

Chief Editor

Dr. A. Singaraj, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.

Editor

Mrs.M.Josephin Immaculate Ruba

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

1. Prof. Dr.Said I.Shalaby, MD,Ph.D.
Professor & Vice President
Tropical Medicine,
Hepatology & Gastroenterology, NRC,
Academy of Scientific Research and Technology,
Cairo, Egypt.
2. Dr. Mussie T. Tessema,
Associate Professor,
Department of Business Administration,
Winona State University, MN,
United States of America,
3. Dr. Mengsteab Tesfayohannes,
Associate Professor,
Department of Management,
Sigmund Weis School of Business,
Susquehanna University,
Selinsgrove, PENN,
United States of America,
4. Dr. Ahmed Sebihi
Associate Professor
Islamic Culture and Social Sciences (ICSS),
Department of General Education (DGE),
Gulf Medical University (GMU),
UAE.
5. Dr. Anne Maduka,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Economics,
Anambra State University,
Igbariam Campus,
Nigeria.
6. Dr. D.K. Awasthi, M.Sc., Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry,
Sri J.N.P.G. College,
Charbagh, Lucknow,
Uttar Pradesh. India
7. Dr. Tirtharaj Bhoi, M.A, Ph.D,
Assistant Professor,
School of Social Science,
University of Jammu,
Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir, India.
8. Dr. Pradeep Kumar Choudhury,
Assistant Professor,
Institute for Studies in Industrial Development,
An ICSSR Research Institute,
New Delhi- 110070, India.
9. Dr. Gyanendra Awasthi, M.Sc., Ph.D., NET
Associate Professor & HOD
Department of Biochemistry,
Dolphin (PG) Institute of Biomedical & Natural
Sciences,
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
10. Dr. C. Satapathy,
Director,
Amity Humanity Foundation,
Amity Business School, Bhubaneswar,
Orissa, India.



ISSN (Online): 2455-7838

SJIF Impact Factor : 6.093

EPRA International Journal of

Research & Development (IJRD)

Monthly Peer Reviewed & Indexed
International Online Journal

Volume: 4, Issue:2, February 2019



Published By
EPRA Publishing

CC License





INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY AND MANAGEMENT OF DISASTER RELIEF MATERIALS IN RIVERS AND BAYELSA STATES: A STUDY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY (NEMA)

Girigiri, Barinem Wisdom

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

Anele, Kinikanwo A.

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

Badey, Dinebari

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Natural disaster relief donations and management is a specialized area that is reserved for professional agencies to handle. Here in Nigeria, disaster relief donation and management is often coordinated by the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA). This paper examined Institutional Capacity and Management of Disaster Relief Materials to victims in Rivers and Bayelsa States with a focus on the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) during the 2012 flood. In order to achieve this aim, purposive sampling technique was adopted to select most impacted Local Government Areas and communities in the two States. A total sample size of 839 was used for the study as the questionnaire respondents. Out of the 839 questionnaire distributed, 151 were not returned, while 688 were duly filled and returned. Two theories which are: collective stress theory and contingency theory were reviewed in the study. However, contingency theory was adopted for the study. The study adopted survey research design. The study found that the nature of training given to NEMA staff in response to distribution of relief materials is adequate. The study also revealed that despite the provision of relief materials to victims of the 2012 flood devastation, their desired needs were not met such as economic activities lost to the flood. Relief materials were delivered but not almost immediately. This proved a low institutional capacity response by NEMA to disaster situations. The study therefore recommends that since disaster can affect the national plans and economic base of the country, it goes therefore to say, the establishment of the Ministry of Disaster to handle specific disaster issues different from that of environment is very necessary.

KEYWORDS: *Institutional capacity, disaster management, NEMA*

1. INTRODUCTION

It is important to note that all over the world, natural disaster relief donations and management is a specialized area that is reserved for professional agencies to handle. Here in Nigeria, disaster relief donation and management is often coordinated by the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA). However, the agency has been accused of not being highly effective and efficient in dealing with the task of disaster management in the country. This has been attributable to weak partnerships, institutional structures and inadequate government support (Kolawale, 2016). With regard to partnership, NEMA has been indicted for not forming strong collaborations with other agencies hence relief donations and management are usually done uncoordinatedly by different organizations in the country.

In relation to institutional structures, Kolawale (2016) is of the opinion that NEMA's institutional framework does not match the challenges they encounter and as such require significant upgrade. Lastly, he blames government for inadequate funding of NEMA which according to him undermines the effectiveness and efficiency of the agency in delivering its functions. In the light of the above, the frequency and severity of disaster events such as floods, fire outbreaks and others are placing greater strain on the resources and funding of the Emergency Management Agencies in Nigeria. Hence it is imperative to gain a detailed understanding about how they manage these resources in the light of disaster relief donations in Rivers and Bayelsa States in the Niger Delta region.

The management of disaster risk is an ever-increasing global problem, and hydro-meteorological activities make up the majority of disaster events (United Nations, 2007). In the case of the developing countries, Nigeria's Niger Delta region is considered as one of the most vulnerable to the effects of disasters especially natural ones (Mmom & Pedro, 2012). In the Niger Delta, these effects are increasingly evident in the form of higher temperatures, heavy and prolonged rainfall and the resultant floods and shoreline erosion. This is not to rule out disasters that are purely associated with the activities of man especially displacement of people resulting from long and protracted social conflicts.

It would be recalled that the flood that took place in 2012 generated significant social, economic, health, policy and academic problems for Nigeria, with a clear demonstration of the risk that natural disaster can pose to human security. Igwe, (2016) in his research work conducted on Community-Based Resilience to the 2012 disaster in Orashi Area of Rivers State, concluded that timely information,

adaptability and planning through raising public awareness would in no small measure prepared the people to manage future disaster.

Bugaji (2012) recounted in his work, over 2.3 million people were displaced from their homes, 363 people lost their lives in the floods in addition to 16 million people, in 108 local governments, negatively affected. In financial terms, the Centre for Human Security (CHS) of the Olusegun Obasanjo Presidential Library Foundation, estimated that the total losses from the flood were 2.6 trillion Naira or \$16.9 billion (CHS, 2013). In similar revelation of what disasters have cost Nigeria and the Niger Delta in particular, Chukwu-Okeah (2012) points out that during the last twenty years, especially in 2012, floods in the Niger Delta have accounted for 39% of total natural hazards/disaster that cost the local communities, on average, in excess of ₦300,000,000 loss.

While flooding is not the only disaster in Nigeria, it seems to be the most common and more widespread than any other kind of disaster. According to Etuonovbe (2011) flooding is the most common natural disaster in Nigeria. Flooding is recorded every year in all the states along the Niger River and its tributaries, frequently causing disasters. Moreover, two-thirds of Bayelsa State and half of Delta State are inundated by devastating floods for at least a quarter of each year. In districts under water, schools and markets are suspended for weeks at a time Efe, (2010) making such areas in serious need of relief donations almost all year round.

There have been few studies on organizational effectiveness in Nigeria. Onaolapo (2014) study on organizational effectiveness and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) delivery in the Niger Delta represent a major watershed in this regard. This study's strength lies in providing a very remarkable insight into how organizations operating within conflict zones such as the Niger Delta region need to redefine their structural priorities in order to be effective in delivering the new demands of CSR in their host communities. Onaolapo (2014) study though useful, has very little to offer in terms of relating organizational effectiveness to disaster relief management.

With regard to NEMA and disaster management, a handful of recent studies have been identified. For example, Idris (2012) studied on the response of NEMA to disaster risk management and came up with the finding that the agency makes significant progress whenever they are on ground but their response capacity is low. Obeta (2014 in Igwe, 2016) study on institutional approach to flood disaster management in Nigeria, observed the clumsy

institutional method of managing the disaster. The findings came to the conclusion that response were rather ad-hoc, ineffective and poorly coordinated, reactionary rather than proactive. Odulari (2016) and Kolawale (2016) on the other hand engaged in a similar study of the institutional capacity of NEMA in terms of management of disasters in Nigeria. Remarkably, both studies came to the conclusion that NEMA’s institutional capacity is constrained by the Nigerian factor of corruption which further undermine their ability to function optimally in times of disaster management.

While it is easy to see that the studies of Idris, Odulari and Kolawale came relatively close in terms of providing understanding on disaster management by NEMA in Nigeria, they did not sufficiently provide knowledge on how NEMA coordinates and manages the distribution of relief materials when it comes to disaster management. This suggests a critical academic gap in existing literature that requires further study to fill. In the light of the foregoing, this study intends to fill this research gap by providing empirical insight into the issue of Institutional Capacity and Management of Disaster Relief Materials in Rivers and Bayelsa States: A Study of NEMA.

The aim of this study is to examine the institutional capacity of NEMA in organizational management of disaster relief materials in Rivers and Bayelsa States during the 2012 flood disaster. Specifically, objectives of the study are to: examine the degree of response by NEMA in relation to time management in the coordination and management of relief materials in Rivers and Bayelsa States, examine

the effectiveness of the nature of training in relation to disaster relief management by NEMA in Rivers and Bayelsa States, investigate whether NEMA actually provided relief materials to the flood affected communities and victims, investigate whether there were certain challenges that can affect the smooth distribution of relief materials by NEMA in Rivers and Bayelsa States during the 2012 flood disaster and investigate the kind of relief materials provided to the communities and victims to cushion the effects of the devastations.

2. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted the survey research design. Surveys make it easy to gather information that are easily analyzed for generalization. Interviews and questionnaire administration are key components of the survey method. The use of survey makes it easy to draw necessary data that help in determining the link between institutional capacity and management of disaster relief materials by NEMA in Rivers and Bayelsa States during 2012 flood devastation.

The population of the study are all those affected by the 2012 flood disaster in Rivers and Bayelsa States as well as all staff of the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) operating in the Niger Delta region. According to the Niger Delta Geophysical Survey (2012), the total populations of the affected communities in the two States; Bayelsa (450,000) and Rivers (380,000) (*see Table 3.1 below for breakdown*). Hence, the total population affected by the natural disaster in the two states is put at 830,000.

Table 1: Population of Flood Affected Areas in Bayelsa& Rivers States

	LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA	COMMUNITIES	POPULATION AFFECTED
Bayelsa	1. Ekeremor	Aiegbe, Aleibiri, Amabulour, Ananagbene, Angalawei-Gbene, Ayamassa, Bown-Adagbabiri, Ebikeme-Gbene, Eduwini-Ekeremor, Feremoama, fontoru-Gbene, Isampou, Isreal o-zion, lalagbene, Nodoro, Norhene, Obrighbene, Ogbogbene, Ogbosuwar, Oposoma, Oyiakiri, Peretou-Gbene, Tamogbene, Tamuubene, Tarakiri, Tietiegbene	450,000
	2. Kolokuma/Opokuma	Akaibiri, Aya-Ama, Ayibabiri, Ayokoroma, Gbaramatu, Igbanwa, Igbedi, Kalama, Odi, Ofonibziri, Kolobaa, Oloibiri, Oyabu, Sabagreia, Sampou	
	3. Ogbia	Abobir, Akolomani, Amorokeni, Amuruto, Anyama, Egeleama, Elebele, Emadike, Emago, Emakalakala, EmegaiEpebu, Ewama, Ewoi, Igbo Imiringi, Lyakiri, Kolo, Obakilolo, Obelebiri, Obuaba, OgbiaOgboama, Ogireyankiri, Okiki, Okodi, Olobiri, Ologi	
	4. Sagbama	Abuku, Adagbabiri, Agbere, Agoro, Agorogbene, Akeddei , Angalabiri, Anibeze, Asamabiri, Bolou-Olrua, Dagnnama, Ebendebiri, Egbepulougbene, Ekperirmware, Elemebiri, Igoni, Ikpidiama, Kanan, Odoni, Ofoni, Ogobiri, Ogobokiriama, Ogoni, Okumbiri, Osibiri, Ossiam, Sagbama Toru-Angiama	

	5. Southern Ijaw	Oporoma, Abagbene, Abolgbene, Agidigbere, Aguobiri, Aleegbene, Amassoma, Angiama, Angiama-Gbene, Ayama, Ayoubene, Azuzuama, Baberegbene, Biabugbene, Biabogbene, Bolongbene, Boma, Climonbene, Diebu, Egarebeni, Ekeni, Ekowa, Emete, Eniwari, Erefumakomogbene, Ezetu, Foinbiri, Furepa	
	6. Yenagoa	Abasere, Agbia, Agbobiri, Agorogbene, AgudamaEpie, Akada, Akpide, Akunomi, Amarata, Amasso, Anyamabele, Atissa, Azikoro, Bebelibiri, Biogbolo, Biseni, Bumodi, Ede-Pie, Egbebiri, Ekeki, Ekpetiama, EmblamaEpie, Fangba Freetown,	
Rivers	1. Abua/Odual	Anyu, Ogboloma, Ophonyepaar, Emelego, Ekunaga, Emago, Amutoro, Akani, Ebedum, Emirikpoko, Odau	380,000
	2. Ahoada West	Egboama (EncheOgbogo), Kala-Ogbogolo, Opu-Ogbogolo, Idu-Ekpeye, Ukpeliende, Akalaolu, Emezi 1, Emezi11, Edagben, Odawu, Isua, Okparaki, Ususu, Odiake-Ugbobi, Oshie, Akinima, Akienison, Eliabi, Mbiama, Ogbo, Betterland JK4, Okarki, Odawu, Oshogbere, Ukpato, Ula-okobo, Oshika, Ogbologbolo, Uyakama, Anakpor, Ogbodhi, Odhiogbor, Ebrass, Akalamini, Ula Okobo1, Odhidwe, Okogbe	
	3. Ahoada East	Ogbo, UlaEhuda, Odiemerenyi, Ihugbogo, OderekeAkoh, Okporowo, Ozochi, Odiagbidi, Ula-ikata, Oshigbokor, Obumeze, Ilubuluko, Edeoha, Okoma and Ikata	
	4. Ogba/Egbema /Ndoni	UwaOma, Ali Oma, Ubuloko, Ohnauku, Ogbuta, Okurowaya, Odumelu, Isukwa, Ndoni, Osiakpu, Okasu, Ikiri, Oboburu, Ogbogu, Mgbede, Okwuzi, Okposi, Egwe, Obiohuru, Ogbo-Ama, Obakata-Obos, Oba-Oma, Ebuzo, Osomini, OsominiEluOha, Obohla, Ogbidima, Agbogue, Obokmoha, Ebelechi, Oku-Oba, Okua-Ugo.	

Shell Petroleum Development Company, Niger Delta Flood Survey, 2012; <https://nigeriazipcodes.com/category/list-of-towns-and-villages-in-bayelsa-sate, Godly, 2010>

800 was the sample size for the study, which was determined using the Taro Yamane formula and in addition to this was 39 member’s staff of NEMA making the total of 839. See the formula

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where:

- n = the expected sample population
- N = the population of the study
- E = level of significance

Thus, using 0.05 level of significance for the study, the sample size is as shown in Table 3.2 below:

Table 2: Sample Size Computation using Taro Yamane Formula

Taro Yamane	Bayelsa	Rivers	Total Size
$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$	N= 450000	N=380000	830,000
	$(e)^2 = .05 \times .05 = 0.0025$	$(e)^2 = .05 \times .05 = 0.0025$	
	$0.0025 \times 450000 = 1125$	$0.0025 \times 380000 = 950$	
	$1 + 1125 = 1126$	$1 + 950 = 951$	
	$\therefore n = 450000 \div 1126 = 400$	$\therefore n = 380000 \div 951 = 400$	800

Having identified the LGAs of reference in the two states, the purposive sampling technique adopted to select the most impacted LGA in each of the state. Within the most impacted LGAs, emphasis was on the

most impacted communities which were selected purposively. There are two broad data collection methods applied in this study. These are the primary and secondary techniques. The questionnaire and

personal interview methods were the main primary data collection technique that was used in this study. Based on this, information was obtained through the administration of a self-designed questionnaire to 800 respondents in the selected communities and 39 NEMA staff. Secondary techniques of data collection for this study were largely depended on extensive document reviews. In this light, information was sourced from related empirical works already published by other scholars. This takes the form of literature review. Consequently, information was extracted from textbooks, articles in print and electronic journals, magazines, the internet and any other print materials.

3. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL POSITION

The theoretical perspectives on organizational effectiveness have been very robust. However, a particular trend is easily noticed where scholars focus more on trying to test theoretical assumptions in relation to how well these theories drive effectiveness in particular organizations. Organizational effectiveness is the concept of how effective an organization is in achieving the outcomes the organization intends to produce (Etzioni, 1964). Meanwhile, this definition that view organizational effectiveness as a simple internal achievement related to profit and production have long been discounted with the demise of the stockholder theory of the firm (Gibson & Gibson, 1998).

Frederick Taylor's time and motion theory kick-started the knowledge base on the concept of organizational effectiveness even though he did not openly referred to his analytical endeavour as such, his scientific management theory provided the foundational theoretical drive for organizational effectiveness. By laying down the clear parameters for ensuring that people and work tools fit the task at hand, Taylor provided the first theoretical guide to the discussion now clearly referred to as organizational effectiveness in the field of management and industrial relations. Thus for the first time, the application of scientific principles to the issue of management in organization as a way of ensuring effectiveness and efficiency was introduced after several studies called time and motion studies. This provided the necessary theoretical guide that ruled the management ideology of Taylor's time despite its many shortcomings.

It is important to note by pointing to the fact that Taylor's scientific management theory is recognized as a watershed in the understanding of organizational effectiveness. The theory also came to mean any system of organization that clearly spelled out the functions of individuals and groups. With even less fidelity to the original meaning, it has been used to describe any situation where jobs are subdivided and

individuals perform repetitive tasks for the purpose of ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in an organization. The main objective of the scientific management theory is improving economic efficiency, especially labour productivity. It was one of the earliest attempts to apply science to the engineering processes and to management (Galbraith, 2001). Its peak of influence came in the 1920s and was highly influential but had begun an era of competition with opposing or complementary ideas. Although scientific management as a distinct theory or school of thought was almost obsolete by the 1930s, most of its themes are still important parts of today's management philosophy and most especially to the understanding of organizational effectiveness.

With the decline of Taylor's scientific management theory, the participative management of the human relations people (Mintzberg, 1991) emerged to provide a human face to the problem of organizational effectiveness. This set of theories debunked the overly 'economic man' perspective that the scientific management theory bourgeoned. The argument of the human relations school of thought rested on the fact that humans are not essentially driven by economic incentives alone and cannot entirely be understood as such. Hence, the emergence of the Chicago School and its allied researchers known as the human relations school provided a new direction to the understanding of organizational effectiveness especially through the popular Hawthorne Experiment.

Much as this is the case, Fatoyi (2016) is of the view that the human relations perspective provided the human side of organizational effectiveness that Taylorism lacked in the first place. In other words, human relations perspective acknowledged the fact that informal associations in organizations are critical to the effectiveness and productivity of any organization. As a result, the human relations school of thought changed the way organizational management operated by drawing attention to social cleavages that emerge during the course of interaction in the workplace. It is the beliefs of the human relations school that in very large formal organization, informal groups or associations equally emerge that require managerial skills and attention if the organization is to function effectively. The emergence of the human relations school threw significant light on the subject matter of organizational effectiveness especially in the light of the emergence of labour unions and their effect on work as well as production.

While Taylor's scientific management theory set the tone for organizational effectiveness thinking and practice, the human relations school provided a new dimension to this thought process. However, after the human relations school came the contingency theorists, who argued that; having the right tools and

the best staff that can manage such tools as well as understanding the nature of informal associations in the organization is not only the necessary and sufficient condition for organizational effectiveness. In fact, there are unique environmental circumstances that can undermine organization effectiveness given the different socio-ecological and technical differences that different organizations are faced with.

In the light of this assumption, contingency theorists hold that, effective organizations design themselves to match their conditions (Wahab, 2014). According to Galbraith (2001) in contingency theory, there is no one best way to achieve organizational effectiveness; any way of organizing is not equally effective. Contingency theory is guided by the general orienting hypothesis that "organizations whose internal features best match the demands of their environments will achieve the best adaptation" (Smith, 1984). It could be easily said that the contingency school of thought provided meaning to the two theoretical perspectives discussed above. This is especially in the light of the fact that understanding the unique context in which scientific management is applied is particularly important to its success as much as it is to the informal social relations that emerge in the workplace.

4.1. Issues in Disaster Analysis and management

The issues of disasters whether natural or man-made continue to stand out as a major concern given the social, political and economic outcomes associated with them. It has been observed, it is beyond polemics that all over the world there have been series of natural and man-made disasters that have wrought devastation on lives and resources. In a historical survey of the century with the highest forms of disasters, Alani (2012) using meteorological data from across the world reported that within the first decade of the 21st century alone, incidents of chemical spillages, explosions, earthquakes, landslides, thunderstorms, hurricanes, infernos, tornadoes, floods, wild fires, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, dam collapses, violent uprisings and massacres have been reported with various degrees of destruction more than any other century in human history. Institutional and individual observers of these incidents agree that there has been an increase in these occurrences over the past decade (Levine, 2013 and Makinde, 2015).

While the experiences of disasters vary from country to country, there are grim indicators that no State on the earth is insulated from disasters (Mumuni, 2013). For developing countries such as Nigeria, the weakness of State infrastructure, absence of appropriate legal and policy frameworks and sometimes inadequate resources particularly creates situations of vulnerabilities during disaster scenarios. This is why Fadahunsi (2013) opined that the

prevention, management and reduction of disasters are therefore a huge challenge for a country like Nigeria. Countries throughout the world have recognised the need to formulate a clear regulatory agenda aimed at the prevention, management and reduction of disasters. A manifestation of this was the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015 titled "Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters: A Global strategy to Reduce Disaster Risks". The HFA was the first plan to explain, describe and detail the work that is required from all different sectors on the issue of disaster intervention. It was developed and agreed on with the many partners needed to reduce disaster risk - governments, international agencies, disaster experts and many others - bringing them into a common system of coordination.

Hyogo Framework is the key instrument for implementing disaster risk reduction, adopted by member states of the United Nations-Nigeria inclusive. Its overarching goal is to build resilience of nations and communities to disasters, by achieving substantive reduction of disaster losses by 2015 in lives, and in the social, economic, and environmental assets of communities and countries.

The HFA offers five areas of priorities for action, guiding principles and practical means for achieving disaster resilience for vulnerable communities in the context of sustainable development. They are:

1. Make Disaster Risk Reduction a Priority: Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation;
2. Know the Risks and Take Action: Identify, assess, and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning;
3. Build Understanding and Awareness: Use knowledge, innovation, and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels;
4. Reduce Risk: Reduction the underlying risk factors; and
5. BePreparedand Ready to Act: Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

While many nations still struggle with the implementation of the HFA, the international community is already thinking beyond 2015. In March 2012, in Geneva, the Special Representative of the Un Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction, Margareta Wahlstrom and Yoichi Otabe, the Japanese Ambassador to the International Organizations in Geneva launched the post -2015 Stakeholders' Consultative Forum.

The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) has been working tirelessly to place Nigeria among the list of nations that have

substantially achieved the target set by the Hyogo Framework for Actions. In her drive to strengthen the mechanism for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and emergency preparedness, Nigeria has received a lot of support and cooperation from the United Nations System, Multilateral Organizations, Development Partners and Regional Platforms such as the European Union (EU), African Union (AU) and ECOWAS (Daily Trust, 30th April, 2013).

There is evidence to suggest that in many countries there has been an increase in the risk of natural disasters due to environmental degradation (World Bank, 2013). Natural disasters are complex and multifaceted events resulting from mismanaged and unmanaged risks that reflect current conditions and historical factors (Fadahunsi, 2013). The frequency of dramatic natural shocks around the world is a reminder that governments and the international community need to be proactive and do more to prevent and mitigate the human misery and economic costs that result from such calamities.

The study of disaster intervention in four countries by Kolawale (2016) revealed that one of the major setback to disaster intervention is the issue of weak institutional readiness. According to him, relief may come increasingly rapidly in best case situations but what is achieved in the rehabilitation and recovery phase is typically inadequate. The human ‘cost’ in terms of deaths, injuries, health challenges and loss of human capital are now widely recognized. The number of people affected by large natural disasters has been rising with three times more people affected by disasters every year. The current natural disasters in the United States of America have led to one of the highest deaths and loss of properties in hurricane Katrina. Poor households are the most exposed to negative shocks.

5 PRESENTATION OF DATA

Table 3: Investigate the effectiveness of the type of relief materials provided to the communities and victims by NEMA to cushion the effects of the flood disaster of 2012 in Rivers and Bayelsa States.

S/N	Management of Funding	A	SA	D	SD
1.	Did the relief materials provided gave some temporary succor to your communities during the 2012 flood disaster?	83 (12)	120 (17)	293 (43)	192 (28)
2.	Were food stuff such as rice, beans, yams, garri, stock fish, etc. and materials such as zinc, cement, nails, blankets, mats, foams, mosquito nets and drugs among the materials provided by NEMA and others during the 2012 flood disaster?	320 (47)	136 (20)	99 (14)	133 (19)
3.	Did the disaster relief materials distributed on the basis of household or individuals being affected by the 2012 flood disaster?	360 (52.3)	123 (18)	99 (14.3)	106 (15.4)
4.	From all indications would you, in your opinion, say that the disaster relief materials distributed in Rivers and Bayelsa met the desired needs of the people at the material time considering what was lost to flood event of 2012?	120 (17.4)	133 (19.3)	290 (42.1)	145 (21.0)

Source: Author's field work, 2018.

Levine (2013) study of over 300 poor households in Haiti after a major disaster using basic needs approach suggested that the poor are less able to respond to crisis than the non-poor. While the most evident impacts are in lost assets, the impacts can permeate further, into social structure and psychological well-being (Levine, 2013).

The link between high exposure to disaster risk and poverty is now widely accepted. Environmental degradation, migration, lack of land rights, and lack of access to basic services are just some of the factors which have a direct adverse effect on the poor and also exacerbate the risk of, or difficulty in recovering from natural hazards. Tearfund(2010) started that 98% of those killed and affected by natural disaster are from developing countries, and it is estimated that by 2025, over half of all people living in developing countries will be highly vulnerable to floods and storms.

It is important to note that amongst all the natural disasters, the issue of flooding has come to attract the highest number of studies around the world. This may be as a result of its frequency and widespread nature globally. However, after examining the empirical literature on flooding, it is easy to pick out a few that make meaning to this study. For instance, the study by Laughlin and Kalma (2000), led to the development of a methodology for flood risk mapping using a regional weather data and local terrain analysis, it was discovered that seasonal rainfall which generate flooding conditions is also a function of changes in weather patterns. By extension, it was also found that the deviation of temperatures at individual sites could be predicted from a local terrain parameter reflecting the extent of cold air accumulations.

Table 4.6 investigates the effectiveness of the type of relief materials provided to cushion the effects on the communities and victims. On the basis of the temporary succor to victims by NEMA during the 2012 flood, 12% of the respondents completely agreed to it, while another 17% respondents strongly agreed. Meanwhile, 43% set of different respondents disagreed and finally, 28% strongly disagreed.

Whether relief materials such as beans, rice, yams, zinc, blankets, mosquito nets, drugs, etc were distributed, 47% majority of the respondents agreed they were provided, and 20% strongly agreed so. Another 19% disagreed while 14% different set of respondents strongly disagreed.

Whether the relief materials were distributed on the basis of household, 52.3% majority agreed it was so, and 18% representing another respondents strongly agreed. In another development, 14.3% disagreed it was on household basis and lastly, 15.4% strongly disagreed to this.

Whether the material distributed met the desired needs of the people considering their lost, 17.4% of the respondents agreed to the assertion, while another 19.3% respondents strongly agreed. And the larger respondents representing 42.1% disagreed it was so. Finally, 21.0 respondents strongly disagreed that it never met expectations.

Table 4: Degree of response by NEMA in relation to time management in the coordination and management of relief materials in Rivers and Bayelsa State N=688

S/N		A	SA	D	SD
1.	Are you aware that relief materials were delivered to your community during the disaster flood?	330 (48)	135 (20)	98 (14)	125 (18)
2.	I assume that during the 2012 flood in Rivers and Bayelsa States, NEMA timely managed distributions of relief materials sent to your community.	102 (15)	123 (18)	282 (41)	181 (26)
3.	I feel that NEMA organisational structure does affects promptness in distributing relief materials to victims of flood disaster in Rivers and Bayelsa States in 2012.	109 (16)	113 (16)	317 (46)	149 (22)
4.	I assume that NEMA partnered with other environmental management agencies do help promptly to assist the victims and communities affected by the flood incidence in Rivers and Bayelsa States in distributing the relief materials.	270 (39)	106 (15)	197 (29)	115 (17)

Source: Author's field work, 2018.

Table 4.2 indicated a review of response by NEMA in relation to delivering of relief materials in Rivers and Bayelsa States during the 2012 flooding. The result for the analysis states that 48% respondents agreed, while another 20% strongly agreed to the assertion. Also, 14% of the respondents disagreed while 18% strongly disagreed to the statement.

On the issue of time management, 15% respondents agreed, while 18% strongly agreed to this. Furthermore, 41% respondents is in disagreement to timely distribution and managing relief materials and another 26% strongly disagreed completely.

On the issue of organisational structure affecting the prompt distribution of relief materials, 16% representing the respondents agreed to this statement, while 16% respondents strongly agreed. Also, another respondents of 46% disagreed to the assertion and lastly, 22% respondent in like manner strongly disagreed.

Majority of the respondents representing 39% of the population agreed that NEMA partnered with other environmental management agencies to assist the victims and communities affected by the 2012 flood incidence in Rivers and Bayelsa States, another 15% respondents strongly agreed. In another development, 29% respondents disagreed NEMA partnered with other agencies to assist the victims and in like manner, 17% representing different view strongly disagreed.

6. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study has shown from our findings that respondents agreed that NEMA delivered relief materials to affected communities. Although respondents believed that the relief materials were not timely delivered. In line with this Idris (2012) maintained that NEMA makes significant progress whenever they are on ground but their response capacity is low to disaster risk management.

The study also found out that NEMA has inadequate staff to discharge its function of distributing relief materials to victims of flood. This information resonates Obeta (2014 in Igwe, 2016) study on institutional approach to flood disaster management in Nigeria, as he observed the clumsy institutional method of managing the disaster. The findings came to the conclusion that response were rather ad-hoc, ineffective and poorly coordinated, reactionary rather than proactive.

It is also agreed that NEMA partnered with other environmental management agencies promptly to assist the victims and communities affected by the flood incidence in Rivers and Bayelsa States, although there is dissatisfaction with the activities of NEMA in respect to distribution of relief material.

The study has also shown that the nature of training to NEMA staff in response to the distributions of disaster relief materials is adequate. The study also indicated that NEMA organizes training for its staff, but it is conducted yearly. Search and rescue, management of relief and under water training are some of the trainings given to NEMA staff to enable them face the challenges that may arise during disaster relief distributions to victims and communities affected. And also the training giving to NEMA staff corresponds to the terrain of Rivers and Bayelsa States in respect to distributing relief materials to victims and communities impacted during disaster. These findings are in line with NEMA (2011) policy of providing for an appropriate training to the staff of the Agency because of the uniqueness of its responsibilities is imperative towards improving the effectiveness and efficiency of its employees at all levels. This requires a comprehensive training programme for career progression from one cadre to another. Various staff of the Agency has benefited from one form of training to the other ranging from the fundamental courses, the specialised courses and the professional courses in addition to attending international conferences and workshops. Reputable training institutions such as the Administrative Staff College of Nigeria (ASCON), Centre for Management Development (CMD), Industrial Training Fund (ITF), University of Ibadan Consultancy, the Nigeria Metrological Agency (NIMET), Nigeria Institute of Management (NIM), Chartered Institute of Personnel Management (CIPM), etc.

The study has further shown that there is a positive relationship in the organizational structure of NEMA. However, bureaucratic bottleneck most often affects the communication flows as part of the organizational structure negatively as the immediate actions by state coordinators during disaster period awaits directives from the director. It also follows that the organizational structure of NEMA does affect the management and coordination of relief materials in

Niger Delta. This supports Kolawale (2016) opinion that NEMA's institutional framework does not match the challenges they encounter and as such require significant upgrade. The upgrade in institutional framework is necessary because as Makinde (2015) clearly opines, a comprehensive natural disaster management approach covering risk prevention, risk mitigation, and effective recovery assistance in any society requires all stakeholders' involvement for it to be effectively achieved.

7. CONCLUSION

Scholars converge on the understanding that designated organizations handling disaster relief donations and management such as the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) in Nigeria, the Global Red Cross Organization among others have institutional mandate to anticipate and therefore plan for natural disaster management before they even occur (Idris, 2012; Makinde, 2015 and Kolawale, 2016). Now, whether we toe the contingency line, the point remains that managing relief donations during natural disaster periods require some level of organizational effectiveness for such a herculean activity to be achieved efficiently with minimal degree of mistake and not to increase the challenges of victims of such natural disasters.

This is why Kolawale (2016) calls for significant collaboration in times of natural disaster management. According to him, although the agency saddled with the responsibility of disaster management in Nigeria is the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), disaster response and its management require concerted effort and proper coordination and synergy among stakeholders involved in prevention as well as rendering assistance to victims of natural and man-made disasters. The following recommendations are made in the light of the findings of the study;

- 1. Establishment of ministry of disaster:** Since disaster can affect the national plans and economic base of the country, it goes therefore to say, the establishment of the Ministry of disaster to handle specific disaster issues different from that of Environment is very necessary because, for instance, where cash crops, livestock, sensitive facilities, etc. are affected by disaster, it has resulted into loss of development capital and destruction of production sources.
- 2. Establishment of permanent disaster relief structures:** State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) and Local Emergency Management Committee (LEMC) in Rivers and Bayelsa States in particular, and Niger Delta at large should see to establishing

permanent structures as proactive measures in each local government usually affected by floods to accommodate victims rather than closing down schools, making temporary tents for victims.

REFERENCES

1. Alani, K. (2012). *Women, Social Cohesion and Resilience in Conflict Environment*. Owerri, Springfield.
2. Bugaji, H. (2012). *The oil economy: A case of Nigeria*. Zaria, Ahmadu Bello University Press.
3. Chukwu-Okeah, G. O. (2012). *Flood in our Kitchen, Nowhere to hide*. Paper Presented at the Colloquium on 2012 Flood in Nigeria. Danic Hotel, Port Harcourt.
4. Etuonovbe, A.K. (2011). *Devastating Effect of Flooding in Nigeria*. FIG Working Week, 18-22 May 2011.
5. Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
6. Fadahunsi, T. (2013). *Between Management and Reduction: The New Problem of Environmental Scientists*. London, Routledge.
7. Fatoyi, A. (2016). *The Study of Scientific Management*. Lagos, University of Lagos Press.
8. Galbraith, J. (2001). *The Basics of Scientific Management Theory*. London, Routledge.
9. Gibson, J & Gibson, S. (1998) *Organizational Effectiveness The Internal Auditor*; Feb 1998; 55, 1; ABI/INFORM Global.
10. Idris, J. (2012). *The Sociology of Natural Disasters*. Kano, Adobayaro University Press.
11. Kolawale, F. (2016). *The Promise of Corporate Delivery*. London, Heinemann.
12. Laughlin, G. P. & Kalma, J. D. (2000). *Frost risk Mapping for Landscape Planning: A Methodology*. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, Vol. 42, pp. 41-51.
13. Levine, M. (2013): *The Promotion of Cooperatives*, ILO Cooperative Branch, at www.ica.coop/europe/ra2002/speech.
14. Makinde, D. (2015). *How Corporations Respond to Communities*. Lagos, McMillan Publishers.
15. Mintzberg, H. (1991). *The effective organization: Forces and forms*. MIT Sloan Management Review, the Magazine. <http://sloanreview.mit.edu/the-magazine/1991-winter/3225/the-effective-organization-forces-and-forms/>
16. Mmom, P.C. & Pedro, E.A. (2012). *Impact of the 2012 Flood on water Quality and Rural Livelihood in the Orashi Province of the Niger Delta, Nigeria*. *Journal of Geography and Geology*; Vol. 5, No. 3.
17. Mumuni, A. (2013). *Natural Disaster in Northern Nigeria*. Katsina. Kazimi Publications.
18. NEMA (2012) *Training Manual on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management for post primary Schools in South-South, Nigeria*.
19. Odulari, O. (2016). *Ad-hoc Responses in Disaster Management*. Port Harcourt. Arwansa Books.
20. Onaolapo, B. (2014). *Organizational Effectiveness for Stakeholder Value Creation in Nigeria Oil Industry: A case study of the Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria*. Thesis submitted.
21. Smith, M. J. (1984): *Contingency Rules Theory, context, and Compliance behaviors*. *Human Communication Research*, 10, 489-512.
22. Tearfund, D. (2010). *One Disaster too many: Why thousands are dying needlessly each year in preventable disasters*. A briefing for the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, 18-22nd January, Kobe, Japan.
23. United Nations (2007) *International Strategy for disaster Reduction Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. United Nations, Geneva.
24. Wahab, H. (2014). *Management theory and Practice*. Kano, Ado Bayero University Press.