Nigeria: A Focus on Benue Cement Company Gboko (Dangote Cement PLC).

Edward Aondona Apken-Ageh

Abstract

The study assessed the extent to which Benue Cement Company (BCC) now managed by Dangote industries engaged locals in menial jobs in the company and also provides basic amenities and welfare packages to the rural communities in mbayion Gboko local government area of Benue state, Nigeria. Before privatization (BP) that is when the company was managed by government and after privatization (AP), now that Dangote industries plc is in charge. A cross-sectional survey research design was used for the study. The population comprised all the three major communities of Tse-Kucha, Amua and Inonganor in Mbayion Gboko local government area. The sample consisted of 450 locals randomly selected in the three major communities in the study area. A check list titled; Menial Jobs and Basic Amenities for locals Checklist (MJBALC) and Locals Welfare Packages Questionnaire (LWPQ) were used for data collection. The instruments were validated by three experts, two in Community and Social Development and one in Test and Measurement. The reliability coefficient of the instruments was determined using Cronbach alpha and internal consistency of the instruments was obtained as 0.92 and 0.78. The three research questions which guided the study were answered using mean and standard deviation (SD), while the three null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. The result revealed that the locals were engaged in menial jobs in Benue Cement Company moderately when it was managed by the state government compare to now that is managed by Dangote industries. Consequently, the company has provided basic amenities such as electricity, pipe born water and roads as well as welfare packages to the rural communities in mbayion where the factory is sited to a less extent at both intervals. It was recommended based on the findings that; the government through the Bureau for public Enterprises (BPE) in conjunction with the state government should ensure that Dangote industries keep to the terms of engagement for the takeover (privatization) of Benue Cement Company (BCC) Gboko with regard to the social-economic benefits of the rural communities in mbayion where the factory is sited. By providing to a great extent; Menial jobs such as electricians, mechanics, portals and drivers to the locals in the area, Basic amenities such as electricity, pipe born water, and good roads in the rural communities hosting the factory and Welfare packages such as housing and loan schemes, as well as health services to improve their livelihood.

Keywords: privatization, socio-economic impact, rural communities, local company, state owned enterprise (SOE)

Introduction

When governments divested state-owned enterprises in developed economies, especially in the 1980s and 1990s, their objectives were usually to enhance economic efficiency by improving firm performance, to decrease government intervention and increase its revenue, and to introduce competition in monopolized sectors (Vickers & Yarrow in Saul & Adeline, 2018). According to Austin and Samuelson (2016) the process in which a publicly-traded or government company is taken over by a private entity is called privatization. The author maintained that, the stock of the company is no longer traded in the stock market and the general public is barred from holding stake in such a company. *The purpose of privatization is to bring more efficiency and objectivity to the public sector in order to improve the*

Correspondence:

Edward Aondona Apken-Ageh
Center for Food Technology
and Research (CEFTER)
Benue State University
Makurdi, Nigeria.

livelihood of the citizenry. Thus, any private firm that takes over SOEs through privatization is bounded by terms of engagement to improve the economy of the state as well as the rural communities where these sectors are located; through provision of welfare packages, employment and basic amenities such as pipe born water, electricity and feeder roads (Odeh, 2011). Privatization is sometimes used as a synonym for deregulation when a heavily regulated private company or industry becomes less regulated. Based on the reports of Privatization Barometer (BP, 2013), the complete transfer of ownership, property or business from the government to the private sector is termed privatization. Benue Cement Company (BCC) Gboko is a State Owned Enterprise (SOE) that was transferred to Dangote plc in 2000, hence the new name; Dangote Cement plc. Therefore, only empirical evaluation could ascertain the extent to which the company (Dangote Cement plc Gboko) now fully privatized has positively changed or improved the social-economic fortunes of the state and particularly the rural communities of Tse-Kucha, Amua and Ihungwanor where the company is located.

In Latin America and especially in Chile, large-scale privatization programs have been launched, especially in the infrastructure sector right from 1974 and the peak was witnessed in the 1990s. Between 1988 and 2008, the total privatization proceeds in Latin America amounted to \$220 billion (28% of total world proceeds). However, there is every reason to be cautious, when interpreting the raw data because of differences in the size of economies. According to Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) privatization can suggest several things, including migrating something from the public sector into the private sector. The authors explained further that, it is also seldom used as a metonym for deregulation when a massively regulated private firm or industry becomes less organized. Government services and operations may also be (denationalized) privatized; in this circumstance, private entities are tasked with the application of government plans or execution of government assistance that had earlier been the vision of state-run companies. Some instances involve law enforcement, revenue collection, and prison management (Nwoye, 2011).

The differences between the privatization experience of Africa, Asia, and Europe become less striking when proceeds are normalized by Gross Domestic Product (GDP), though privatization revenue to GDP which were high in Latin America, representing, on average, 0.5% of GDP. The five years to 2015 were marked by the predominant role of China in global privatizations, while the European Unions' share went below its long-term average of 45% of the world's total proceeds, running at only one-third of worldwide totals, on average (Saul & Adeline, 2018). According to the Privatization Barometer (PB) Report 2013–2014, global privatization total proceeds exceeded \$1.1 trillion from January 2009 to November 2014, with \$544 billion of divested assets between January 2012 and November 2014. In addition, the 20-month period that started in January 2014 witnessed privatizations totaling \$431.4 billion (PB report 2015). This was far more than any comparable period since the beginning of the privatization programs in the U.K. in the late 1970s. India went for privatization in the historic reforms budget of 1991, also known as 'New Economic Policy.

African states privatized a smaller percentage (about 40%)

of their State Owned Enterprise (SOEs) than other developing regions such as Latin America and the transition economies. Most privatization activities took place in South Africa, Ghana, Nigeria, Zambia and Cote d'Ivoire. Although privatization of state assets is primarily a political matter, in many developing countries, it has legal and constitutional implications that are either not understood clearly or are simply ignored by well-meaning politicians (Odeh, 2011). Popoola (2016) stated that, the African states are pressured and often seduced by foreign economic and commercial interests, some of them equally well-meaning with promises of enriching their economies rapidly in exchange for various concessions to exploit mineral and other key economic resources. The author explained that, they are persuaded by bi-lateral aid agencies and the development banks and the IMF to let the private sector take over state owned enterprises and some of the public services to improve economic performance even if it meant bending the law.

Salako (2016) asserted that in Nigeria, there had been a cumulative dismal performance of SOEs which resulted in a "crisis of confidence". This was due to various problems which can be attributed to internal and external factors. The author maintained that, the internal factors relate to inadequate and inappropriate investment decisions, adverse business environment characterized by weak capital base and control mechanism, poor system of accountability and the absence of any remarkable reward system. The external factors relate to unfavorable export/import prices, restricted access to external markets and funds; high rates of interest on foreign loans, etc. According to Nwoye (2011) the prevailing socio-economic and political conditions of the Nigerian economy, the justification for institutional reform of the SOEs derives from three main concerns which are macroeconomic in nature. The first, centers on the need for the restoration of fiscal balance in the highly indebted Nigerian economy in the light of excessive budget deficits, (which SOEs have been a major cause, through excessive loans) and their inflationary impact. The second relates to the need to improve efficiency in the public sector, especially the SOEs' sub-sector. The third factor, which is international in dimension, centers on the need to reduce the size of government involvement in economic activities in order to free some resources which could be deployed to alleviate international debt burden. Magaji (2012) stated that the reform of SOEs in Nigeria has, thus, focused on such critical aspects as financial and physical restructuring via divestiture with a market-oriented approach under the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) adopted in 1986. Egwu (1998) in Udoka and Anyingang (2012) observed that one of the main objectives of SAP was therefore to pursue deregulation and privatization leading to removal of subsidies, reduction in the wage bills and the retrenchment of the public sector ostensible to trim the State down to size. Dibia (2004) opined that the success of Nigeria's privatization policy ultimately depend on the willingness of Nigerian political leaders to surrender the political and economic patronage powers associated with direct involvement in the production of goods and services to the private sector and non-profit organizations.

Privatization in Nigeria is carried out in accordance with Act No. 38 of 1999, which established the National Council on Privatization with the Bureau for public Enterprises (BPE) as its Secretariat. Based on the report of NCP (2015)

the Public Enterprises (Privatization and Commercialization) Act No. 38 of 1999 provides the enabling legislation for the implementation of the privatization and commercialization programme. Part 1 of the First Schedule to the Act listed the Public Enterprises (PEs) for partial privatization while Part 2 listed the PEs for full privatization. PEs for full commercialization are those that are expected to operate profitably on a commercial basis, and raise funds from the capital market without Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) guarantee. Such PEs adopts private sector procedures and processes in running their businesses; in order to ensure effective coordination and proper implementation of all programmes. Privatization if well implemented could lead to open and competitive economy that would produce wealth and jobs. Popoola (2016) observed that developing countries including Nigeria, hope to realize substantial revenues from the sale of state owned enterprises to private entrepreneurs who will manage them efficiently. The author stressed further that; privatization offers a number of attractive possibilities to governments and private citizens, these include easing of foreign debt, increased productivity resulting from enterprises that are better managed in the private sector, a growth of the entrepreneurial climate necessary for economic growth, and a substantial broadening of ownership of private property in the society, thus broadening people's stake and encouraging political support for the system (Hanke, 1988 in Popoola, 2016). Magaji (2012) reported that between 2000 and 2011, in consortium with Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, Dangote purchased government enterprises in Nigeria including BCC Gboko.

According to Orokpo and Ejeh (2014) a survey undertaken by the Technical Committee on Privatization and Commercialization (TCPC) in Nigeria revealed that there are about 600 public enterprises controlled by the federal government and an estimated 900 controlled by states and local governments respectively. The estimated 1,500 public enterprises in Nigeria account for between 30 and 40 percent of fixed capital investments and the same proportion of formal sector employment. The authors stressed further that the returns from these investments had never exceeded two per cent per annum, which is less than 25 per cent of the annual subventions from the government to the public enterprise sector. The Bureau for public Enterprises (BPE) since inception in 2011 have privatized up to 142 public Enterprises (PEs), some federal firms privatized in Nigeria include; Telecoms, pension, seaports, power sectors etc. Meanwhile the states on the other hand have privatized most of the State owned Enterprises (SOEs) since the return of democracy in Nigeria in 1999. Some of the SOEs privatized in Nigeria include; Benue Cement Company plc now Dangote Cement plc, Bauchi-Gwana Cement now a subsidiary of Cement International, Obajana cement factory kogi state now Dangote Cement plc, Atlas Cement and Lakatabu cement factory now managed by WAPCO Lafarge plc and so many others in the country.

Benue Cement Company (BCC) plc now Dangote cement plant, located at Tse-Kucha, Mbayion in Gboko Local Government Area of Benue State, was built in 1972 through partnership by oinvited dementia holding of Zurich, Switzerland. The company was incorporated on the 16th July 1975 in Nigeria as a limited company and a profit

oriented organization with the Cementia holding of Zurich as the first management partners. By August 1980 the first production line came to stream and Lion brand Portland cement was introduced into the market, with a rated capacity of 900,000 tonnes per annum. Sampson Mirilla and Emerole (2016) reported that the federal government privatization programme of 2000 conceded BCC to Dangote Industries Limited who bought majority 65% equity in the company and effectively took over the management of the company in 2004 with an annual capacity of 900,000 tonnes and capacity utilization below 50%. The authors maintained that BCC's principal activities are the manufacture and sale of cement. In order to put the company at a maximum production capacity, Dangote upgraded and rehabilitated the plant, which transformed it into a new state-of-the-art cement factory with two 1.4 million tonnes lines, thereby increasing the company's annual capacity by more than three-fold. The first cement line was commissioned in late 2007, while the second became operation in 2008 respectively. Agema, Adegbe and Chinda (2017) asserted that before privatization of the company which is now manage by Dangote industries plc. The rural dwellers in the communities enjoyed the privilege of handling majority of the menial jobs in the company as well as some welfare packages and basic amenities such as electricity. Now that the company is fully privatized and upgraded, it expected that the social economic activities of the rural communities where the company is sited would improve to a great extent, as contained in the blue print for setting up the company in the area. That means, there would be more menial jobs, welfare schemes and basic amenities to these communities.

Balogun (2016) assessed the impact of Obajana cement factory on the socio-economic development of Obajana, Kogi State, Nigeria. Data was collected through administration of questionnaire among 361 households that were systematically sampled. Also, three sections of Focus Group Discussion (FGDs) were held with groups consisting of male, female and youth in the study area. The data was analyzed using both descriptive and Principal Component Analysis techniques. The result revealed that only 7% earn above N80, 000 per month while 25.2% earn below N20, 000 monthly. It was also perceived that the establishment of the factory has generally improved the income of the residents because most residents have diversified their income base from agriculture to other more profitable businesses hence, more than 70% earn above the N18, 000 minimum wage monthly. The standard of living of the people of Obajana has also been improved. This is because more health, education and other social facilities have been established as a result of the influx of people into the area. About 24% are now living their personal houses while 42.7% live in rented apartments. About 94% of the respondents agreed that the population of the community has now constituted a market for local agricultural produce, farmers no longer travel to Kabba or Lokoja markets to sell their products as what they produce is barely enough for the consumption of the reside. It was also discovered that about 21.3% were employed in the factory and other jobs have also been created indirectly in the community as a result of the movement of diverse people into the area. Ado (2013) examined the role of industry in promoting sustainable development in its host communities through

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Using Ashaka Cement Company as a case of study. Two hundred and fifty (250) questionnaires were distributed to the respondents, selected randomly from the five villages used for the research. Out of the 250 questionnaires, 206 questionnaires were returned, which is 82 percent. The questionnaire contains both closed items and open-ended questions. The stakeholder theory of the firm was used as a theoretical framework for the study. The data collected was analyzed by means of tabulation and percentage tools. The result revealed general outcry of the host communities against marginalization in terms of employment and the provisions of basic social infrastructures, such as pipe bore water, road, school and electricity. This implied significant positive relationship between grievances in the Ashaka communities and the activities of the company.

Statement of the Problem

The huge number of State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) privatized in Nigeria shows that government has good intentions to improve the livelihood of the citizenry; by promoting to a great extent economic fortunes of the states that owned these enterprises as well as the social economic activities of the rural communities where the enterprises are located. It is as result of this that empirical evaluation to ascertain the extent privatization of SOEs has impacted the rural communities where these enterprises are sited becomes necessary. Because if well checked or monitored, the big industries which the SOEs are conceded to have as an obligation in their terms of engagement to compliment government efforts in the rural communities where there are operating by providing menial jobs to the locals as well as basic amenities and welfare schemes. Based on this situation it is reasonable to assessed the extent BCC (Dangote Cement plc) have positively impacted the rural communities of Tes-Kucha, Amua and Ihonganor where the factory is located, hence time has elapsed that Dangote industries took over the cement plant. Also, studies by Balogun (2016) on the socio-economic development of Obajana, Kogi State, Nigeria. And Ado (2013) on the role of industry in promoting sustainable development in its host communities through Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Using Ashaka Cement Company as a case of study has reported the good and the bad of privatization on the host communities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which Benue Cement Company (BCC) now known as Dangote cement plc Gboko engage the locals in menial jobs in the company and also provide basic amenities and welfare packages to the three rural communities where the company is sited, before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP). Basically, the objectives of the study were to;

1. Find out the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in menial jobs in the company before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).
2. Determine the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).
3. Determine the extent to which Dangote cement plc

(BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).

Research Questions

1. What is the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in menial jobs in the company before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)?
2. What is the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)?
3. What is the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)?

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in the company Before Privatization (BP) and After Privatization (AP).
2. There is no significant difference in the mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to rural communities Before Privatization (BP) and After Privatization (AP).
3. There is no significant difference in the mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to rural communities Before Privatization (BP) and After Privatization (AP).

Methodology

The study is a cross sectional survey on the extent to which Benue Cement Company (BCC) now known as Dangote cement plc Gboko engage locals in menial jobs and also provide basic amenities and welfare packages for the entire rural communities where the company is sited, when it was managed by government i.e before privatization (BP). And now that is managed by a private firm i.e after privatization (AP). The population comprised all the three major communities of Tse-Kucha, Amua and Inonganor in Mbayion Gboko local government area of Benue State Nigeria. The sample consisted of 450 locals randomly selected in the three major communities in the study area. A check list title; Menial Jobs and Basic Amenities for locals Checklist (MJBALC) and Locals Welfare Packages Questionnaire (LWPQ) were used for data collection. The instrument was validated by three experts, two in Community and Social Development and one in Test and Measurement. The reliability coefficient of the instruments was determined using Cronbach alpha and internal consistency of the instruments was obtained as 0.92 and 0.78. Both MJBALC which contained two sections and LWPQ that had only one section were developed on a modified Likert-type four point rating scale of 4, 3, 2, and 1 as follows: each item in all the sections of the instruments has; Great Extent (GE) = 4points = 3.50 – 4.00, Moderate Extent (ME) = 3points = 2.50 – 3.49, Less Extent (LE) = 2points = 1.50 – 2.49, No Extent (NE) = 1point = 0.50 – 1.49. The data collected was analyzed using mean and Standard Deviation (SD) while t-test of independent sample was used to test hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

Meanwhile, any item with the mean of 2.50 and above was accepted while items with the mean of 2.49 and below were considered less extent.

Results

Research Question 1. What is the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in menial jobs in the company before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)?

Table. 1: The extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in menial jobs in the company before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)

s/n	Menial Jobs	BP			AP		
		Mean	SD	Dec	Mean	SD	Dec
1	Mechanics	3.40	1.18	ME	2.56	1.17	ME
2	Electricians	3.70	1.27	GE	2.35	1.23	LE
3	Plumbers	3.61	1.29	GE	2.00	1.10	LE
4	Portals	4.20	1.21	GE	3.10	1.11	ME
5	Cleaners	3.20	1.20	ME	2.01	1.23	LE
6	Massagers	2.54	1.25	ME	2.10	1.17	LE
7	Drivers	3.62	1.21	ME	2.17	1.21	LE
8	Security guards	4.20	1.16	GE	2.52	1.13	ME
9	Caters	2.80	1.11	ME	2.21	1.29	LE
10	Unit helpers	2.70	1.13	ME	2.22	1.20	LE

Composite Mean 3.40 2.32

Key: BP = Before Privatization (company managed as Benue Cement Company Gboko)

AP = After Privatization (company managed as Dangote Cement plc)

GE = Great Extent, ME = Moderate Extent, LE = Less Extent & NE = No Extent

The result revealed that, the locals were engaged in menial

jobs in the company before privatization (BP) to moderate extent and after privatization (AP) to a less extent with a cluster means of 3.40 and 2.32 respectively.

Research Question 2. What is the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)?

Table. 2: The extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)

s/n	Basic Amenities	BP			AP		
		Mean	SD	Dec	Mean	SD	Dec
1	Hospitals	2.30	1.28	LE	2.45	1.28	LE
2	Roads	2.12	1.34	LE	2.07	1.19	LE
3	Water	2.41	1.30	GE	2.31	1.31	LE
4	Electricity	2.80	1.27	ME	2.58	1.27	ME
5	Schools	2.30	1.11	LE	2.18	1.16	LE

Composite Mean 2.39 2.31

Key: BP = Before Privatization (company managed as Benue Cement Company Gboko)

AP = After Privatization (company managed as Dangote Cement plc)

GE = Great Extent, ME = Moderate Extent, LE = Less Extent & NE = No Extent

The result revealed that, the rural communities hosting the

company have enjoyed basic amenities such as hospitals, roads, water, electricity and schools before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP) to a less extent with cluster means of 2.39 and 2.31 respectively.

Research Question 3. What is the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)?

Table. 3: The extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to the rural communities where the company is sited before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)

s/n	Welfare packages	BP			AP		
		Mean	SD	Dec	Mean	SD	Dec
1	The company has empowered the locals in each of the host communities to build their own houses.	2.15	1.03	LE	2.28	1.19	LE
2	The company has constructed feeder roads in each of the host communities.	2.35	1.21	LE	2.07	1.29	LE
3	The company has empowered the locals to open up mini-markets in each of the host communities.	2.59	1.15	ME	2.50	1.18	ME
4	The company has empowered locals to engage in petty trading to improve their economic status	2.62	1.30	ME	2.56	1.32	ME
5	The company has soft loan schemes in each host communities to improve their livelihood.	2.00	1.25	LE	2.21	1.27	LE

Composite Mean 2.34 2.32

Key: BP = Before Privatization (company managed as

Benue Cement Company Gboko)

AP = After Privatization (company managed as Dangote

Cement plc)

GE = Great Extent, ME = Moderate Extent, LE = Less Extent & NE = No Extent

The result revealed that, the company has provided welfare packages to the rural communities hosting the company at both intervals to a less extent with cluster means of 2.34 and 2.32 respectively. That is before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).

Table. 4: t-test of independent sample of the difference between mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in the company before Privatization (BP) and After Privatization (AP).

Variables	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P	Level of Sig	Dec
Locals BF	225	3.3970	0.5222	0.059	62	0.042	0.05	R
AP	225	2.3240	0.5101					

The t-test of independent sample on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in the company before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP) recorded t-test value of 0.052 with a p-value of 0.042 which is less than 0.05 level of significance ($p=0.042 < 0.05$). That means the null hypothesis is rejected. This implied that, there is significant difference on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage

Hypothesis One (HO1)

There is no significant difference in the mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in the company Before Privatization (BP) and After Privatization (AP).

locals in the company before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP)

Hypothesis Two (HO2)

There is no significant difference in the mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).

Table. 5: t-test of independent sample of the difference between mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).

Variables	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P	Level of Sig	Dec
Locals BF	225	2.3860	0.5512	0.050	62	0.060	0.05	N
AP	225	2.3180	0.5500					

The t-test of independent sample on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to the rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP) recorded t-test value of 0.050 with a p-value of 0.060 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance ($p=0.60 > 0.05$). That means the null hypothesis is not rejected. This implied that, there is no significant difference on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provides basic amenities to the

rural communities hosting the company when it was managed by government and now that the company is managed by a private firm.

Hypothesis Three (HO3)

There is no significant difference in the mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).

Table. 6: t-test of independent sample of the difference between mean rating scores on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic welfare packages to rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP).

Variables	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P	Level of Sig	Dec
Locals BF	225	2.3420	0.5119	0.055	62	0.057	0.05	N
AP	225	2.3240	0.5003					

The t-test of independent sample on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to the rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP) recorded t-test value of 0.055 with a p-value of 0.057 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance ($p=0.57 > 0.05$). That means the null hypothesis is not rejected. This implied that, there is no significance difference on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provides welfare packages to the rural communities in mbayion when the company was managed by government and now that it is managed by Dangote industries.

before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP) with a t-test value of 0.052 and a p-value of 0.042 which is less than 0.05 level of significance ($p=0.042 < 0.05$). That means the null hypothesis is rejected. This implied that, there is significant difference on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in in menial jobs in the company before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP). That is, when the company was managed by the state government the locals were engaged in menial jobs in the company to a moderate extent compare to now that is managed by Dangote industries. This result is agreement with Balogun (2016) who discovered that about 21.3% of the people of Obajana community in Kogi state where the cement factory is located and now manage by the same Dangote industries were employed in the factory and other jobs have also been

Discussion

The result revealed the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko engage locals in menial jobs in the company

created indirectly for the people in the community. The result on the other hand showed the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide basic amenities to the rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP) with a t-test value of 0.050 and a p-value of 0.060 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance ($p=0.60>0.05$). That means the null hypothesis is not rejected. This implied that, there is no significant difference on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provides basic amenities to the rural communities hosting the company when it was managed by government and now that the company is managed by a private firm. The study is in consonance Ado (2013) who stated that, the standard of living of the people of Ashaka have not improved, hence general outcry of the host communities against marginalization in terms of employment and the provisions of basic social infrastructures, such as pipe bone water, road, school and electricity.

The result also indicated the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provide welfare packages to the rural communities in mbayion before privatization (BP) and after privatization (AP) with a t-test value of 0.055 and a p-value of 0.057 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance ($p=0.57>0.05$). That means the null hypothesis is not rejected. This implied that, there is no significant difference on the extent to which Dangote cement plc (BCC) Gboko provides welfare packages to the rural communities in mbayion when the company was managed by government and now that it is managed by Dangote industries. The finding is in agreement with Ado (2013) who reported significant positive relationship between grievances in the Ashaka communities and the activities of the company.

Conclusion

Going by the findings, it is concluded that the locals were engage in menial jobs in Benue Cement Company moderately when it was managed by the state government compare to now that is managed by Dangote industries. Consequently, the company has provided basic amenities such as electricity, pipe born water and roads as well as welfare packages to the rural communities in mbayion where it is located to a less extent at both intervals.

Recommendations

It was recommended based on the findings that; the government through the Bureau for public Enterprises (BPE) in conjunction with the state government should ensure that Dangote industries keep to the terms of engagement for the takeover (privatization) of Benue Cement Company (BCC) Gboko with regard to the social-economic benefits of the rural communities in mbayion where the factory is sited. By providing to a great extent;

1. Menial jobs such as electricians, mechanics, portals and drivers to the locals in the rural communities where the factory is located.
2. Basic amenities such as electricity, pipe born water, and good roads in the rural communities hosting the factory.
3. Welfare packages such as housing schemes, health services and loan schemes to the rural communities hosting the company to improve their livelihood.

Reference

1. Acemoglu, D., and Robinson J. (2012) Why Nations Fail. New York: Random House.
2. Ado U. (2013) Politics and Corporate Social Responsibility: A Study of the AShaka Cement Company Plc in Gombe State (1999 – 2009) International Journal of Social development 11(2) 54-49 Retrieved on 12th September, 2020 www.transcampus.org/journals/; www.ajol.info/journals/jorind
3. Agema R. J., Adegbe B. & Chinda C. C. (2016) Review of Operational Constraints Responsible for Benue Cement Company Inability to Achieve Strategic Business. International Journal of Business and Management Review 5 (5).38-57
4. Austin, K., C. D, & L. Samuelsen. 2016. "The Failures of Privatization: A Comparative Investigation of Tuberculosis Rates and the Structure of Healthcare in Less-Developed Nations." World Development 78: 450–60.
5. Balogun E. S. (2016) An Assessment of the Inpact of Obajana Cement factory on the Social- Economic Development of Obajana, Kogi State Nigeria. Unpublished masters' thesis from the Department of Goegraphy Amadu Bello University Zaria.
6. Dibie, R.,2004, 'Privatization Policy, Challenges and Prospect(s) for Sustainable Development in Nigeria', in Agenda Setting and Public Policy in Africa, ed. K. Kalu, Ashgate Publishers, Aldershot, UK.
7. Magaji A. M. (2012) "A Review of Post Privatization Performance of Ashaka Cement Manufacturing Company Nigeria PLC through the use of Financial Ratios," Journal of Social and Development Sciences, AMH International, vol. 3(12), pages 382-388.
8. National Council on Privatisation (NCP) and its implementation arm, the Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPE) 2015 Retrieved on the 7th August 2020 <https://bpe.gov.ng/about/>.
9. Nwoye, M.I. (2011) "Privatization of Public Enterprises in Nigeria: The Views and Counterviews" http://www.globalizacija.com/doc_en/e0062pri.htm
10. Odeh, A.M. (2011) "Privatization of Public Enterprises and Productivity: Nigeria's Dilemma" Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS) 2(6) 490-496.
11. Orokpo O. F. E. & Ejeh A. W. (2014) An Assessment of the Privatization of Benue Cement Company plc Gboko: 1986- 2011. International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR), Vol. 2, No 2, March, 2014 Website: <http://www.rcmss.com>. ISSN: 2350-2231(Online) ISSN: 2346-7215 (Print).
12. Popoola O. O (2016) Privatization of public Enterprises in Nigeria: Critical Success Factors. Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization ISSN 2224-3240 (Paper) ISSN 2224-3259 (Online) Vol.49, 2016.
13. Salaka H. A (2016) Privatisation In Nigeria And Options For Its Efficient Implementation CBN Economic & Financial Review, Vol. 37 No.2 17-30 An Overview.

14. Sampson C. T., Mirilla A. T. & Emerole G. A. (2016) Evaluation of Organizational Structure on Management Effectiveness: A Study of Dangote Cement plc Gboko Plant, Benue State Singaporean Journal of Business economics, and management Studies (SJBem) 10 (2) 33-38.
15. Saul E. & Adeline P. (2018) the World Bank Research Observer. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / THE WORLD BANK.
16. The Privatization Barometer PB Report 2013. A Publication of the Privatization Barometer. Retrieved on the 8th September, 2020 from https://assets.kpmg/content/dam/kpmg/pdf/2013/10/PB_KPMGEpdf.
17. Udoka C. O & Anyigang R. A. (2012) the Effect of Privatization on Economic Growth of Nigeria: 1979 - 2007 in Retrospect. International Journal of Economic Development Research and Investment Vol. 3, No 2, August 2012 25 VOL. 5, NO. 4, 2016.