

Human Capacity Building in Selected Local Government Areas of Ebonyi State, Nigeria – The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations and Development Agencies (2000 – 2008)

Dr. Larry E. Udu¹

¹Department of Public Administration, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria. Gsm:
+234(0)803-744-1746; Email: lamaken.larryudu503@gmail.com

DOI: 10.12735/jbm.v3i1p25

Abstracts

The role of Non-governmental organizations and Development Agencies in Human Capacity-Building in selected Local Government Areas of Ebonyi State; and the effectiveness of Capacity-building programmes in facilitating community development were examined. The study reviewed the contributions of Scholars in this area and related fields; with particular attention to the activities of indigenous NGOs and the Ebonyi State, Community-Based Poverty Reduction Agency. To effectively evaluate the activities of these bodies, the focus of the Research was on issues relating to human capacity-building through workshops and training as well as issues on capacity-building through micro-projects at the community and council levels. Three hypotheses were formulated and tested using chi-square method. The study adopted the System Approach to training and that of Development participation. Data were collected via: structured questionnaires, interviews, records and documents. The central point of the findings is that the Agencies' capacity building efforts cannot promote skill acquisition, and most of their outcomes are not sustainable at the grassroots. The study recommended, among others, that the skills acquisition centres should be equipped and that capacity building programmes should involve the people at the critical stages of the process, in addition to sequencing programmes in accordance with assessed needs of the time. That sustainability could be ensured through participative processes to strengthen the involvement of local communities; with special attention to maintenance arrangements. These, would assist the government, NGOs and Development Agencies appreciate new strategies in the efforts on capacity development at the grassroots.

JEL Classifications: O15; I30

Keywords: Human Capacity, Rural / Community Development, NGOs, participation, Training, Sustainability

1. Introduction

A country's human capital constitutes its most formidable asset and resources in striving towards sustainable development in all its facets. Countries such as Singapore have excelled both economically and socially as a result of heavy and sustained investments in their human resources, despite a limited natural resources endowment (Wadda, 2000). Similarly, from 1960 to 1990, eight East Asian economies achieved extraordinary economic success. For instance, per capita income grew more rapidly in South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Japan more than anywhere else in the world. The same was also true of Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia (Obadiah, 2008).

According to Obadiah (2008), this growth was matched by improvement in life expectancy, gains in educational attainments and reduction in poverty. The challenge for other developing countries such as Nigeria is to develop and retain their human resources for the purpose of development.

Be that as it may, lack of requisite human capacity has persistently remained the bane of economic development in Nigeria. The problem is observed in business enterprises as well as governance, particularly at the local levels.

Despite the laudable efforts of NGOs and Development Agencies such as the World Bank, in addressing the poverty rates and capacity building, achievements have been low due to poor background studies and understanding of the social and demographic characteristics of beneficiaries. As a result, there has been visible mismatch between community structure and the kind of capacity-building programmes targeted at them.

Ebonyi State, classified as one of the poorest states in Nigeria, has been chosen to examine the activities of NGOs and Development agencies in this context.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Lack of requisite human capacity has persistently remained one of the key challenges of economic development in Nigeria. The problem takes a transverse dimension across the three tiers of government in the country. Nevertheless, the impact of poor capacity development seems to be more felt at the lower levels of government, especially at the local government and community levels. This explains the glaring cases of under-development and high poverty rates at these governance levels.

The fact that poor human capacity development lies at the heart of under-development, explains why the Poverty Alleviation Programmes of Governments, the World Bank and Civil Society Organizations are focused on capacity building workshops and Initiatives. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of capacity building programmes seems to be constrained by the complexities of local government areas and rural communities. Some States, for instance, have greater proportion of Rural Poor than others. Some also have Lower Literacy Rates than others. The overall level of basic infrastructural and social amenities also varies across states, local government councils and communities. The case of Ebonyi local government areas is very glaring; most communities in the 13 Local Government Areas face high poverty rates, chronic inadequate supply of social amenities and general lack of access to meaningful means of livelihood.

No doubt, a good number of NGOs and development agencies have obviously risen to the challenges of providing needed capacities to communities in the State. Most of the Assistantship Programmes are anchored on Capacity Building and Poverty Alleviation goals. Irrespective of the efforts of these agencies, little achievements have so far been recorded at the local grassroots. Virtually every one of the Capacity Building and Poverty Alleviation Programmes failed to yield the desired results. Ironically, very few background studies are sponsored or undertaken by the Development Agencies and Partners to understand the social and demographic characteristics of their target communities and groups. This has continued to result to a situation where there is visible mismatch between the community structure and the kind of capacity building programmes targeted at them.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to examine the roles of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) and development agencies (such as the World Bank) in human capacity building at the grassroots in Nigeria; and the effectiveness of capacity building programmes in facilitating community development.

The specific objectives are:

1. To identify whether the capacity building programmes of NGOs and development agencies enhance the quality of community development projects.
2. To examine the link between community involvement and the outcome of capacity building workshops.
3. To assess the degree of sustainability of capacity building programmes as basis for community development.

1.3. Review of Related Literature

1.3.1 Concept of Capacity-Building/Development

Capacity-building is the process of increasing the abilities and resources of individuals, organizations and communities to manage change (Matachi, 2006). It is the elements that give fluidity, flexibility and functionality of a programme/organization to adapt to changing needs of the population that is served. According to the World Bank (2003), capacity-building occurs when relevant community of practice consciously use their stock of human and social capital and their access to financial, physical and natural capital to improve a problematic situation, and improve the stock of capital in the process.

For individuals, capacity building may relate to leadership development, advocacy skills, training/speaking abilities, technical skills, organization skills and other areas of personal and professional development (Linnell, 2003; Udu, 2009).

Capacity development, according to (Madavo, 2006), is the proven ability of key actors in a society to achieve socio-economic goals on their own. This is demonstrated through the functional presence of a combination of most of the following factors: viable institutions and respective organizations; commitment and vision of leadership; financial and material resources; skilled human resources.

From the above definitions, one deduces that: (i) Capacity development is a process of change; hence, about managing transformation. (ii) There can be a short-term results; even so, must be supported by a sustained resource and political commitment to yield longer term results that truly impact on existing capacities. (iii) Capacity development takes place at different levels: the individual levels the organizational level and the societal level, which are interlinked and interdependent. (iv) Capacity development is about who and where the decisions are made, management takes place, services are delivered and results are monitored and evaluated. It is primarily an endogenous process, and whilst supported and facilitated by the international development community; it cannot be owned or driven from outside.

1.3.2 New Perspective on Capacity and Capacity Development

In the preceding paragraphs, we learnt that the communities of practice are indispensable for effective capacity-building exercise. It would amount to exercise in futility if the target individuals, institutions or group are not actively involved in capacity building programmes. In fact, their understanding, appreciation and participation in what is being done, is essentially capacity development in itself. This new conceptualization of capacity development is what is meant by new perspectives on capacity development as opposed to the traditional top-down approach in enhancing skills and knowledge via the instrumentality of training and re-training processes (Oscar, 2012).

A major study of the European centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), involving sixteen case studies in Asia, Africa and Latin America, underscores the complexity of capacity development. According to EDCPM, those involved in developing capacity need to pay close attention to the formal and informal systems, beliefs, values, skills sets and social and political processes that affect individuals and organizations in carrying out their functions (Morgan, 2006).

Watson (2006) and Oscar (2012) agree with the above stance when they suggest that development agencies are in part responsible for poor results in developing capacities within the public sector, particularly when “they apply formal result based management/logical framework approaches rigidly to programme design, after what may be flawed analysis of capacity needs. The ECDPM research shows that institutional capacity development does not lend itself to the kind of rational planning favoured by most development assistance agencies, such as the grand schemes of sector reforms and poverty alleviation, a view that is shared by economist such as Easterly (2006).

Similarly, the OECD/DAC (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee) Network on Governance, contends that, capacity development needs to be viewed as “an endogenous process strongly led from within a country, with donors playing a supporting role” whereas, it used to be thought of largely as, a process of technical transfer of knowledge, skills and models from north to south (OECD/DAC, 2006). In contrast, supply – driven capacity development, where recipients have little say in decision-making, have generated limited success, according to analysis, such as Israel (1987).

Successful capacity development requires a holistic approach. Tackling one dimension or one level of capacity is unlikely to achieve sustainable change overtime. “The traditional capacity tools of technical cooperation and training have often proved ineffective in helping to improve performance because they have not been linked to the necessary organizational and institutional developments” (OECD/DAC, 2006). The implication is that development needs an integrated approach so that individual skills and organizational settings in which they can be put effectively to work are created simultaneously.

1.3.3 Training and Capacity Building

In the foregoing review, we have noted that capacity building involves training. The System Approach to training propounded by Eckstrand (1964), and corroborated by authors like Easton (1965); Katz and Kahn (1966), respectively, are most appropriate for result-oriented capacity building exercise. The System Approach to training considers problems such as training not only in terms of training objectives per se, but also in terms of the objectives and goals of the total organization or “system” in which the individual will be performing his task. The term “system” implies that one must be concerned with the objectives of the total system rather than the objective of any of its component parts (Onah, 2003).

The advantage of the system approach is that it helps the trainer in making decisions. He is able to understand and keep in mind the total training process as he tries to accomplish his objectives. The systems approach to the study of organizations focuses on the System as a whole, the environment of the system, the interdependent relationships between parts of the system and the tendency for the system to strive for survival by negotiating with its environment.

However, the systems theory does not adequately address the imperative of involving the capacity building targets at the critical stages within the process. This calls to question, the level of sustainability of capacity building outcomes. Moreover, human capacity building is not restricted to training and development of staff but incorporates other socio-economic and political factors facing the individual in the society. Hence, to properly address this gap, the study further considers Development participation in the context of rural development.

1.3.4 Community Participation and Capacity Building

Cohen and Uphoff (1977) provided theoretical and practical uses of participation as a measure of rural capacity development. Their framework is hinged basically on three dimensions of participation; what? Who? And How? These dimensions are augmented by consideration of how the context of participation may affect its extent and substance. To understand this context, they

suggest analysis of the nature of development task at hand and the most salient features of the environment in which projects are undertaken (Abah, 2005).

The whole idea of 'development participation' is to involve beneficiaries at the critical stages of the process so as to ensure sustainability of capacity development/building outcomes. Therefore, it is imperative to stress that, for any human capacity building effort to be sustainable; it must make man the centre, the beginning and the end of its efforts.

1.3.5 *Concept of Sustainable Development*

Development has been variously defined as multi-dimensional and man-centered. However, it lacks the basic ingredients of sustainability. Abah (2005) notes that only very few (if any) interdisciplinary concept possess greater intellectual challenge for scholars and policy analysts than "sustainable development". This, according to Eboh (1995) and Abah (2005), is because of the cross-disciplinary sensibilities which the concept involves; thereby making a universal definition far-fetched. However, sustainability is central to all development efforts; without it, investments in the development efforts are short-level and of no effect. It is the only global barometer for measuring a resilient and enduring socio-economic system.

A programme's results are called sustainable if they are utilized by the direct recipients after the completion of the programme without further external assistance (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP]: Management Programme, 2001:488).

In more encompassing definitions, sustainable development is defined as development that meets the needs of the present without even compromising the future generations to meet their own needs. The definition as expanded by the World Commission on Environment and Development [WCED] (1987), builds development efforts on man whom it is believed should be the purveyor and end of development efforts.

From our review, there is a consensus among scholars that for outcomes of development efforts to be impactful and sustainable, man must be made the focal point-the beginning, the centre and the end of such efforts.

1.3.6 *Ebonyi State Community-Based Poverty Reduction Agency (EB-CPRA)*

According to the EB-CPRA Project Operation Manual (POM), the main aim of the agency is to select, appraise and finance the implementation of micro-projects which will: (i) support the rehabilitation and development of basic social and economic infrastructure, critical to the improvement and development of the economic and social conditions of the population, especially in the rural communities and poverty stricken areas of Ebonyi State; and, (ii) improve the income earning capacity of poor people and household.

It would be recalled that, in the United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] (2002) Human Development Report, Enugu and Ebonyi States, ranked low (0.466) in the Human Development Index (HDI), a combined measure of longevity (physical health), knowledge (education), and income (purchasing power). The reasons for this low expectancy are not far-fetched; life expectancy at birth is estimated to be below 59.2 years for male and 66.7 years for female. Mortality rate for children under 5 is 191 per 1000 life births (United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], 1994). Against this background, Ebonyi State was selected by the Federal Ministry of Finance and National Planning Commission as one of the six pilot states in Nigeria for the phase II Community-Based Poverty Reduction Project (EB-CPRP).

As poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria particularly in Ebonyi State, have not been believed to have been participatory, demand-driven, well targeted and originating from the people, EB-CPRA micro-projects were to be identified, selected and implemented by the agency in collaboration with the target beneficiaries.

1.3.7 *Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)*

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play significant roles in Human and institutional capacities development. In Ebonyi State, for example, such capacity-building activities are often carried out in collaboration with Development Agency such as the World Bank. There are many NGOs carrying out various and divergent activities in Ebonyi State. For this study, however, four indigenous NGOs whose activities border essentially, on human capacity-building have been carefully selected.

They are:

- (i) The AGAPE Foundation for Literacy and Rural Development;
- (ii) The Ebonyi Humanity Foundation (EHF);
- (iii) The Civil Resource Development and Documentation Centre (CIRDDOC); and the
- (iv) Women, Children's Health and Community Development Initiative (WOCHACD).

1.4 Research Hypotheses

HO₁: Capacity building programmes of NGOs and other development agencies are **not capable** of enhancing the quality of community development projects.

H1: Capacity building programmes of NGOs and other development agencies **are capable** of enhancing the quality of community development projects.

HO₂: The level of involvement of communities and council areas in designing and implementing capacity building programmes **does not promote or enhance** the outcome of such programmes.

H₂: The level of involvement of communities and council areas in designing and implementing capacity building programmes **promotes or enhances** the outcome of such programmes.

HO₃: The results of most capacity building programmes **are sustainable** at the grassroots level.

H₃: The results of most capacity building programme **are not sustainable** at the grassroots level.

2. Research Design/Methodology

To ascertain the impact of the various strategies adopted by NGOs and Development Agencies in their capacity building efforts, which cannot be effectively determined using available literature, the study adopted a survey design. Data were collected using documentary instrument, direct observation, oral interviews and structured questionnaires. The study covered nine (9) local government areas of the state with remarkable presence of the Ebonyi State Community-Based Poverty Reduction Agency (EB-CPRA) – a World Bank Assisted Agency. Three LGAs were selected from the 3-geo-political zones of the state ensuring that from each zone, urban and semi-urban and rural LGAs were identified / selected.

Out of 96 autonomous communities in Ebonyi State, there are 80 within the target areas and 88 Development Associations / Union and 4 NGOs which activities border essentially on human capacity building. Five (5) key officers of the Development Associations were selected, making a total of 440 people. Twenty (20) principal/key officers from the 9 LGAs, totaling 180 and 10 officers of NGOs/EB-CPRA were selected from each of the 5 groups, totaling 50 persons on the whole, a randomly selected of 670 literate adults from the aforementioned categories were identified.

This was further stepped down to 600 people for convenience purpose. Thus, 600 copies of questionnaires were circulated; out of which 400 (67%) were duly completed and considered fit for use in the study. Pilot tests as well as test-re-test techniques were also used to determine validity and reliability of the instruments.

Chi-square method was used to analyze the data. Degree of freedom of the χ^2 variable is $(r - 1)(c - 1)$ where r , is the number of rows and c , the number of columns in the contingency table. Thus $(4 - 1)(5 - 1) = 12$; the level of significance is 5 percent. In the study, we have 4 rows and 5 columns. Decision Rule was: Reject H_0 , if $\chi^2_{cal} (V, 0.05) > \chi^2_{tbl} (V, 0.05)$ ie if the calculated χ^2 is greater than the theorized χ^2 for 12 degree of freedom at 5 percent level of significance; otherwise accept.

3. Data Presentation

The Ebonyi State Community-Based Poverty Reduction Agency (EB-CPRA), a World Bank Assisted Agency and the four indigenous Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs); viz: The AGAPE Foundation for Literacy and Rural Development; The Civil Resource Development and Documentation Centre (CIRDDOC); The Woman, Children's Health and Community Development (WOCHACD) Initiative and the Ebonyi Humanity Foundation (EHF); focused on Human Capacity Building through training/ workshops for skills development and provision of micro-projects in the rural communities of Ebonyi State. Table 1 below shows a summary of EB-CPRA) micro-projects in 9 LGAs for the period under review.

Table 1. Summary of EB-CPRA Micro-Projects in LGAs of Ebonyi State (1st -6th Batches)

S/n	LGA(s)	Senatorial zone	Nos of Project	Approval Budget	% share of total Budget
1	Abakaliki	Ebonyi North	9	28,960,500	7.84
2	Ebonyi	Ebonyi North	12	26,925,820	7.29
3	Ohaukwu	Ebonyi North	34	91,479,042	24.78
4	Afikpo North	South	30	57,971,253	15.70
5	Onicha	South	6	18,805,780	5.09
6	Ivo	South	22	30,740,750	8.33
7	Ezza South	Central	7	30,638,438	8.30
8	Ishielu	Central	13	43,357,410	11.74
9	Ikwo	Central	15	40,352,249	10.93
	Total		88	369,231,242	100

Source: Field Survey

3.1 Results and Discussion

Table 2, was designed to provide answers to research objectives 1 and the accompanying hypotheses which sought answers to whether or not, capacity building programmes of NGOs and development agencies enhance the quality of community development projects. Majority of the respondents opined that programmes are incapable of enhancing quality of projects. This was further tested scientifically in table 3. Here, the calculated χ^2 at 11.92 is less than the theorized χ^2 for 12 degree of freedom and 5 percent level of significance at 21.020 (ie, $\chi^2 < \chi^2_{12, 0.05}$); this confirms the above stance.

From the research, the reason for the above state of affairs is that most of the popular training methods of the capacity building programmes such as workshops were oral coaching which is

incapable of effectively tackling the issue of skills acquisition; moreover, the beneficiaries were not involved at the critical stage (planning / design) of the programmes.

Table 2. Assessment of the effectiveness of NGOs/EB-CPRA capacity building strategies in relation to skills acquisition

S/n	Responses	NGOs/WB		LGA Officials		Community Reps		Observer		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
A	Highly effective	5	1.25	20	11.76	24	13.33	1	10	50	12.5
B	Just Effective	8	20	20	11.76	30	16.67	1	10	59	14.75
C	Fairly Effective	7	17.5	40	23.54	27	15	2	20	76	19
D	Just ineffective	15	37.5	43	25.29	48	26.67	2	20	108	27
E	Very ineffective	5	12.5	47	27.76	51	28.33	4	40	107	26.75
	Total	40	100	170	100	180	100	10	100	400	100

Source: Field Survey

Again, the level of political will coupled with the fact that as Morgan (2006) pointed out, the development agents saw themselves as experts, imparting knowledge to others rather than base their strategies on the concept of co-learning.

Table 3. Statistical components of the Chi-Square Test for hypothesis one

Observed Responses O_R	Expected Responses E_R	Residuals ($O_R - E_R$)	Square of residuals ($O_R - E_R$) ²	Ratio of Square Residuals to expected value ($O_R - E_R$) ² / E_R
5	4.98	0.00	0.00	0.00
20	21.25	-1.25	1.56	0.07
24	22.50	1.50	2.25	0.17
1	1.25	-0.25	0.06	0.05
8	5.90	2.10	4.41	0.75
20	25.08	-5.08	25.76	1.03
30	26.55	3.45	11.90	0.45
1	1.48	-0.48	0.23	0.15
7	7.60	-0.60	0.36	0.05
40	32.30	7.70	59.29	1.84
27	34.20	-7.20	51.84	1.52
2	1.90	0.10	0.01	0.01
15	10.80	4.20	17.64	1.63
43	45.90	2.90	8.41	0.18
48	48.60	-0.60	0.36	0.01
2	2.70	-0.70	0.49	0.18
5	10.70	-5.70	32.49	3.04
47	45.48	1.53	2.33	0.05
51	48.15	2.85	8.12	0.17
4	2.68	1.33	1.76	0.66
400	400.00			Chi-Square (x^2) = 11.92

Note: the Degree of Freedom is $(4-1)(5-1) = 12$ and the level of significance is 5 percent

Source: Table 2

Research objective 2 which sought to examine the link between community involvement and the results of development programmes was placed in table 4. In the table, respondents overwhelmingly affirm that the level of relationship between development agents and beneficiaries could make or mar outcomes. The statistical test of hypotheses 2 is shown in table 5, which also affirm the above stand point. By implication, beneficiaries of projects were only involved at the implementation stages which impacted negatively on the desired results. This corroborates the earlier work of Reid (1995), which emphasized the principle of local participation in all aspects of programme processes.

Table 4. Assessment of significance of relationship between NGO/WB and beneficiary communities on programme objective

S/n	Responses	NGOs/WB		LGA Officials		Community Reps		Others		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
A	Very significantly	20	50	78	45.88	78	43.33	5	50	181	45.25
B	Significantly	15	37.5	75	44.12	89	49.44	2	20	181	45.25
C	Fairly significant	3	7.5	12	7.06	11	6.11	1	10	27	6.75
D	Insignificantly	1	2.5	3	1.76	1	0.56	1	10	6	1.5
E	Very insignificantly	1	2.5	2	1.18	1	0.56	1	10	5	1.25
	Total	40	100	170	100	180	100	10	100	400	100

Source: Field Survey

Table 5. Statistical components of the Chi-Square Test for hypothesis two

Observed Responses O_R	Expected of Responses E_R	Residuals ($O_R - E_R$)	Square of Residuals Expected ($(O_R - E_R)^2$)	Ratio of Square Residuals to value $(O_R - E_R)^2 / E_R$
20	18.10	1.90	3.61	0.20
78	76.923	1.08	1.16	0.02
78	81.45	-3.45	11.90	0.15
5	4.53	0.48	0.23	0.05
15	18.10	-3.10	9.613	0.53
75	76.93	-1.93	3.71	0.05
89	81.45	7.55	57.00	0.70
2	4.53	-2.54	6.38	1.41
3	2.70	0.30	0.09	0.03
12	11.48	0.53	0.28	0.02
11	12.15	-1.15	1.32	0.11
1	0.68	0.33	0.11	0.16
1	0.60	0.40	0.16	0.27
3	2.55	0.45	0.20	0.08
1	2.70	-1.70	2.89	1.07
1	0.15	0.85	0.72	4.82
1	0.50	0.50	0.25	0.50
2	2.13	-0.13	0.02	0.01
1	2.25	-1.25	1.56	0.69
1	0.13	0.875	0.77	6.13
400	400.00		Chi-Square (χ^2) = 16.98	

Note: the Degree of Freedom is $(4-1)(5-1) = 12$ and the level of significance is 5 percent

Source: Table 4

In table 5, the calculated X^2 at 16.98 is less than the theorized X^2 for 12 degree of freedom and 5 percent significance level at 21.020 (ie; $X^2 < X^2_{12, 5\%}$), so we accept the null hypotheses implying that the level at which NGOs/WB involve the beneficiaries, rather than promote, actually undermined the outcome of capacity building programmes.

Table 6. Assessment of the level of sustainability of NGOs/EB-CPRA capacity building facilities (for at least 5-10 years)

S/n	Responses	NGOs/WB		LGA Officials		Community Reps		Others		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
A	Highly sustainable	1	2.5	1	0.59	3	1.67	1	10	6	1.5
B	Moderately sustainable	10	25	12	7.03	10	5.56	2	20	34	8.5
C	Fairly sustainable	9	22.5	30	17.65	11	6.11	1	10	51	12.75
D	unsustainable	15	37.5	73	42.94	93	51.67	4	40	185	46.25
E	Highly unsustainable	5	12.5	54	31.76	49	49.44	2	20	124	31
	Total	40	100	170	100	180	100	10	100	400	100

Source: Field work

Table 7. Statistical components of the Chi-Square Test for hypothesis three

Observed Responses O_R	Expected of Response E_R	Residuals ($O_R - E_R$)	Square of Residuals ($O_R - E_R$) ²	Ratio of Square of Residual to Expected value ($O_R - E_R$) ² / E_R
1	0.60	0.40	0.16	0.27
1	2.55	-1.55	2.40	0.94
3	2.70	0.30	0.09	0.03
1	0.15	0.85	0.72	4.82
10	3.40	6.60	43.56	12.81
12	14.45	-2.45	6.00	0.42
10	15.30	-5.30	28.09	1.84
2	0.85	1.15	1.32	1.56
9	5.10	3.90	15.21	2.98
30	21.68	8.33	68.31	3.20
1	22.95	-11.95	142.80	6.22
1	1.28	0.28	0.08	0.06
15	18.50	-3.50	12.25	0.66
3	78.63	-5.63	31.64	0.40
3	83.75	9.75	95.06	1.14
4	4.63	-0.63	0.39	0.08
5	12.40	-7.40	54.76	4.42
54	52.70	1.30	1.69	0.03
63	55.80	7.20	51.84	0.93
2	3.10	-1.10	1.21	0.39
400	400.00		Chi-Square (x^2) = 43.200	

Source: Table 6

Table 6 assessed the level of sustainability of Development agencies capacity building facilities for at least 5 – 10 years. The trend of responses obtained as shown, indicate unsustainability, though affirmative responses are not uniform across the sub-group of the respondents. The statistical

components of the chi-square Test for hypotheses three is shown in table 7. Here, the null hypotheses is rejected since the value of X^2 calculated at 43.200 is greater than the theoretical X^2 for 12 degree of freedom and at 5 percent significance level at 21.020 (ie, $X^2 > X^2_{12, 5\%}$). Hence, the results of capacity building programmes are not sustainable at the community and local government levels.

Sustainability, according to World Bank Benchmark, entails that: target groups are sufficiently involved in project identification, selection, execution, maintenance and that leadership style is facilitative to project and sustainability (Udu, 2009). Field survey showed insufficient political will and overbearing elite influence in project design/execution.

3.2 Summary of Findings

The summary of the findings are as follows:

1. Capacity building programmes of NGOs and development agencies (EB-CPRA) specifically, are not capable of enhancing skills acquisition and the quality of community development projects;
2. The level of involvement of communities and council areas in designing and implementing capacity building programmes does not promote or enhance the outcome of such programmes;
3. The results of most capacity building programmes are not sustainable at the community and local government level.
4. The major capacity building tool of NGOs/development Agencies organized workshops is theoretical coaching which is inappropriate for skills acquisition.
5. The Poverty Reduction programmes of EB-CPRA involve the end-users but capacity building programmes through workshops do not involved the target audience at the critical stages.

4. Conclusion

The major findings of this research appear to confirm literature studies as well as the theoretical framework, that participation of the people in designing and implementing capacity building programmes is a sine qua non for the success and effectiveness of such programmes. By its definition, capacity building is a process that takes place at the individual, organizational and systemic/societal levels. Hence, the system approach to the issues of capacity building, is all it takes to ensure that results of efforts in capacity building, are not confined to a small group of individuals or organizations.

For efforts of NGOs and development agencies to impact meaningfully on community development, comprehensive researches are needed to understand the economic and social characteristics of the communities, the relevant areas of capacity building needs, and the sustainability of the goals and results of each capacity building effort.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion drawn from the study, we hereby recommend as follows:

1. That capacity building strategies should be enhanced to incorporate relevant trainings based on skills acquisition and utilization and such trainings programmes should be adequately sequenced according to assessed needs.

2. Capacity building is a programme based on co-learning and as such, programmes such as seminars/workshop, should be designed in such a way that they sufficiently and adequately involve, at all critical stages, those whose capacity are being built.
3. It is recommended that EB-CPRA and indigenous NGOs should establish an internal study group on capacity development, linked to external networks and organizations that are conducting research and sharing information in this area.
4. With the rapid development of knowledge-based economy, human capacity building could be promoted through the tripartite co-operation of the Government, development agencies and the academia. There is a need to develop sector-specific guidance on designing capacity needs and evaluating capacity building measures.
5. To ensure sustainability, beneficiary communities should be motivated through assurance of local ownership to be committed to projects. This should include provision of local technologies (where necessary) and maintenance responsibilities.

Acknowledgements

The contributions of the following people towards the successful completion of this paper, are acknowledged and appreciated; Professor, Fidelis Okoli, Dr. Abel Ezeoha, Dr. Sunday Onwe and Dr. Joseph Nkwede, for their editorial advise; Celestina Njoku for typing the manuscript and my beloved wife, Amaka, for her support and encouragements.

References

- [1] Abah, E. O. (2005). United Nations Development Programme and Sustainable Human Development in Nigeria – A Case Study of Ebonyi State. Ph.D Thesis, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- [2] Cohen, J. M., & Uphoff, N. T. (1977). *Rural Development Participation: Concepts and Measures for Project Design, Implementation and Evaluation*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.
- [3] Easterly, W. (2006). *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*. New York, Penguin Press.
- [4] Easton, D. (1965). *A Framework for Political Analysis*. Eaglewood NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [5] Eboh, E. C. (1995). Sustainable development: the theory and implications for rural Nigeria. In E. C. Eboh, C. U. Okoye, & D. Ayichi (Eds.), *Rural Development in Nigeria: Concepts, Processes and Prospects*. Enugu: Auto-Century Publishing Company.
- [6] Ebonyi State Community-Based Poverty Reduction Agency (EB-CPRA) (2008). *Project Operations Manual (POM, 2008) for Community Poverty Reduction Projects*.
- [7] Eckstrand, G. A. (1964). *Current status of the technology of training* (p. 64-88). AMRL Document Technical Report.
- [8] Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- [9] Linnell, D. (2003). *Evaluation of Capacity Building: Lessons from the Field*. Alliance for Nonprofit Management.
- [10] Madavo, C. (2006). *Five key messages: recommendations for capacity development in Africa*. Africa Region findings; no. 259. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [11] Matachi, A. (2006). *Capacity Building Framework*. UNESCO – UBA, Addis Ababa: UN Economic Commission for Africa.

- [12] Morgan, P. (2006). *The Concept of Capacity* (Draft Version). Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management.
- [13] Obadiah, M. (2008). Economic Growth and Policy Choice. In Nigeria: Lessons from the Asia Pacific. In P. Collier, C. C. Soludo, & C. Pattillo (Eds.), *Economic Policy Options for a Prosperous Nigeria*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [14] Onah, F. O. (2003). *Human Resource Management*. Enugu: Fulladu Publishing Company.
- [15] Oscar, E. I. C. (2012). *Capacity Development in the Nigerian Public Service: A Study of Edo State, Nigeria*. Ph.D Thesis, Ebonyi State University Abakaliki, Nigeria.
- [16] Reid, D. (1995). *Sustainable Development: An Introductory Guide*. London, Earthscan.
- [17] Udu, L. E. (2009). *Human Capacity Building in Selected Local Government Areas of Ebonyi State – The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Development Agencies (2000 – 2008)*. Ph.D Thesis, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria.
- [18] United Nations Development Programme (2001). *Management of Sustainable Human Development at Local Government Level Modules 1-4, UNDP Training Manual*.
- [19] United Nations Development Programme (2002). *Human Development Report*.
- [20] United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF] (1994). *Annual Report*.
- [21] Wadda, I. R. (2000). *The Brain Drain and Capacity Building in Africa: The Gambian experience*. Contributions to the Joint ECA/IOM/IDRC Regional Conference. February 22-24. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Retrieved from <http://www.iom.int/africandiaspora/pdf/WADDA.pdf>.
- [22] Watson, D. (2006). Monitoring and evaluating capacity and capacity development. Embracing innovative practices. *Capacity.org*, 29. Retrieved from <http://www.capacity.org>.
- [23] World Bank (2003). *Towards Country-led Development: A Multi-partner Evaluation of the Comprehensive Development Framework: findings from six countries case studies*. Washington.
- [24] World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *From One Earth to One World: An Overview*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix

Questionnaires

Dear Respondent,

I am currently carrying out a research entitled: “Human Capacity Building in selected Local Government Areas of Ebonyi State-the role of Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Development Agencies”, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) Degree in Public Administration.

Please, furnish answers to the questions below by ticking (√) as appropriate in the boxes provided.

Your kind responses to these questions are purely for academic exercise. All information gathered will be treated in strict confidence and will not be used for any other purpose other than the one stated above.

Thanks immensely for your anticipated co-operation.

Larry Udu, Ph.D

(Researcher)

Personal data

Institution/LGA

Community Group /Development Association.....

Sex: Male Female

Educational qualification(s)

Please tick (✓) in one box (only) that represents your answer.

Section A: Issues relating to capacity building through workshops and training (for every respondent).

1. Have you ever-participated in human capacity-building programmes organized by NGOs or the World Bank- Assisted, Ebonyi State Community-Based Poverty Reduction Agency (EB-CPRA)?
Yes No
2. If yes in No 1, how many times have you participated in such activities?
 - a) Once
 - b) Twice
 - c) Three times
 - d) Four times and more
3. If yes in No 1, in which capacity did you participate?
 - a) As community Representative
 - b) As LGA officer/Staff
 - c) As World Bank/NGO staff
 - d) As an observer
4. What areas did the workshop/seminar focus on?
 - a) Skills and entrepreneurial capacity
 - b) Revenue generation
 - c) Work ethics
 - d) All of the above
 - e) None of the above
5. At what stage were you involved in the capacity-building programme?
 - a) Planning stage
 - b) Organizing stage
 - c) Implementation stages
 - d) All of the above stages
6. What were your key role in the workshops?
 - a) Facilitator
 - b) Co-ordinator
 - c) Repertoire
 - d) Ordinary Participant

7. What do you think is the major incentive for attracting participation in capacity-building programmes?
- a) Monetary incentive
 - b) Proximity to training venue
 - c) Reputation of the organizers
 - d) Some or all of the above
 - e) None of the above
8. To what extent do you think your participation was able to influence the overall capacity-building objective of the programme?
- a) Very large extent
 - b) Large extent
 - c) Limited extent
 - d) Very limited extent
 - e) No extent
9. How do you think the relationship between the development agency or NGOs and the benefiting council/communities affected the objective of the capacity-building programme?
- a) Very significantly
 - b) Significantly
 - c) Fairly significantly
 - d) Insignificantly
 - e) Very insignificantly
10. What are the popular methods of training in the capacity-building programme in which you have been involved?
- a) Oral coaching only
 - b) Oral and practical training
 - c) Interactive sessions
 - d) All of the above
11. How would you rank the effectiveness of the strategies/methods adopted by the NGOs and or the EB-CPRA in the capacity-building programmes in relation to skill acquisition?
- a) Highly effective
 - b) Just effective
 - c) Fairly effective
 - d) Just ineffective
 - e) Very ineffective
12. To what extent do you think the programmes were able to improve the quality of entrepreneurial life of the benefiting councils and communities?
- a) Very large extent
 - b) Large extent
 - c) Limited extent

- d) Very Limited extent
- e) No extent
13. How many cottage industries have been established in your community by the participants in the capacity building program in response to acquired skill for indigenous technology?

- a) One
- b) Two
- c) Three
- d) Four and above
- e) None

14. Given the option, would you subscribe to capacity-building strategies adopted by NGOs or the EB-CPRA at the council and community levels?

- a) Yes No

15. How do you think LGAs respond to capacity-building programmes?

- a) Very positively
- b) Positively
- c) Negatively
- d) Very Negatively
- e) Indifferently

Section B: Issues on capacity building through micro-projects (for LGA, community & Development Associations only).

16. Is your community benefiting from the World Bank Assisted Micro-project scheme operated by the Ebonyi State Community-Based Poverty Reduction agency (EB-CPRA)?

- Yes No

17. If yes, how many of such projects have been established in your area?

- a) One
- b) Two
- c) Three
- d) Four
- e) Five and above

18. How were the projects identified/selected?

- a) By appraised needs and recommended by community development committee (CDC)
- b) Selected by Government Agency only
- c) By the CDC and EB-CPRA working as a team
- d) I don't know

19. Did your community participate in the execution of these projects? a) Yes b) No

20. Was your community made to pay any counterpart contribution? a) Yes b) No

21. How would you assess the general contributions of the Micro-projects in improving the living conditions of the community members?

- a) Very highly
- b) Highly
- c) Average
- d) Low
- e) Very low

22. How would you rank the sustainability of the facilities offered by NGOs and the EB-CPRA to the benefiting communities/councils (for at least 5-10 years duration)?

- a) Highly sustainable
- b) Moderately sustainable
- c) Fairly sustainable
- d) Insustainable
- e) Highly insustainable

23. Which of the followings do you think is the most pressing problem constraining human capacity development programmes at the grass roots level?

- a) Inability of government to pay counterpart funds
- b) Insincerity on the side of the organizers
- c) Lack of clear focus and goals
- d) High illiteracy rate at the community levels

Pervasive poverty at the community levels

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the authors, with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license.