

# Institutional Framework, Management and Coordination of Disaster Situations in Nigeria: Theoretical Standpoint on National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA)

Barinem Wisdom Girigiri PhD<sup>1</sup> and Porbari Monbari Badom, PhD<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Rivers State University, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Nkpolu Oroworukwo, Port Harcourt

<sup>2</sup>Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences. University of Port Harcourt, 500272, Nigeria

**Abstract** :The accuracy in handling and conforming to established procedures and objectives set by organizations to achieving results in course of attending to disaster situations has become a cumbersome process considering the environmental circumstances and the nature of disaster which could be naturalistic and humanistic or anthropogenic in nature that confront organizations. This paper which utilized description of secondary literature is a positioned one that is anchored on the two theories in consideration of NEMA as a specialized agency of government designated and saddled with the mandates to coordinate, investigate, monitor and manage disasters within the environmental peculiarities of where disaster occurs. Collective Stress and Contingency Theories are the two theories used in the study while the Contingency theory is the considered most relevant in the explanation of disaster management; the paper argued that collective stress situations emerged as a direct response to adaptation to the crises bedeviling the environment been affected by the disaster and how the people being affected can adapt to new strategies to survive in such environment. The paper maintains that NEMA adopts certain social constructs to help manage disaster situations. Furthermore, the paper in its adoption of the contingency theory upholds the view that no one best approach is very effective and efficient for any situation; but rather, advocates combination of approaches to achieving results when organizations encounter difficult situation. It is for the management of the organization (now NEMA) to apply approaches to a given suitable situations considering the ecological circumstances, the time constraint, the technology needed and those available man-power in the organization and the resources available to the organization to handle the structural components of the situations.

**Keywords:** Institutional Framework, Management, Coordination, Disaster situations, Contingency Theory, Collective Stress.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Managing and coordinating set objectives to achieve ends within organizations has been of great concern among sociologists and those in the field of Industrial Relations and Personnel Management among others. It is imperative to note that considering sweeping changes within the domain of organizational sphere of operations, for organizations to remain in operation, Organization of Economic Cooperation

and Development OECD (2016) provides three critical frameworks that are needed to be adhered to, to understand how organizations can be effective. These include the following propositions: (1) Organizations must ensure that resources match the objectives; (2) employees share the vision of the organization in terms of the related activity to be implemented and (3) the activity has shared value for organizations and a section of the society in general. Girigiri, Anele & Badey (2019) opined that the effectiveness and efficiency of an organization in delivering on set targets is principally contingent on the maximum effort at utilizing the available resources maximally for organization's successes and environmental gains.

In addition to the OECD critical framework for effective work organization, there is need to stress that the peculiar environment that organizations find themselves is another critical factor that influences how organizations operate and achieve effectiveness. Kolawale (2016) corroborating the latter argued that no matter the availability of both materials and human resources, organizations still need to consistently adjust to its environment for it to be effective and efficient in delivering goals. Meanwhile, two contending approaches exist on the issue of disaster management and coordination. One is the belief that contingencies emerge during disaster scenarios to make such organizations put to test the basic assumptions of the contingency approach in management and coordination given the fact that most disaster outcomes are not planned (Morris, 2013; Benanke, 2015 & Odulari, 2016). On the other hand, some scholars converge on the understanding that designated organizations handling disaster management and coordination during disaster period 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 disaster management before they even occur (Idris, 2012; Makinde, 2015 & Kolawale, 2016).

Now, whether we adopt the contingency theory which is the second approach, the point remains that managing and

coordinating disaster periods requires high level of organizational effectiveness for such a herculean task to be achieved efficiently and effectively with minimal degree of mistake while also reducing the challenges faced by victims of such disasters. This is the reason Kolawale (2016) calls for significant collaboration in times of 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. "Earthquake, hurricane, flood, and terrorist attack" are conversant and regular disasters. These terms, appear in the headlines too often. Of course, it is one thing to read about disaster; and it is another to live through one. In disaster situations, government and other efforts focus on helping people to survive, reduce tensions and not to replace everything that was lost (Awake, 2017).

Nonetheless, disasters come in various forms, locations and magnitude. Some disasters have a slow on-set as in the case of drought while some as in flood; have a rapid on-set with little or no warning time for preparedness thereby leading to much devastation on lives and properties, causing lots of dislocation. Disasters and emergencies turn back the hands of development clock destroying years of effort and labour, thereby perpetuating poverty and underdevelopment through the destruction of infrastructure and other economic investments (NEMA, 2014). Reducing disaster management to mere interventions, we lose vital opportunities to institute disaster management strategies as one of the pillars of sustainable national development (The NEMA News Paper Compendium, 2010 & 2011). The National Emergency Relief Agency (NERA) was first established in 1976 to coordinate disaster relief activities of the Federal Government, which was later broadened to include the mandate to coordinate disaster management in Nigeria in 1993. However, in March, 1999 the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) was established by Act 12 as amended by Act 50 which was promulgated, to manage disasters situations in the country through enabling structures (NEMA, 2014). Prior to the establishment of the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), response to disasters was individualistic and emanated separately from each tier of government (Federal, State and Local). Consequently, this approach had led to duplication of efforts, wastage of resources and sometimes responders get in each other's spheres of duty- a somewhat usurpation of duty. NEMA therefore was mandated to harmonize the activities of disaster management nationwide in line with global best practices (NEMA, 2012). According to the enabling law, the Agency shall among other things; formulate policy on all activities relating to disaster management in Nigeria and also coordinate the plans and programs for efficient and effective response to disaster at

National Level; monitor the state of preparedness of all organizations and agencies which may contribute to disaster management in Nigeria, collate data from relevant agencies, so as to enhance forecasting, planning and field operation of disaster management; educate and inform the public on disaster prevention and control measures; coordinate and facilitate the provision of necessary resources for research and rescue and other forms of disaster curtailment activities in response to distress calls (NEMA, 2013).

Other mandates expected to be carried out is to liaise with State Emergency Management Committees (SEMC), to assess and monitor, where necessary, the distribution of relief materials to disaster victims; process relief assistance to such countries as may be determined from time to time; liaise with the United National Disaster Reduction Organizations and such other International bodies for the reduction of natural and other disaster (NEMA 2013; 2014). Igwe (2016) stressed that, inefficiency of NEMA in managing disaster became glaring judging from the massive loss of lives, damage to households and industrial property associated with the 2012 nationwide flood event. Accordingly, Obeta (as cited in Igwe, 2016) affirmed deficiency of well-directed, well ordered institutional arrangement to coordinate response and performance during the 2012 flood disaster in Nigeria. What rather obtained in the area of response was unplanned, impromptu, ineffective and inadequate coordination. The Federal Government being aware and recognized the fact that disaster management is multidisciplinary and that successful response of activities can only be possible through an integrated and co-ordinate approach, place the disaster management responsibilities in the collaborative efforts of all the stakeholders. Since its inception, it has been tackling all kinds of disasters in several parts of Nigeria. Therefore, given the number of years it has been in operations, the organization presents itself as an attractive entity requiring content analysis to unearth its capacity readiness and methods of operations with regard to how management and coordination of disaster situations is been done. The author anchors his points of analysis on theoretical justification to drive home his point.

## II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

Intervention to address disasters has evolved through time into a complex policy subsystem, and disaster policy is implemented through a set of functions known as emergency management response (Muller and Whiteman, 2012). Modern approaches to emergency management and response involve multidimensional efforts to reduce our vulnerability to hazards; to diminish the impact of disaster, and to prepare for, respond to, and recover from those that occur (Olson, 2000). These responsibilities present formidable challenges for governments, corporate organization, private bodies, philanthropists, NGOs, etc. because of the extraordinary demands disaster events impose on the decision-making systems and service delivery infrastructure of the communities

they affect. In the context of a federally structured government, when the capacities of government jurisdictions at lower levels are overwhelmed, higher levels are called upon to assist, by either supporting or supplanting the activities of the subordinations jurisdictions. Likewise, assets and capabilities in the corporate and non-governmental sectors may be brought to bear (Olson, 2000). As a result, emergency management and response are intrinsically intergovernmental, and there abound cross-sector policy implementation challenges. Also, since disasters dramatically affect our physical, social and economic geography, there is a recent upsurge in empirical studies concerning the issue of how disasters are coordinated and managed around the world. The response to disaster in any society usually assumes philanthropic character (Sayegh, 2014) with stakeholders ensuring that affected persons recover in such a way that they eventually start to live normal lives after such devastating events. However, there are significant differences with respect to stakeholders' approach in disaster management in many countries (Muller & Whiteman, 2012). However, in Sayegh (2014) study of the major approaches to disaster recovery by government, NGOs and businesses, it was proven that philanthropy is the most popular among disaster relief donations actors especially in disaster management scenarios. Philanthropy in disasters includes two forms namely; funding and technical support. Funding refers to monetary support, and technical support includes providing facilities and volunteers. For example, an agency can send volunteers to disastrous areas to help mitigate associated shocks or risks.

Twigg (2015) has however pointed out in another study that the management of disaster-hit areas especially in terms of social response depends on the character of the responding organization. In a study of corporate involvement in disaster relief donations in most African countries, Twigg came to the conclusion that over 80 percent of companies get involved in disaster management and coordination for philanthropic and business reasons. The outcome of the study showed that companies gain benefits from responding to natural disasters, such as positive publicity, good image, and customer loyalty. Becker-Olsen, Cudmore & Hill (2012) in a previous study revealed that a mismatch between company's historical profit and the associated response to disaster situations in any society may result in negative and unfavourable thoughts and companies considered as irresponsible. Researchers have shown that when government and other stakeholders respond to disaster management and coordination through technical support to manage such adverse conditions, disaster recoveries can become quite stress-free (Ellen, Mohr & Webb, 2010). Disaster management agencies often respond to disasters with the hope of ensuring quick recovery for affected people. Regardless of the many tasks that disaster agencies undergo prior to disaster situations, disaster periods provide them with ample opportunity and time to prove that they are efficient and effective in their job as they undertake, physical and psychological programmes or activities that are required

for disaster recovery with the aim of achieving positive impact on the areas affected by disasters (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore & Hill, 2012; Simmons & Becker-Olsen, 2013). While the presence of the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) is yet to be seriously felt in Nigeria in terms of disaster management, the ability of the agency to galvanize relevant stakeholders in society to achieve robust results in such situations have been very low. Bamgboye (2013) & Makinde (2015) point to the fact that the involvement of one critical stakeholder (which is business corporations) in natural disaster relief management has been very minimal if not non-existent in Nigeria. This has been attributed to the fact that NEMA has not sufficiently created a collaborative environment for the involvement of corporations operating in the country. However, Makinde (2015)'s study of the flood disaster which occurred in 2012 revealed that International Oil Corporations (IOCs) played a significant role in disaster relief donations but this was done in isolation from the activities of NEMA making it easy for efforts to be duplicated. According to Makinde (2015), IOCs operating in Nigeria should begin to integrate natural disaster management into their overall corporate goal as a business strategy especially in the Niger Delta region and associated coastal communities.

According to Mumuni (2013) humanitarian organizations have a long history of public knowledge especially with regard to potency in disaster recovery situations. Humanitarian organizations go a long way to provide locally needed services, circulate money locally and contribute to a sense of community or social cohesion during and after natural disasters. They provide the necessary psychological, medical and technical support that disaster hit areas require to upgrade socio-economic conditions through support systems that ordinarily, individuals cannot get on their own. The study by Alani (2012) revealed that the importance of humanitarian organizations such as the Red Cross in disaster situations is a major subject of serious research in recent times. Historically, approaches have focused primarily on factors external to disaster affected communities, and have paid little attention to the ways in which Red Cross galvanize local efforts within the community to the process of recovery. The study of several flood ravaged communities in Nigeria revealed that the ability of specialized disaster recovery groups like the Red Cross to galvanize local resources for disaster recovery is significantly higher than government and corporations put together (Makinde, 2015).

Researches on the role of humanitarian NGO's have illuminated three mechanisms through which social networks and other kinds of social capital provide helps for communities hit by disasters can influence the process of recovery during and after natural disasters such as flooding (Agbo, 2012). First mechanism is where residents return and begin to work collectively, letting authorities in the area know their preferences and working to make themselves heard in the planning process is a technique deployed by the Red Cross with high effectiveness. This is usually referred to as

collective recovery (Agbo, 2012). Research on the process of return has underscored that individuals with more social ties whether through family, friends, a sense of belonging or place, or jobs are more likely to recover than those standing alone (Levine, 2013). Those who feel less connected to their neighbours, or who feel that their social networks is weak, are likely not to have sufficient support systems to manage risks during or after natural disasters. The second mechanism by which humanitarian NGOs can assist following disaster is with the overcoming of barriers to collective action (Fagade, 2016). Around the world, people often have strong beliefs and deeply rooted ideals, but they may not actually work to see these put into practice. This may be because they lack the time, energy, or ability, but it can also be because they assume that someone else will do the heavy lifting involved. Social scientists call this phenomenon free-riding, and because of it many are content to remain in their homes or offices while others go out and march, vote, sign petitions, blockade doors, and actually mobilize. Post-disaster situations often have collective action problems that require maximum participation. Communities with significant numbers of NGOs can better overcome the barriers to collective action and mobilize their members including other residents to participate in social actions that could trigger external support either from local, national or international agencies and governments (Alani, 2012). On the other hand, communities where less of these exist and other forms of social capital are lacking may confront the challenge of not having enough voice to attract external support of any kind.

A number of studies have underscored the role of social networks in broader processes of adaptation and resilience during and after disaster situations. One highly-cited study in *Science* magazine argued that local institutions and social networks provided the basis for both local and international action in response to increasing vulnerability. The article brought examples from the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami and the 2004 Hurricane Ivan to show how well-connected communities learned from previous hazards and used social connections provided under humanitarian organizations to strengthen their resilience (Geis, 2000). The researchers emphasized that “networks and institutions that promote resilience to present-day hazards also buffer against future risks, such as those associated with climate change” (Richard, Devinney, Yip, & Johnson, 2009). Similarly, scholars have researched the ways in which different types of social networks created varying degrees of capacities in two neighbourhoods devastated by Hurricane Katrina (Elliott, Haney, & Sams-Abiodun, 2010). One neighbourhood, the Lower Ninth Ward, was made up primarily of African-Americans who lived below the poverty line, while the other, Lakeview, was a neighbourhood made up primarily of affluent whites. Interviewing 100 residents from each of the neighbourhoods, the researchers sought to understand how networks - especially bonding and linking social capital - played a role in recovery after the storm. Overall, it took more

than twice as long for residents of the Lower Ninth Ward to return to their homes as their counterparts in Lakeview, and they also were about one-seventh as likely to contact a neighbour. In the Lower Ninth Ward, individuals were less likely to connect to their geographically proximal neighbours and friends, and also less likely to be able to call on the help of outsiders who lived beyond the ruined area. As a result, relative declines in trans-local assistance dovetailed with a relative inability to re-establish local residential networks to undercut the reconstitution of local sources of social support for Lower Ninth Ward residents.

Lastly, the strength of social networks in disaster management and rebuilding after disaster risks was acknowledged by another study in Nigeria. Nabegu (2014) used the wide variation in reconstruction rates among 7 communities in Kano State, Nigeria after the 2012 flooding experience to reject explanations for post-crisis recovery based on economic or state-centric hypotheses which posit that higher levels of economic resources or the presence of a cohesive and autonomous state are sufficient conditions for better recovery (Nabegu, 2014). Through side-by-side process tracing in selected communities along with cases of social networks in these communities, he showed how some areas in post flood Kano had greater citizen enthusiasm for and involvement in voluntary activities while others withered, especially as post flood time conditions deteriorated and top-down, government coercion intensified. This shows that collective action during stress periods associated with post natural and man-made disaster situations go a long way to reduce stress and risks. AfatVimo is a partner-agent micro-insurance model, where poor communities and commercial and public insurance companies have cooperated. AfatVimo scheme is a strong version of the micro-insurance designed for the poor households in disaster-prone areas (Geis, 2000). It protects people from the impacts of hazards on their assets by providing predetermined cash payouts in the aftermath of a disaster. This is done in return for monthly premiums, which are paid to the insurance companies through All Indian Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI). The role of AIDMI in the AfatVimo scheme is that of both facilitator and intermediary. While rigorous scientific assessments of the impact of micro-insurance are not yet available, current experience suggests that micro-insurance may increase access to finance aftershocks, thus strengthening coping and reducing the livelihoods of disastrous long-term consequences on livelihoods and household welfare. Insurance payouts also provide greater discretion to households and business in providing coping and recovery strategies after disaster has occurred (Alejandro, Maureen, Ben, & Han, (2014).

According to Berke, Kartez & Wenger (1993), the scheme covers damages or losses in a very wide range of disaster such as floods, earthquakes, cyclones, being struck by lightning, and landslides. The AfatVimo team compiled a list of potential beneficiaries for the scheme based on their registered demands. Once this insurance companies designed operational

policies and premiums have been set, AIDMI reconfirms the beneficiaries on the list and ensures that all of the requisite information has been collated and passed to the insurance companies. Policy holder's details are stored in a database kept by AIDMI. Once this process is completed, All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI) pays the premiums to the insurance companies on behalf of the beneficiaries, ensuring immediate coverage. If and when disaster occurs, the beneficiary immediately informs the AfatVimo team of the occurrence and the team responds quickly to process claim. The AIDMI assists beneficiaries in filing claims, since many of the AfatVimo beneficiaries are illiterate or have poor literacy skills, they require such assistance. The AfatVimo product as a scheme is currently promoted by a local membership-based organization called the Chamber of Commerce and Industry for Small Business (CCISB), which is a network of small-scale entrepreneurs ((Alejandro, et al. (2014). It is important to note that more studies on disaster relief and recovery are emerging every year given that disasters tend to occur especially during the rainy season. Several disasters have been reported in 2017 with high rates of devastation like never before seen. For instance, Hurricane IRMA which recently did hit the Caribbean and most parts of the United States of America with high level storm surge which definitely attract academic concerns. While we expect new empirical insights to disaster management and coordination and recovery in this new experiences with natural disaster, the need for all stakeholders in society to galvanize efforts can never be overemphasized.

Disasters whether they are man-made or natural caused could be particularly devastating. It is important to point out, that the theoretical line between man-made and natural disasters is becoming really blurred and this is because, most natural disasters have been clearly linked to anthropogenic activities. However, natural disasters present the highest level of risk to man especially when they occur without adequate preparation. Natural disasters are caused by natural hazards, and they negatively impact human activities and the environment (Girigiri, Anele & Badey, 2019). Sadly, human sufferings and economic losses from disasters are unacceptably high around the world. Today's disasters stem from a complex of mixed factors, including routine climate change, global warming influenced by human behavior, socio-economic factors causing poorer people to live in risky areas and inadequate disaster preparedness and education on the part of government as well as the general population (Awake, 2017). So complex and intertwined are the factors behind those disasters that some experts believe the most practical approach to preparedness may be to focus on reducing the risks rather than factors behind the risks. Disasters are also a consequence of development and industrialization. In Europe, experts believe that countries such as France and Germany are more adversely affected by floods today because major rivers, such as the Rhine, have been straightened to ease commercial traffic.

The United Nation for instance reported that between 2007 and 2013 alone, natural hazards caused USD 180 billion in economic losses (UN, 2013). As a result, several theories have emerged trying to explain the causes, nature and impact of disasters around the world. This plethora of theories notwithstanding, two polar ideas remains identifiable. These are: (1) the naturalist views and 2) humanist or anthropogenic view. Meanwhile, by far the most celebrated or widely accepted of the two perspectives, is the humanist or anthropogenic view of disasters. This view represents a good number of scholarly writings that converge on the assumption that man and his economic activities are responsible for the growing spate of natural disasters around the world. While not downplaying the fact that nature gets angry sometimes as to invoke disasters on man, this theoretical perspective rest on the notion that human activities especially with regard to the need for economic growth are the primary reason why nature gets upset in the first place. For instance, the discussion on climate change and its consequences for the natural environment of man has been ongoing for quite some time now (UN, 2013). The change in climatic conditions causing global warming has been blamed on the activities of man especially with regard to the titanic emission of carbon and other obnoxious gases into the atmosphere. Climate change is predicted to make natural hazards like hurricanes, droughts and floods, more frequent and more intense (Girigiri, Anele & Badey, 2019).

However, the theoretical assumption of the anthropogenic school of thought also acknowledges the fact that natural or man-made hazards need not result automatically in disasters. This is because; simple management measures can be taken before, during and after to strengthen the resilience of communities, to save lives, to secure livelihoods and to prevent the loss of investments and development gains (Makinde, 2015). The argument in this regard, is that man must impact on his environment for economic reasons hence, disasters must occur. However, the concern is to note that before a natural hazard threatens a nation, public facilities and private businesses alike have to protect their assets, their workforce, and their supply and distribution chains in order for society and the economy to keep functioning. Although, natural disasters present high negative impacts globally, this is much higher in low- income countries (World Bank, 2001). It is known that poor countries are generally more vulnerable to disaster damage because of their lack of effective risk-management systems, the prevalence of low construction standards and uncontrolled urbanization, and in some cases, because they have large environmentally degraded zones prone to heavy damage from floods.

In the aftermath of a disaster, relief donations and other related social efforts often focus on rebuilding major economic infrastructure whose destruction will hinder macroeconomic recovery (Prabel, 2012). Giving priority to vital social projects is also justified in terms of the benefits that their rehabilitation eventually brings to the entire

population. However, in many cases, disaster management programmes are insufficiently targeted toward those most affected and with the least resources to bounce back (McEntire, 2002). This includes groups such as subsistence farmers, landless labourers, people working in cottage industries and the informal sector, small and micro entrepreneurs, who have in one way or the others contributed immensely to economic growth of the society but have lost their livelihood as a result of a disaster. This is why all theoretical positions howbeit, naturalist or humanist, agree to the fact that managing disaster situations or recovery, require wide range of collaboration and partnerships between the private sector and government if effective management is to be achieved. Makinde (2015) clearly opines that 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.

Given the possible rewards, multi-sector links involving corporations, humanitarian Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and government agencies are attracting increased attention. According to Wassenhove (2008), humanitarian organizations are now recognizing that businesses have more to offer in terms of resources, expertise, and technology. As a result, they are becoming more open to discussions in other sectors and, in some instances, are identifying their ideal partners and making the first approach. Similarly, governments are realizing that they may have something to learn from the humanitarian and private sectors, particularly about being agile and adaptable in difficult circumstances—one of the main strengths of humanitarian organizations (Adeyemi, 2013). They are interested in starting a dialogue to examine what types of partnerships are feasible and most likely to deliver mutual benefits. Corporate-public-humanitarian partnerships that include the transfer of expertise can be a great source of learning across the three sectors and can be instrumental in improving the preparedness of humanitarian organizations to cope when a disaster arises. According to the United Nations (2013) the expertise offered by the corporate sector organizations must be aligned with the needs of the humanitarian organizations as a result; companies should work closely with humanitarian and relevant public sector organizations such as NEMA to discover what is really needed.

The nature and extent of disaster management and coordination within government agencies is central to the level of deliverables that they can offer in times of disaster directly or indirectly. As Ross (2009) captures it, within such agencies, coordination of the overall disaster response can assist in transferring knowledge, leveraging funds, avoiding waste and duplication. For such an increasing number of government disaster management agencies, forming partnerships with humanitarian NGOs and private organizations that are targeted at the management of natural disasters are also a visible means of demonstrating to society,

that they are active subscribers to effective delivery of disaster management expertise (Fakunle, 2013). In other words, when disaster management strategies involve multi-stakeholder approach, communities where disasters happen, tend to be more confident in the structure than when a single sector tries to assist them in their recovery state. However, in reality very few government agencies responsible for managing disasters have formed explicit disaster management partnerships with other sectors in society. One of the main reasons is the fundamental difference between, and/or among the sectors (McEntire, 2002). For instance, humanitarian organizations can be slow especially through bureaucratic decision-making processes (during non-disaster times), while businesses are fast moving and action oriented and government clearly requires technical expertise (Wassenhove, 2008). Even more, the different sectors also have very different agenda; put simply, businesses are motivated by profit, humanitarian organizations by saving lives and government agencies by service. Working together, therefore, is not an obvious move, though it is certainly not impossible.

One of the biggest hurdles to a successful multi-sectoral partnership is alignment of goals between the three sectors (corporation, government and NGOs). Inevitably, a company's shareholders will ask questions, forcing managers to show that the way they run the partnership is not only beneficial to the humanitarian organization or government agencies but also adds value for the company. Finding common ground and forging understanding between the parties requires commitment on all sides. This can only be realized when all the parties understand that it is possible for economic benefits and social values to go hand in hand and that the greatest impact is achieved for collective reasons.

### III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

For those of us in the science of sociology, while there are number of mainstream theories within the field of disaster risk management that can be deployed in analyzing the position of the paper, most of them may not convey clear sociological knowledge. In this regard, sociological theories with promising assumptions in relations to the paper, disaster management and organizational efficiency will be considered in this section even though not all of them discussed may be relevant to this paper. A review of these theories is done mostly to explain why they are not the most preferred and why the preferred theoretical framework was chosen as the theoretical standpoint explaining NEMA actions in disaster situations by the authors.

#### *Collective Stress Theory*

The collective stress perspective was developed by Barton (1969). In his book titled '*Communities in Disaster*' Barton proposed what is today acknowledged as the first sociological theory in the study of disaster management. He revealed a classic analytical structure which showed how collective stress situations such as disasters drive new group actions as a

way of coping with disaster challenges. By doing this, Barton (1969), provided a sociological framework for understanding group actions during disaster situations. This approach contributes to the disaster field as well as to general sociology. The contribution of "collective stress" to the study of disasters has led to key constructs such as the "emergency social system," "mass convergence" and "therapeutic community", which David (2008; Sanchez & Huy, 2009); Vollhardt & Bilewicz, 2013) have used as standard terms in the field of disaster relief management. According to David, emergency social systems, are those intricate social networks that are oftentimes global that arise in order to provide support to victims of disasters. In the same vein, mass convergence according to David represents the coming together of people who fall outside the emergency social systems to provide relief donations to disaster victims oftentimes through the platforms of emergency social systems. On the other hand, David refers to therapeutic communities as an extension of the emergency social system. To him, the therapeutic community is a combination of all social networks that address the non-material (emotional and psychological) problems of natural disaster victims. The theory of helping behavior in the therapeutic communities is both complex and simple. It is complex because it is dynamic, containing large numbers of variables such as contact with victims is a necessary condition for helping; contact with victims makes for sympathetic identification, discussing victims' deprivations with others makes for awareness (knowledge) of the number of deprived and the intensity of deprivation; the greater the perceived deprivation of others (knowledge), the less the individual's subjective deprivation, etc. At different levels of analysis, and feedback loops, it is simple because it concentrates on blocks of variables and direct linear relationships. Although the essence of the theory lies principally in the dynamic interaction among the activating mechanism, the analytical segments or blocks offer a viable approach to test and refine the theory (Barton, 1969). The combined use of individual and collective level variables is nicely illustrated in Barton's approach. As one of numerous examples, Barton (1969; Schiff, Noy & Cohler, 2001) hypothesize that "the greater the total number of people who are discussing the victims, the more likely a given individual is to discuss the victims". This hypothesis expresses a contextual relationship which shows how individual behavior is influenced by the proportion of people that engaged in that type of behavior. According to Barton (1969), the basic assumptions of the theory are that "*Collective Stress*" situations occur when many members of a social system fail to receive expected conditions of life from the system.

In addition, collective stress can come from sources either outside or inside the system. External sources include earthquakes, tornadoes, floods, droughts, hurricanes, and blights, loss of markets or sources of supply. Internal sources include economic depression, inflation, slums, strikes, riots, banditry, revolutions, civil wars, mass purges, and even the

growth of tyranny (Barton, 1969). Also, since collective stress reflects expected conditions, it can stem from both debilitating conditions and from rapid increases in expectations that the system is unable to meet. The breadth of a collective stress perspective placed the study of disasters in mainstream sociology. This is because insofar as disaster is part of the general human condition, system perspectives are conducive to viewing disasters as a part of normal life (Perrow, 1984). At micro levels, there is daily anticipation of disaster response experiences, and at macro levels, disasters are occurring every day. Thus, rather than viewing disasters as exceptional events, they are part of the normal social fabric. This means that models of vulnerability and preparedness are at least as important as models of response behaviour (Vollhardt & Bilewicz, 2013). Barton's concept of collective stress is functionally linked to the concept of a social system. This implies certain dimensions: scope of the impact, speed of onset, duration of the impact itself, and social preparedness. Barton (1969) cross-classifies these dimensions to create various classes of collective stress situations. Collective stress situation activate the "emergency social system" (Barton, 1969). The characteristics of this social system are conceptualized as a process. The pre-disaster system functions more or less smoothly; the impact from a disaster requires activating temporarily units and behavior not normally operative (Schiff, Noy & Choler, 2001), which then moves towards a reduction of the deprivation brought on by the disaster; eventually the temporary units are retired and the previously functioning system is reactivated. This eventual state of the system, however, is not a return to the state which existed before the disaster, but rather a different equilibrium. Barton (1969) refers to "amplified rebound" effects from disaster, where there are system improvements resulting from disaster. For example, in some cases, the temporary arrangements become normalized as the new state of equilibrium (Bates, Frederick, Farrell, & Timothy, 1979). Barton's model suggests that the social importance or impacts of disasters are intricately related to what is normal, everyday, and systematic. Barton's model suggests that analyses of disaster response provide understanding of the interactional processes that link objective features of the sociological circumstance, including preexisting social structures and preparedness, with the situational specific nature of these events (Nobre, Tobias & Walkers, 2009a).

In the light of this paper and drawing from the assumptions of the collective stress theory highlighted above, disasters such as flooding and others set in motion dynamic social processes that require some degree of collective effort to address. One of Barton's major contributions to the theory is that institutional support and the effective and efficient management of disaster victims is a critical medium for alleviating the impact of natural or man-made disasters on affected people especially at the community level. This is because; Barton believed that local communities lack the required institutional capacity to manage the outcomes of disasters on their own. As a result,

collective actions often times requiring collaborative actions by social institutions become a viable lifeline for rural people to come out of natural or man-made disasters. Although the theory would have been ideal, it does not sufficiently address the key focus of this paper. This is because setting dynamic processes that motivate people to collectively mitigate disaster risks does not in any way explain how disaster agency such as NEMA manages disaster. Hence, the theory fails to meet the analytical specifications for this paper.

### *Contingency Theory*

Every organization exists in a milieu – set of ‘domain’, formally called, to which it must respond when designing its structure. The contingency factors associated with this milieu are the characteristics of its general environment. The environment could be conceived of as comprising its technology, the nature of the social environment, competitors, its geographical setting, political, economic and even meteorological climate in which it must operate, to mention but a few (Baridam, 2002). The characteristics of the environment that have always been focused upon are: Complexity: an organization’s environment can range from simple to complex; Stability: stable to dynamic, from integrated to diversified and finally hostility- organization’s environment ranging from munificence to hostility. Each of these characteristics affects organization structure (Baridam, 2002). The central point of the above is simply that, for an organization to deliver on its mandates, certain salient variables must be considered for the success or otherwise of the organization. In this case, NEMA is to take cognizance of the different environments within the geo-political setting of Nigeria, where its core mandates cover before, during and after disasters before it can achieve its aims and objectives.

In his book, *Organisations in Action*, Thompson (1967) argued that organizational design is a function of the environment in which the organizations exist, and the technology they employ. He asserted that organizations are economically efficient when they obtain results with minimal expenditure of resources. That technological efficiency is greatest under closed system conditions, because demand and requirements are predictable and controllable. However, Argote (2007) added that absolute control and predictability are seldom achieved, because of the constant changing conditions within the organization’s environment. What this means is that, the proper management of available resources plus acquiring the required technological tools where necessary for operations definitely place NEMA in a vintage position to do the needful as duties call upon it as an agency saddled with the responsibilities to protect and respond as timely as possible to victims and communities facing disaster situations. The paper adopts the contingency theory because contingency theory attempts to provide a perspective on organizations and management based on the integration of prior theories. Contingency theory argued that the solution to any one managerial problem is contingent on the factors that

are impinging on the situation. The theory known as contingency theory is an outgrowth of the systems theory. Galbraith (2001) states that in contingency theory, there is no one best way to organize; but the best way to organizing is as the situations present itself. Accordingly, Smith (1984) supports the view above, and states that 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. Those who set this school of thought in motion suggest that organization structures should reflect current environmental circumstances (Nobre, Tobias & Walker, 2009c).

Contingency organizational design is based on the principle that the organizational structure accommodates the specific needs of the situation. Kast & Resenzweig posit that:

*The contingency view seeks to understand the interrelationships within and among subsystems as well as between the organization and its environment and to define patterns of relationships or configurations of variables. It emphasizes the multivariate nature of organizations and attempts to understand how organizations operate under varying conditions and in specific circumstances. Contingency views are ultimately how organizations operate under varying conditions directed towards suggesting organizational designs and managerial actions most appropriate for specific situations (1973).*

The clear implication of the above assertions suggests that the contingency theory argues that the appropriate organizational design depends on the organizational context and the demands made by the environment of operations and other sub-systems. This is a rejection of the one-best-way approach to organizational design. Woodward (1958) pre-occupied himself with the issue of technology on work organizations, pointing out that effective management of resources in any situation whether disaster or not is contingent on the right technology plus the right environment. In addition, Burns & Stalker (1961) suggested the best organizational design to be contingent on innovation both technically and cognitively. Still professing the same contingency theory, the problems associated with coping with uncertainty and the right actions and direction to take is predicated on, on-hand situations (Choo, 2005). The issue is that, from Thompson’s assumption, the central problem of complex organization is coping with uncertainty. This uncertainty has in fact, been the environmental dimension most often considered. Agreement on uncertainty as an important environmental characteristic faced by organizations in their areas of operations has not been able to solve the issue of unprecedented challenges confronting organizations. In his article, *Characteristics of organizational environments and perceived environmental uncertainty*, Duncan (1972) argues that environmental uncertainty was the result of two dimensions- complexity, or the number of elements dealt with and variability, or the

extent to which these elements changed over time. In addition to the issue of how to best capture the dimensions of the environment, further debate is centered on whether it is the objective characteristics of the environment or those characteristics of the environment as perceived by organizational decisions makers that should be incorporated in studies of structure (Galbraith, 2002). The point to note here as clearly spelt out by the author is that for NEMA to meet up the challenges bestowed on it by the environment where it is situated to serve with maximum capacities and much expectation from the people, the organization must be proactive, innovative and be able to handle bureaucratic principles in line with predictable occurrences as it relates disasters which could happen from the activities of nature and that of man-made on the environment unannounced.

The contingency theory demonstrates that a manager who develops a working familiarity with the concept of organizational differentiation will be able to deal with any complex problem that faces the organization. We should say, and perhaps rightly too, that organizations that recognize the emerging task differences at a proper time and reflect them in their structure and related management practices, tend to achieve a competitive advantage (Baridam, 2002). Accordingly, Kast & Rosenzweig (1973) argue that an organization is unlikely to succeed if its strategic plan is based on managerial interests, and without reference to competence, opportunity, or societal responsibilities (Ichijo & Nonaka, 2006). Balancing the four components of strategy formulation is a complex and delicate task and while the contingency approach does not simplify the problems involved, it does facilitate understanding of the complexity of the interrelationships between the various components, and helps management to cope with the problem realistically as it affects the environment and by extension the organization (Ichijo & Nonaka, 2006). It is noteworthy to say therefore, that the contingency theory of organizations suggests the major relationships that management should think about as they design and plan organizations to deal with specific environmental conditions. It clearly indicates that management can no longer be concerned about the one best way to organize but rather be ready at all times to adopt approaches necessary while also adapting to the request and demand from the environment of operation (Girigiri, 2021).

This suggests the fact that if, the Director General, Zonal Coordinators and other staff of NEMA, being the organization understudy, have good inter-departmental relationship anchored on the principle of cooperativeness and good working synergy, the results from the team work in the face of disastrous events will always be a positive one. Put this differently, since each department has specific but inter-related and inter-dependent role to play to make the organization perform ultimately, proper planning plus timely dissemination of information where possible and prompt action when necessary will position the organization to face challenges of disaster. The contingency approach which takes

cognizance of uncertainties as the base of every effective organization draws our sympathy and is adopted here as the theoretical framework for this paper. This is because the theory has been able to show that every organization that wants to function with fewer problems must be able to adapt to environmental (both social and physical) changes that act themselves out within the scope of the organization and the problems to be addressed. This paper therefore subscribes to this strand of contingency theory, which argued that environmental alterations and uncertainty is the key to effective management by organizations.

In the light of the above assumptions, it is the contention of this paper that in an environment where both man-made and natural disasters such as floods have caused significant social and physical risks to inhabitants of particular areas, NEMA must as a matter of necessity adopt management strategies that are contingent on the peculiar environment and problems facing them as well as the unique environment that they find themselves. Much as this is the case, the effective management of disaster and communities in distress is contingent on several things such as: the social conditions of the area, the physical environment, available technologies to be deployed where and when necessary, communication patterns and the drivers of the policy actions to tackle and ameliorate the effects and suffering of those affected by whatever disasters.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

This expository article dwells on the coherent understanding on the issues of organizational effectiveness in deploring all available machineries in delivery derivable even in a critical situation of disaster occurrences. We discovered that National Emergency Relief Agency (NERA) was the first government established agency to coordinate disaster matters in 1976. Going further, NEMA through an Act was promulgated or legislated into action in March 1999 to replace the former in all areas of responsibilities. We have State Emergency Management Committee, a subsidiary of NEMA that reports emergencies to the parent body as national coordinating agency on behalf of the Federal Government.

In course of analyzing issues relating to disaster relief and recovery, we found out that humanitarian NGOs operate some mechanisms by providing helps for people affected by disaster. First, is where after victims return, they work collectively, also letting authorities on ground to know their preferences and felt needs in planning. They also provide avenues to overcoming barriers by mobilizing and providing collective actions to solving problems through maximum participation. AfatVimo is a partner-agent Micro-insurance model to poor communities and households by providing cash pay outs aftermath of a disaster to help as a coping strategy and recovery.

Finally, two contending theories drive this paper, which is a positioned paper. The perspective of the Collective Stress

Theory which hypothetically owns that collective stress experiences and coping strategies have collective qualities that are determined by the affected victims to survive. Also, we found that collective stress represents a response to threats and survival of the people after disaster situations- in this case, adaptation to the environment and integration of the people are necessary. On the contrary, contingency theory that considers environmental uncertainty and influences organization and its management to understand that the extent to which organization can control its environment through its ability to adopt necessary strategies at all times knowing that mixed approaches work better than a single method. It is pertinent to note that in mixed approaches, organizational management can swindle over strategies as situations unfold. Therefore, contingency theory was adopted for this paper since NEMA should have an understanding that no single straight jacket way work for any organization success but rather changing patterns and approaches as situations demand.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Adeyemi, O. (2013). *Oil Production and Environmental Degradation in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria*. Yenago: Motimi Books.
- [2] Agbo, C.A. (2012). Strengthening the Legal Frameworks for International Response. *Paper presented at the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent in Geneva, Switzerland* from 26-30.
- [3] Aргote, L. (2007). *Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge*. New York: Springer.
- [4] Alani, K. (2012). *Women, Social Cohesion and Resilience in Conflict Environment*. Owerri: Springfield.
- [5] Alejandro, L.C. Maureen, F. Ben, W. Han, K (2014) *Disaster Management: International Lessons in Risk Reduction, Response and Recovery*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [6] Awake, (2017) *When Disaster Strikes: Steps that can save lives*.
- [7] Baridam, M. D. (2002). *Management and Organisation Theory*. Port Harcourt: Sherbrooke Associates.
- [8] Barton, A. H. (1969). *Communities in Disasters: A Sociological Analysis of Collective Stress Situations*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books edition.
- [9] Bates, Federick, L., Farrell, Timothy W., and JoAnn K. Glittenberg (1979). "Some Changes in Housing Characteristics in Guatemala following the February 1976 Earthquake and their Implications for Future Earthquake Vulnerability". *Mass Emergencies*.
- [10] Becker-Olsen, K.L., Cudmore, B. A. & Hill, R. P. (2012). The Impact of Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility on consumer behaviour. *Journal of Business Research*. 59, 46-53.
- [11] Benanke, C. (2015). *Building Institutional Capacity for Contingencies: Studies in Hazard Management*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press.
- [12] Berker, P., Kartez, J., & Wenger, D. (1993). Recovery after disaster: Achieving sustainable development, mitigation, and equity. *Disaster*, 17, 93-109.
- [13] Buckland, A. & Rahman, E. (2009). Temporal and Spatial Changes in Social Vulnerability to Natural Hazards. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 105 (7): 2301–2318.
- [14] Burns, T. & G. M. Stalker. (1961): *The management of innovation*. London. U.K.: Lavistock.
- [15] Choo, C.W. (2010). A new contingency view of the organization: Managing complexity and uncertainty through cognition. *Brazilian Administration Review (BAR)*, Curritiba. 7(4), 380-396.
- [16] Ellen, P.S., Mohr, L.A., & Webb, D. J. (2010). Charitable Programs and the Retailer: Do they mix? *Journal of Retail*. 76(3), 393–406.
- [17] Elliott, J. R., T. J. Haney, & P. Sams-Abiodun (2010). Limits to Social Capital: Comparing Network Assistance in two New Orleans neighborhoods devastated by hurricane Katrina'. *Sociological Quarterly*. 51(4), 624-648.
- [18] Fagade, O. (2016). *Disaster risk reduction in Nigeria*. Lagos: University Press.
- [19] Fakunle, J. (2013). *Corporate Response to Social Problems: A value Creation Hypothesis*. Port Harcourt: Tammy & Down Printers.
- [20] Galbraith, J. (2001). *The Basics of Scientific Management Theory*. London: Routledge.
- [21] Galbraith, J.R. (2002). *Designing organizations- an executive guide to strategy, structure and process*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [22] Geis, D.E. (2000). By design: The disaster resilient and quality of life in community. *Natural Hazards Review*. 1(3), 151-160.
- [23] Ichijo, K. & Nonaka, I. (2006). *Knowledge creation and management: New challenges for managers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [24] Idris, J. (2012). *The Sociology of Natural Disasters*. Kano: Adobayaro University, Press.
- [25] Kast, F.E. and Rosenzweig, J.E. (1973). *Contingency views of Organisation and Management*. Chicago: Sciences Research Associates Inc.
- [26] Kolawale, F. (2016). *The Promise of Corporate Delivery*. London: Heinemann.
- [27] Levine, M. (2013): The Promotion of Cooperatives, ILO Cooperative Branch. Retrieved from [www.ica.coop/europe/ra2002/speech](http://www.ica.coop/europe/ra2002/speech).
- [28] Makinde, D. (2015). *How Corporations Respond to Communities*. Lagos: MacMillan Publishers.
- [29] McEntire, D.A. (2002). Coordinating multi-organizational responses to disaster: Lessons from the March 28, 2000, Fort Worth Tornado. *Disaster Prevention & Management. An International Journal of Disaster Management*. 11 (5), 369-389.
- [30] Middlebrook, P. (2005) Fighting hunger and poverty in Ethiopia: Ethiopia's experience in implementing employment generation schemes as part of the national policy for disaster prevention and management. PhD thesis, University of Durham.
- [31] Morris, K (2013). *Promoting Effectiveness in Corporate Governance*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- [32] Muller, A. & Whiteman, G. (2012). Exploring the geography of corporate philanthropic disaster response: A study of Fortune Global 500 Firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 6(2), 33-50.
- [33] Mumuni, A. (2013). *Natural Disaster in Northern Nigeria. Katsina: Kazimi Publications*.
- [34] Nabegu, A.B. (2014). Analysis of Vulnerability to Flood Disaster in Kano State, Nigeria. *Greener Journal of Physical Sciences*. 4(2), 022-029.
- [35] Nakagawa, Y. and R. Shaw (2004). Social Capital: A Missing Link to Disaster Recovery', *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*. 22(1), 5–34.
- [36] NEMA (2012) *Training Manual on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management for post primary Schools in South-South, Nigeria*.
- [37] NEMA, Annual Report 2010
- [38] NEMA, Annual Report 2011
- [39] NEMA, Annual Report 2013
- [40] NEMA, Annual Report 2014
- [41] Nobre, F.S., Tobias, A.M. & Walker, D. (2009). Organizational and technological implications of cognitive machines: Designing future information management systems. Hershey & New York: Information Science Reference, IGI Global.
- [42] Odulari, O. (2016). *Ad-hoc Responses in Disaster Management*. Port Harcourt: Awansca Books.
- [43] OECD (2016). *MEASURING Organizational Effectiveness. OECD Policy Brief No.19*.
- [44] Olson, R.S. (2000). Toward a politics of disaster: Losses, values, agendas and blame. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*. 18(2), 265-287.

- [45] Perrow, C. (1984). *Normal Accidents: Living with High Risk Technologies*. New York: Basic Books.
- [46] Prabel, D. (2012). *Institutional focus in Rebuilding Natural Disaster Ravaged Communities*. New York: Allen and Wiley.
- [47] Richard, P.J., Devinney, T.M., Yip, G.S. & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological best practice. In Wikipedia (May, 2008). Organizational Effectiveness. Retrieved from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational\\_effectiveness](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational_effectiveness)
- [48] Ross, W. (2009). *Learning from humanitarian assistance: A partnership perspective*. Oxford: University Press.
- [49] Sanchez-Burks, J. & Huy, Q.N. (2009). Emotional aperture and strategic change: The accurate recognition of collective emotions. *Organ.Sci.* 20, 22-23.
- [50] Sayegh, T. (2014). *Corporate Involvement in Disaster response and Recovery: An analysis of the Gujarat Earthquake*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MA.
- [51] Schiff, B., Noy, C., & Choler, B.J. (2001). Collective stress in the life narratives of Holocaust survivors. *Narrat Inq.*, 11, 159-194.
- [52] Simmons, C.J. & Becker-Olsen, K. L. (2013). Achieving Marketing Objectives through Social Sponsorships *Journal of Marketing*. 70(1), 154-169.
- [53] Thompson, J.D. (1967). *Organizations in Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [54] Twigg, J. (2015). *Corporate Social Responsibility and Disaster Deduction: A global view*. Retrieved from [http://www.research4development.info/PDF/Outputs/Mis\\_SPC/R7893CSROverview.pdf](http://www.research4development.info/PDF/Outputs/Mis_SPC/R7893CSROverview.pdf).
- [55] United Nations (2013). *The Year of Recurring Disasters a Review of Natural Disasters in 2012*. Geneva, Switzerland, United Nations Publication.
- [56] Vollhardt, J.R. & Bilewicz, M. (2013). After the disaster: Psychological perspectives on victims, bystander, and perpetrator groups. *Journal of Social Issues*. 69, 1-15.
- [57] Wassenhove, V.N. (2008). Corporate Responses to Humanitarian Disasters Trusted Insights for Business Worldwide. *The Mutual Benefits of Private-Humanitarian Cooperation*. Retrieved from [www.conference-board.org](http://www.conference-board.org) Research Report.
- [58] Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T. & Davis, I. (2004). *At risk: Natural hazards, people's vulnerability, and disasters*. New York: Routledge.
- [59] Woodward, J. (1958). *Management and Technology*. London: HMSO.
- [60] World Bank (2013). *World natural disaster outlook*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank Publication.