

# Assessment of the Grievances Redress Mechanisms of Multisectoral Crisis Recovery Project in Northeast Nigeria Case Study of Adamawa State, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Sadiq Bariki; <sup>2</sup>Dr. Eli Joel; <sup>2</sup>Rukkaiyatu Bashir Ribadu <sup>3</sup>Dr. Sani Shallangwa; <sup>4</sup>Engr. Ahmed Hamis, <sup>5</sup>Dr. Francis Obiora Nwabufo; <sup>6</sup>Engr. Enoch Bello James

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Adamawa State Multi-Sectoral Crisis Recovery Project (MCRP), No. 3 Karewa Extension Jimeta-Yola Adamawa State

<sup>4,5</sup>North East Recovery and Stability Program (NERSP) North East Development Commission (NEDC) Federal Program Management and Coordination Cell, No. 13 Danube Street, Maitama, Abuja, Nigeria.

<sup>6</sup>Gaiwan and Associates Ltd (Project Engineers and Consultants), Nigeria.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8080356>

Received: 13 August 2024; Accepted: 21 August 2024; Published: 25 September 2024

## ABSTRACT

The Adamawa State Multisectoral Crisis Recovery Project (AS-MCRP) is an initiative aimed at addressing the complex challenges caused by Boko Haram insurgency in Adamawa State. A study was conducted to assess the effectiveness of the project's grievance redress mechanisms, focusing on three research objectives. A sample of 100 respondents from Mubi, Michika, and Madagali local governments was selected using cluster sampling. Data were collected through key informant interviews and analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, and content analysis. The study found that while the grievance redress mechanisms of AS-MCRP are accessible, awareness among the public is low. However, these mechanisms are highly effective in resolving grievances, contributing significantly to rebuilding trust, fostering social cohesion, and promoting community resilience. The study recommends that AS-MCRP should launch a comprehensive awareness campaign, including community meetings, pamphlets, posters, and digital channels, to inform all beneficiaries about the grievance mechanisms. It also suggests ongoing training and capacity building for grievance officers and maintaining continuous dialogue with affected communities to address evolving grievances and needs.

**Keywords:** Adamawa State Multisectoral Crisis Recovery Project (MCRP); Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs);

## INTRODUCTION

In all societies and organizations, human interactions will inevitably result in complaints. It occurs when individuals or groups feel a sense of injustice, dissatisfaction, or conflict. Grievances can occur in a variety of settings, including the workplace, the community, government agencies, educational institutions, and public services. They may involve a variety of issues, including, but not limited to, unfair treatment, discrimination, harassment, policy violations, contractual conflicts, and access to services. Grievances can emerge at the individual level, but they can also manifest as a collective issue, representing the worries of a greater community (Obiekwe & Eke, 2019). Grievances have a tendency to fester and escalate, resulting in bad outcomes for individuals, organizations, and societies as a whole if they are not addressed. This can lead to violations of society's laws and orders, which have a propensity to degenerate into violent crises of varying severity, accompanied by loss of life, destruction of property, and destruction of livelihood. Consequently, it is necessary to address such grievances so as to lessen their harmful and debilitating potential.

Thus, addressing these grievances effectively is vital for maintaining harmony, trust, and social cohesion through grievance redress mechanisms. Grievances redress mechanisms encompass processes, procedures, and systems

that are put in place to address and resolve grievances in a fair, transparent, and timely manner. Hossain et al., (2023) stated that grievances redress mechanisms provide a structured framework for individuals or groups to voice their concerns, seek resolution, and obtain justice. By providing an avenue for individuals to seek redress, these mechanisms contribute to the overall well-being and stability of societies and organizations. The significance of grievances redress cannot be exaggerated. It ensures that grievances are not left unattended, as this can lead to resentment, discontent, and potential conflicts. Effective redress mechanisms provide individuals with a sense of validation and empowerment, fostering trust in institutions and promoting social justice in society.

The strength of grievance redress mechanisms lies in their ability to address various types of grievances that can arise in different contexts. In workplaces, grievances may involve issues such as unfair treatment, discrimination, bullying, or violation of employment rights. In communities, grievances may revolve around social injustices, disputes over resources, or cultural clashes. Government agencies may face grievances related to administrative decisions, public service delivery, or policy implementation. Educational institutions may encounter grievances concerning academic matters, discipline, or campus environment (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2017). Regardless of the context, the availability of an effective redress mechanism is essential in fostering a sense of justice, ensuring accountability, and maintaining social order.

The impact of grievance redress mechanisms is multifaceted. At the individual level, these mechanisms provide a platform for individuals to express their concerns, seek resolution, and regain a sense of justice. Individuals who feel heard and valued through the redress process are more likely to regain trust in institutions and maintain positive relationships (Kotagiri & Antoine 2018). Moreover, effective redress mechanisms can contribute to personal growth and empowerment, as individuals develop confidence in their ability to address grievances and advocate for their rights. Furthermore, at organizational level, grievances redress mechanisms play a vital role in maintaining a positive work environment. They provide employees with a means to address workplace issues, ensure fairness, and prevent the build-up of resentment (Robinson, 2014). Organizations that prioritize the establishment of robust redress mechanisms benefit from improved employee morale, increased productivity, and reduced turnover. Moreover, effective redress mechanisms contribute to the overall reputation of organizations, attracting talented individuals and enhancing their competitive advantage.

Also, at the community level, grievances redress mechanisms are essential for fostering social cohesion, justice, and harmony. By providing a formal process for addressing grievances, these mechanisms prevent the escalation of conflicts and promote peaceful resolution (Rohwerder, 2015). They also serve as a check on institutional power, ensuring that individuals have a voice and can seek redress when their rights are violated through upholding of principles of justice and fairness, grievances redress mechanisms contribute to the legitimacy and trustworthiness of institutions, bolstering social stability and preventing societal fragmentation. The impact of grievances redress extends beyond individual satisfaction. Societies that prioritize robust redress mechanisms experience enhanced social cohesion, reduced tensions, and greater trust in institutions. However, the establishment and implementation of effective grievance redress mechanisms come with their own set of challenges. These challenges may include a lack of awareness among individuals about available redress mechanisms, limited accessibility, bureaucratic delays, institutional biases, and resource constraints (World Bank, 2021). Overcoming these challenges requires a concerted effort from stakeholders to continuously improve and refine the redress mechanisms, ensuring they are efficient, fair, and responsive to the needs of the individuals and communities they serve.

For every state and institutional-sponsored project, there are high tendency of grievances to occur during the planning and implementation of such project because wherever people gather to work, there will be grievances over issues and how to get work down. The multisectoral crisis recovery project in Adamawa State is not an exception because the project is saddled with the responsibilities of responding to the acute humanitarian and forced-displacement crisis triggered by the Boko Haram insurgency in North East Nigeria. The project provided crisis recovery in the states of Borno, Yobe and Adamawa, including social cohesion among the people, service delivery restoration and infrastructure rehabilitation in health, education, transport, water, and sanitation sectors. In the process of achieving this task, there will be grievances either among the workers, stakeholders or the community members where such project will be carried out. Therefore, this study examined the grievances redress mechanisms of Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Theoretical Framework

This study was grounded on two theories, namely, the theory of organization justice and theory of equity. The theory of organization justice was propounded by Greenberg in 1887. The theory submits that grievance procedures play a crucial role in contributing to organizational justice by resolving the disputes between management and the workforce through the collection of information about employee relations, the expression of grievances by employees, and the protection of workplace equality and justice, as Greenberg and Scott note (2005). The organizational justice theory incorporates three distinct perspectives: distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (Skitka, 2003; Ambrose et al., 2005). Originating from equity theory, distributive justice focuses on the fair allocation of goods. In contrast, procedural justice emphasizes the fairness of the method through which results are allocated. Interactional justice focuses on the equity of interpersonal relationships or communications (Grattan, 2000).

In addition to other motivations, such as gauging the fairness of grievance procedures and, to a lesser extent, self-interest procedural-distributive justice theory, employees utilize grievance procedures to achieve justice and fairness. Gordon and Fryxell (1993) emphasized the connection between justice perceptions and the grievance system. They asserted the link between unions and their constituents is maintained through procedural and distributive fairness provided by the union's representation in the complaint system, as opposed to any other form of benefit under the collective bargaining agreement. This indicates that filing a complaint is a formal statement of procedural justice viewpoints. The workforce forms their opinion of the union based on its perceptions of the system's neutrality. Thus, the seeming fairness of the complaint method has a positive correlation with worker satisfaction, as well as with the complaint procedure, management, and union. In addition, eminent fairness of complaint handling has a significant impact on employee satisfaction compared to the results of perceived fairness of complaint procedures; access to complaint procedures that have a negative relationship with job performance and intention to leave the organization; and perceived fairness of complaint procedures (OlsonBuchanan, 1996). Employees place a greater emphasis on procedural fairness since it ensures impartial outcomes – as opposed to maximizing outputs or outcomes (Van den Bos, 2005). Ambrose and Arnround (2005) identified the seven foundations of procedural justice as follows: the opportunity to express one's views; the possibility of having some control over the outcomes; the consistency of the processes of procedure application; the inhibition of bias in the processes of decision making; the accuracy of the information used for decision making; the right to petition the outcome; and finally, the ethical nature of the procedure.

### Conceptual Description

**Grievances:** Grievance is a sense of discontent, dissatisfaction, misery, suffering, or sorrow felt by workers. When displeasure is conveyed, it becomes a complaint; when it is presented as a compliment, it becomes a compliment; and when an employee thinks an injustice is being committed, it becomes a grievance. According to Mubezi (2015), a grievance is an employee's official expression of displeasure with his work and workplace to his immediate supervisor. The author adds that an employee's attempt to demonstrate that she or he has suffered or been wronged, often as a result of acts or choices made by management working on behalf of the firm, constitutes employee grievance. According to ILO (international labour organization), as mentioned by (Harold Arie, 2015), a grievance is a worker's complaint over pay and allowances, working conditions and interpretation of service, job assignment and termination of service. The National Commission on Labour observed that "grievances" involving one or more employees, irrespective of their salary, overtime, leave, transfer, promotion, job assignment, or termination, had the potential to constitute grievances. It is necessary to distinguish between individual and communal grievances. If the concerns made pertain to specific employees, they should be addressed through grievance processes.

### Importance of Grievance Redress Systems

Understanding GRMs is important because they are becoming increasingly prevalent and notable features of international development; they are viewed as having the substantial potential to improve the quality of public investment and service delivery; and they have the potential to improve accountability to excluded and

marginalized groups. This evaluation focuses on determining how GRMs affect the quality of public service delivery (in any sector with evidence) and the interaction between people and public authorities. In the Global South, there are more GRMs consuming policymaker attention, administrative energy, and public resources than ever before, at least on paper. GRMs were incorporated into 28% of World Bank investment loan programs in 2008, and 50% of projects by 2011. (Brown et al. 2014). This increased to 67 percent between 2014 and 2016 and 69 percent by September 2020. (World Bank 2021). Since 1997, GRMs have been necessary if protections for indigenous populations or involuntary relocation are activated. However, effective from 2018, the new Environmental and Social Framework of the World Bank mandates all investment project finance to "propose and execute GMs in accordance with Environmental and Social Standard 10: Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure (World Bank 2021). Other international and bilateral aid agencies have developed and pushed the usage of GRMs in their lending and assistance programs (ADB 2018). Over the last two decades, several attempts have been made to enhance national grievance resolution systems via legal and independent ombudsman institutions and program-level methods (Randolph and Edjeta 2011; SSPS 2020; Chen 2016)

### **Causes of grievances**

In accordance with Averineni (2012), a grievance entails employee dissatisfaction, which often results from unfair treatment. Managerial incompetence in maintaining the actual code of ethics and repeated processes at various corporate levels would surely increase employee discontent. According to Baumruk (2010), the management of a firm is extremely committed to achieving the company's goals but is oblivious to the stress level of its employees. As a result, insufficient vacation time is provided, and employees are left with less time off. An employee is under extreme mental, physical, and psychological stress and may become ill. This eventually leads to a complaint. According to Hunter and Kleiner (2004), the most common employee complaints are uneven treatment by the supervisor, contract violations, employer communication, and slander. Absenteeism, disobedience, misbehaviour, drug abuse, subpar performance, and safety and health violations are employers' most common workplace problems. Employees' perceptions of the grievance procedure's desirability and any potential solutions to unfairness would be affected by whether or not they employ a rational, calculative approach when choosing whether to register a grievance (Klaas, 1989b). Individual and authoritative factors create organizational complaints. Individual elements such as employee personality/character, beliefs, viewpoints, convictions, information, skills, and talents can exacerbate conflict (Aktar, 2021; Raphael, 2021).

## **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter examined the methods and procedures that were employed in the study. It specifically covers research design, population of the study, sample of the study, sampling technique, instrument for data collection, validity of the instrument, methods of data collection and methods of data analysis.

### **Research Design**

The research design that was adopted in this study is descriptive survey research. Descriptive survey design are those studies which aim at collecting data and describing in a systematic manner, the characteristics, features or facts about a given population. The choice of this design is informed by the fact that the study is interested in gathering data on the grievances redress mechanisms of Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project. The collection and analysis of data aimed at highlighting the grievances redress mechanisms of the multisectoral crisis recovery project in Adamawa State.

### **Area of the study**

The geographical area of the study is Adamawa State. The state is located in the North-Eastern part of Nigeria. Adamawa State lies between latitude  $7^{\circ}$  and  $11^{\circ}$  N of the equator between longitude  $11^{\circ}$  and  $14^{\circ}$  E of the Greenwich Meridian. It shares boundary with Taraba State in the south, Borno in the north, Gombe in the west and Republic of Cameroon in the east. The state covers a land area of about 36, 717 km<sup>2</sup> with a population of 4,902,100 people based on 2022 population projection by Citypopulation.de. The state is noted for its ethnic and cultural diversity, and the principal towns in the State are: Yola, Numan, Mubi, Hong, Gombi, Ganye, Song, Girei, Demsa, Shelleng, Fufore, Michika, Toungo e.t.c. Adamawa State has 21 local government councils and



37 development areas. The major occupation of the people is farming as reflected in their two notable vegetation zones, the Sub-Sudan and Northern Guinea Savannah zones. Their cash crops are cotton and groundnuts, while food crops include maize, yam, cassava, guinea corn, millet and rice. The communities living on the banks of the rivers engage in fishing, while the Fulanis are cattle rearers.

### Population of the Study

The population of the study comprised an estimated 20,000 residents of Mubi, Michika and Madagali local government areas who have the knowledge of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project and the staff of the multisectoral crisis recovery project.

### Sample of the Study

Based on the population of the study, a sample size of 100 was selected for the study. The study adopted Taro Yamane simplified formula in calculating the sample size of the study, with a representative sample size of 95% confidence and a precision of 0.10. The sample of the study was selected from residents of Mubi, Michika and Madagali local government areas who have the knowledge of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project and the staff of the multisectoral crisis recovery project.

The Yamane formula is thus presented:

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

Where:

n: is the sample size

N: is the population size

e: is the level of precision

### Sampling Techniques

A cluster sampling technique was adopted to select the sample of the study. This was done in order to select the respondents from each ward of the local government. Simple random sampling technique was later used to select the key informants from each ward, which gave the researcher the opportunity to balance the respondents in order to avoid a lopsided response.

### Method of Data Analysis

Frequency counts and percentage was used to analyze the secondary data while content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data collected through key informant interview question guide.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the data analysed were discussed and justified in the light of existing scholarly studies. The table and explanations that follow represent the results and discussion of the study.

### Data Analysis and Results

**Research Question 1:** What is the level of accessibility and awareness of the grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs) within the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project?

From the interviews conducted, it is obvious that there are avenues for the aggrieved community members, groups of people, or communities to register their grievances through the grievance redress mechanism of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project. These mediums include toll-free phone numbers,

grievances redress mechanism complaint boxes, and open appointments for people to come in and lodge their complaints in person. This underscore the fact that the grievance redress mechanisms are accessible to people or group without any restriction; which is a very good approach for people and communities to register their grievances. Despite the accessibility of the programme, it could be noted that the awareness of the programme is considerably low. Therefore, there is need to come up with plans to increase the awareness of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project in order for the project to be optimally efficient.

**Research Question 2:** How effective are the GRMs in addressing the grievances raised by individuals and communities affected by the crises?

Table 1: Effectiveness of the GRMs in addressing the grievances raised by individuals and communities affected by the crises

S/N	Year	Number of Grievances Reported	Resolved		Pending	
			F	%	F	%
1	2019	33	33	100	--	--
2	2020	36	36	100	--	--
3	2021	5	5	100	--	--
4	2022	11	2	18.2	9	81.8
5	2023	91	88	96.7	3	3.3
	Total	176	164	93.2	12	6.8

Table 1 shows the effectiveness of the GRMs in addressing the grievances raised by individuals and communities affected by the crises. In 2019, a total of 33 cases were reported through the grievance redress mechanisms. The whole of the 33 cases were resolved which signifies 100%. In 2020, 36 grievances were reported, while all the reported grievances were resolved. This represents 100% resolved cases for the year 2020. Furthermore, in 2021, 5 grievances were reported and all 5 cases were resolved. This signifies that 100% of the grievances reported were resolved. In 2022, 11 grievance complaints were recorded, 2 representing 18.2% were resolved while 9 representing 81.8% were pending. Also, in 2023, 91 grievance complaints were recorded, 88 signifying 96.7% were resolved while 3 representing 3.3% were pending. In summary, 176 grievance complaints were recorded, 164 representing 93.2% were resolved while 12, representing 6.8% were pending.

In support of the above, the key informant interviewed reported that:

*The grievance redress mechanisms adopted by Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project is very effective as none of the complaints received last for more than 10 days without being addressed and the complainant is kept in the picture of the resolution processes so as to calm him or her down. The process is transparent which gives the complainant the confidence that justice will be served.*

**Research Question 3:** What is the impact of the GRMs on rebuilding trust, fostering social cohesion, and promoting community resilience?

The key informant interviewed reported that:

*The grievance redress mechanism has contributed enormously in building trust in my community as all grievances raised by the people have been resolved. Also, all the projects initiated have been completed which has really improved our livelihoods. Furthermore, they also an active role in promoting trust and peaceful coexistence in the community by organising sporting activities which promote social cohesion among the people*

*in the community irrespective of their tribe and religion.*

Also, another key informant interviewed stated that:

*In my community, the community level GRCs, the local council GRCs, and the MCRP office GRCs worked together to resolve any grievance reported and also ensure that there is unity between the people, the contractors and their staff. They also carry out activities that are highly impactful and has promoted trust and peaceful coexistence among the communities. They have also improved people's livelihood opportunities.*

Furthermore, a key informant interviewed reiterated that:

*The GRMs demonstrate a commitment to transparency and accountability. GRMs provide a platform for individuals to voice their concerns and participate in decision-making. By addressing grievances and conflicts at an early stage, GRMs prevents the escalation of tensions and disputes. The process of engaging with communities through GRMs fosters dialogue and interaction among diverse groups which further promote trust as the demand of the community members are met.*

## **FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

Based on the analysis of the study, the following findings were made:

- i. The study found that the grievances redress mechanism of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project is accessible but the awareness level among the people is low.
- ii. The study found that the grievances redress mechanism of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project is highly effective in addressing the grievances of the complainants.
- iii. The study found that the grievances redress mechanism of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project has contributed enormously on rebuilding trust, fostering social cohesion, and promoting community resilience.

## **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

The findings of the study were discussed under the following sub-headings

- i. Accessibility and awareness of the grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs) within the Adamawa State Multisectoral Crisis Recovery Project.
- ii. Effectiveness of the GRMs in addressing the grievances raised by individuals and communities affected by the crises.
- iii. Impact of the GRMs on rebuilding trust, fostering social cohesion, and promoting community resilience.

### **Accessibility and awareness of the grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs) within the Adamawa State Multisectoral Crisis Recovery Project**

The study found that the grievances redress mechanism of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project is accessible but the awareness level among the people is low. This is in agreement with Shaw (2021). Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) throughout the globe, whether those of large financial institutions, local banks, or governments, are designed to manage complaints from project-affected individuals, employees, and other aggrieved parties. Many of them have effective processes in place and are prepared to provide redress to people who experience negative effects. However, not all of them devote the same amount of time and effort to engaging with their stakeholders, including prospective complainants who may be unaware that GRMs exist to assist them in finding solutions. In 2020, the Independent Evaluation Unit produced a report evaluating the Environmental and Social Safeguards and Environmental Management System of the GCF. This analysis

concludes that "there is insufficient understanding of existing grievance resolution procedures," including the GCF's IRM and accredited organizations' GRMs. Concerns and complaints about GCF projects/programmes are anticipated to rise as the GCF portfolio expands, however, it is troubling that those who may require access to redress may be unaware that such procedures exist. This study suggests that focused communication actions are a need for an "effective" mechanism. In this context, a GRM's low complaint number is not always indicative of the absence of problems. It is possible that offended individuals simply do not know where to seek redress.

The RM has maintained communication initiatives throughout the previous several years. In 2021, the IRM has chosen to adopt a more active approach towards enhancing communications with stakeholders in light of the realization that awareness-raising is crucial to achieving the IRM's mandates. Among these initiatives was the employment of a communications consultant to help the IRM in developing a communications strategy for the next three years. This consultant's initial recommendation was to evaluate the existing state of the IRM's stakeholders' knowledge, comprehension, and access to the IRM. To collect this information, the IRM circulated a communications survey to its stakeholders, and the consultant conducted interviews with a number of stakeholders to develop a plan that fits their requirements. The IRM communications survey, which sought to determine the stakeholders' knowledge and comprehension of the IRM and their preferred communication channels, garnered over 100 answers in less than a week. The IRM has gathered very valuable information that will guide its messaging efforts. For instance, we discovered that the majority of stakeholders who understood the duties and tasks of the IRM were those who handled grievance redress on a daily basis. Some comments also suggested a possible misunderstanding between the GCF Secretariat and the IRM.

There were additional questions about the respondents' social media use. Facebook was the most popular social media site among IRM stakeholders, followed by YouTube and LinkedIn. The IRM will continue to utilize social media platforms to interact with its stakeholders who have access to the internet, since more than half of those surveyed believe social media to be important for conveying the IRM's activities and mission. The IRM employed a social media consultant this year to boost the IRM's online contacts with its stakeholders and the general public, and the IRM has noted an increase in participation on its social media platforms. However, the IRM is aware that there are many individuals who may need access to the IRM but lack adequate internet communication methods.

### **Effectiveness of the GRMs in addressing the grievances raised by individuals and communities affected by the crises**

The study found that the grievances redress mechanism of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project is highly effective in addressing the grievances of the complainants. This is in line with World Bank (2021). Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) are indispensable tools in the realm of development projects, playing a pivotal role in ensuring that the concerns, complaints, and disputes of individuals and communities are heard and addressed. They serve as vital avenues for conflict resolution, accountability, and community engagement. This essay delves into the profound importance of GRMs in addressing grievances and highlights their significance in fostering social cohesion, promoting transparency, and achieving sustainable development. One of the most compelling reasons for the existence of GRMs is their ability to prevent and resolve conflicts. In communities affected by various issues, such as resource scarcity, land disputes, or development projects, tensions can escalate rapidly if grievances are left unaddressed. GRMs provide structured channels through which individuals and communities can express their concerns and seek resolution, thereby mitigating the risk of conflicts and violence. By addressing grievances early on, GRMs contribute significantly to peace and stability within communities. GRMs are integral to ensuring accountability and transparency in development projects. They act as checks and balances on project implementers and government agencies, holding them accountable for their actions and decisions. This accountability is essential to prevent corruption, mismanagement of resources, and the misuse of power. When individuals and communities know that they have the means to report wrongdoing and seek redress, they are more likely to trust in the integrity of development initiatives.

A core element of GRMs is the principle of community engagement and participation. They empower individuals and communities by giving them a voice in decision-making processes related to development projects. This active involvement fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility, making community members feel like



partners rather than passive recipients of aid. When people feel empowered and invested in a project, they are more likely to contribute to its success and sustainability. Trust is a cornerstone of successful development projects. GRMs play a vital role in building and maintaining trust between project implementers, government agencies, and the communities they serve. When individuals and communities have faith in the mechanisms' ability to address their grievances fairly and impartially, it bolsters their confidence in the entire project. Trust facilitates cooperation, which is crucial for the effective implementation of development initiatives. At the heart of the importance of GRMs lies the notion of sustainable development. Sustainable development is not just about economic growth; it encompasses social equity and environmental sustainability. GRMs contribute to this holistic approach by ensuring that development projects respect the rights and well-being of individuals and communities. By addressing grievances promptly and fairly, GRMs help prevent adverse social and environmental impacts, ultimately contributing to the long-term sustainability of development efforts (World Bank, 2021).

### **Impact of the GRMs on rebuilding trust, fostering social cohesion, and promoting community resilience**

The study found that the grievances redress mechanism of the Adamawa State multisectoral crisis recovery project has contributed enormously to rebuilding trust, fostering social cohesion, and promoting community resilience. This is in agreement with the findings of Hossain, Anuradha and Suchi (2023). Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) provides a result-oriented channel by offering a reliable structure and set of approaches where local people and the project implementation unit can find effective solutions together. It is one of many social accountability instruments that can help enhance good governance in projects allowing for quick reforms in the areas where feedback and concerns from beneficiaries can impact a project or any of its components. The grievance redress mechanism is a citizen engagement system by which queries or clarifications about the project are responded to, problems with implementation are resolved, and complaints and grievances are addressed efficiently and effectively. In societies, communities, and organizations, trust and cohesion are the cornerstones of stability, cooperation, and collective progress. Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) play a pivotal role in fostering these vital attributes by providing a structured framework for addressing grievances and conflicts. This comprehensive essay explores the profound ways in which GRMs contribute to the building of trust and cohesion within various contexts. Drawing upon real-world examples, theoretical insights, and empirical evidence, it highlights the transformative potential of these mechanisms. Trust is the bedrock of effective collaboration, enabling individuals and groups to work together towards shared goals. Cohesion fosters a sense of belonging, reinforcing the commitment to collective endeavours. Cohesion enhances social resilience by providing support networks during times of adversity. Trust in institutions and authorities is crucial for maintaining social stability and preventing conflict. Grievance Redress Mechanisms are not mere administrative processes but vital tools for building trust and cohesion within societies, organizations, and communities. Their multifaceted role in providing a voice, ensuring transparency and fairness, and fostering accountability is essential for nurturing trust. Trust, in turn, serves as the foundation upon which cohesion is built, strengthening social bonds and enabling collective action. By recognizing and investing in effective GRMs, stakeholders can contribute to more harmonious and cooperative environments where trust and cohesion flourish, leading to greater social resilience and progress.

### **CONCLUSION**

The assessment of grievance redress mechanisms within the Adamawa State Multisectoral Crisis Recovery Project (MCRP) has provided valuable insights into the critical dimensions of its engagement with affected communities and its commitment to conflict-sensitive development. One of the most salient strengths identified within the MCRP's grievance redress mechanisms is the transparency and fairness inherent in their design and execution. A significant proportion of beneficiaries and community members expressed trust in the impartiality of the process, attributing this largely to the meticulous documentation and tracking of grievance cases. Such transparency not only engenders accountability but also engenders a sense of legitimacy, bolstering community confidence in the mechanisms. Accessibility of these mechanisms also emerges as a notable positive facet. A majority of respondents indicated awareness of the available grievance redress avenues. However, the assessment uncovered instances where accessibility was hindered due to limited awareness among certain segments of the beneficiary population. This highlights the imperative of adopting more proactive

communication strategies to ensure that all beneficiaries are not only aware of these mechanisms but can also navigate them with ease. Clearer channels of communication, coupled with increased community engagement, can substantially mitigate this challenge.

Community engagement within the grievance redress process remains another pivotal area for enhancement.

Encouraging more active involvement of community leaders and representatives can cultivate a sense of ownership, accountability, and local buy-in. This participatory approach can substantially deepen community trust in the mechanisms and facilitate a greater understanding of the nuances of local grievances. Capacity building among project staff and grievance redress officers' surfaces as a key recommendation stemming from this assessment. Regular and targeted training sessions can equip these personnel with the requisite skills and knowledge to manage grievances effectively, thereby further solidifying the mechanisms' effectiveness. Also, establishing a robust feedback loop and learning mechanism is imperative. The MCRP must remain in continuous dialogue with affected communities to discern evolving grievances, needs, and aspirations. Moreover, lessons garnered from the grievance redress process should be seamlessly integrated into project design and implementation. This iterative approach ensures a dynamic, adaptive, and responsive stance, demonstrating the project's unwavering commitment to not only addressing grievances but also preventing their recurrence.

Furthermore, the assessment of grievance redress mechanisms within the Adamawa State Multisectoral Crisis Recovery Project underscores the project's dedication to actively addressing community concerns and fostering an environment conducive to sustainable development in the face of adversity. By capitalizing on its strengths in transparency and accessibility, and concurrently addressing areas for enhancement in efficiency, community engagement, capacity building, and feedback integration, the MCRP can solidify its role as a catalyst for peace, recovery, and development in Adamawa State. This comprehensive assessment serves as an invaluable blueprint for enhancing the project's impact and ensuring that the voices of affected communities continue to guide its mission and contribute to the broader discourse on conflict-sensitive development

## REFERENCES

1. Adams, J.S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67:422-436.
2. ADB. (2018). "Building Bridges: Lessons from Problem-Solving in Viet Nam." Manila: Asian Development Bank.
3. Aktar, S. (2021). Workers' satisfaction with grievance-handling procedure: a study on the selected garment factories in Bangladesh. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 9(3), 345-362.
4. Ambrose, M.L. & Arnaud, A. (2005). Are procedural justice and distributive justice conceptually distinct? In Greenberg J, at Colquit J.A (editors) *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp 59-84) New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum
5. Averineni, A. (2012). Impact of Grievances on Industrial Relations. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 1(1), 60-61.
6. Bagraim, J. (2007). Motivating the South African Workforce. In Werner, A. (Ed.) *Organizational Behavior, a Contemporary South African Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. Pp.68-98
7. Baumruk, R. (2010). The Missing Link: The Role of Employee Engagement in Business Success. *Workspan*, 47(1), 48-52.
8. Bean, R. (1994). *Corporative industrial relations: an introduction to cross-national perspectives*, London: Routledge.
9. Bhim, C. (2006). Causes of Grievances Google Retrieved from <https://www.wisenepali.com/.com/2006/02employees-grievance-reasoncauses.html?m=1>:
10. Botero, J., Alejandro, P. & Andrei, S. (2013). "Education, Complaints, and Accountability." *The Journal of Law and Economics* 56 (4): 959-96
11. Britton, Y (1992), The Roles of Supervisors, Employees and Stewards in Grievance Initiation. *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 45 (1), 15-31.
12. Brown, M., Bruce, J., Leon, P., Aaron, S. & Amar, I. (2014). "Global Review of Grievance Redress

- Mechanisms in World Bank Projects.” 90388. The World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/907421468337160282/Global-reviewof-grievance-redress-mechanisms-in-World-Bank-projects>
13. Centre For Social Responsibility in Mining, -CSRM- (2009) Community Complaints and Grievance Mechanisms and the Australian Minerals Industry, Queensland, Australia. [www.csr.com.au](http://www.csr.com.au). Retrieved 16th June 2015.
  14. Chand, S. (2017). Grievances Redress Mechanism. Retrieved from [www.yourarticlelibrary.com/human-resources/grievance-handling-definition-features-and-effects](http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/human-resources/grievance-handling-definition-features-and-effects)
  15. Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct Validation of a measure, *Journal of applied psychology*, vol 86 pp. 386-400.
  16. D’Cruz, M.N. (1999). A practical guide to grievance procedure, misconduct and domestic inquiry. Kuala Lumpur: Leeds Publication.
  17. Dwivedi, R.S. (2009). A textbook of human resource management. India: Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.
  18. Fox, J. A. (2007). Accountability Politics: Power and Voice in Rural Mexico. OUP Oxford.
  19. Freeman, P.(2009). Introduction to Human Resource Management. Theory and practical Palgrave. New York.
  20. Göbel, C. & Li, J. (2021). “From Bulletin Boards to Big Data: The Origins and Evolution of Public Complaint Websites in China.” *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs* 50 (1): 39–62.
  21. Gordon, M.E., & Fryxell, G.E. (1993). The role of justice in organizational grievance Systems. In Corpanzano, R., (Ed). *Justice in the workplace: approaching fairness in human resource management: Series in Applied Psychology* (231- 255). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbawn Associates.
  22. Grandvoinet, H., Ghazia, A. & Shomikho, R. (2015). *Opening the Black Box: The Contextual Drivers of Social Accountability*. World Bank Publications.
  23. Grattan, L., 2000. *Living strategy: putting people at the heart of corporate purpose*. London: Pearson Education.
  24. Greenberg, J., (2005). The social side of fairness: interpersonal and information classes of organizational justice. In Cropanzano. R. (ed). *Justice in the workplace; approaching fairness in human resource management*. 79-103. Lawrence Erlbaum, New Jersey.
  25. Hossain, N., Anuradha, J. & Suchi, P. (2023) *The politics of complaint: a review of the literature on grievance redress mechanisms in the global South*, Policy Studies.
  26. Huczynski, A. & Buchanan, D. (2007). *Organizational Behavior: An Introductory Text*, 6th Edition, Harlow, Pearson/Prentice Hall
  27. Hunter, S., & Kleiner, B. H. (2004). Effective grievance handling procedures. *Management Research News*, 27(1/2), 85-94.
  28. International Finance Corporation (IFC) (2009) . *Addressing Grievance from project Affected Communities*, Good Practice note. International finance corporation 2121 pennsylvania avenue, nwwashington, dc
  29. IPIECA., (2012) *The global oil and gas industry association for environmental and social issues; Community grievance mechanisms in the oil and gas industry- A manual for implementing operational-level grievance mechanisms and designing corporate frameworks*. 5th Floor, 209–215 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NL, United Kingdom E-mail: [info@ipieca.org](mailto:info@ipieca.org) Internet: [www.ipieca.org](http://www.ipieca.org).
  30. Jenkins, R. & Manor, J. (2017). *Politics and the Right to Work: India’s National Rural Employment Guarantee Act*. Oxford University Press.
  31. Juneja, P. (2018). Employee grievance - effective ways of handling grievance. Retrieved from: <https://www.managementstudyguide.com/employee-grievance.htm>
  32. Kellor, L. J. (1999). *Essentials of Organizational Behaviour*, Prentice Hall, pp 183-190.
  33. Klaas, B. S. (1989). Determinants of grievance activity and the grievance system's impact on employee behaviour: An integrative perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 445-458.
  34. Kotagiri, S. & Antoine, M. (2018). “Lessons from Deploying a Multifaceted Grievance Redress Mechanism.” *Development Asia* (blog). July 4, 2018.
  35. Kotagiri, Sushma, and Antoine Morel. (2018). “Lessons from Deploying a Multifaceted Grievance Redress Mechanism.” *Development Asia* (blog). 4 July 2018. <https://development.asia/case->

- study/lessons-deploying-multifaceted-grievance-redress-mechanism.
36. Kreitner R. & Kinicki A (2008). *Organizational behavior*. 8th (edn.), New York: McGraw-Hill:
  37. Locke, E.A. (2013). *A Theory of goal setting and task performance*, NJ, USA: Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
  38. Malani, P. (2017). *Grievance Redressal Mechanism: Need for Developing an Adequate Machinery*, *Common Wealth Journal of Commerce & Management Research*, 4(3).
  39. Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2014). *Occupational stress and its consequences*. *Leadership in Health Services*, 27(3), 224-239.
  40. Mubezi S. (2015), *Perceived effectiveness of employee grievance handling procedure on conflict management in Kenya*; *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management* Jomo kennytta University.
  41. Obiekwe, O. & Eke, N. (2019). *Impact of Employee Grievance Management on Organizational Performance*. *International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 5(1) 1-10.
  42. Ogunbameru, O. (2016). *Organizational Dynamics*, Ibadan. Spectrum Book Publishers.
  43. Osad, O.(2013). *Harmonious Industrial Relations as a Panacea for Ailing Enterprises in Nigeria*. *Journal of Asian Scientific Research*, 3(3), 229-246.
  44. Oslon- Buchanan, J.,(1996). *Voicing discontent: what happens to the grievance filer after the grievances?* *Journal of Applied Psychology*.81, 1:52-63
  45. Pande, S. & Hossain, N. (2022). *Grievance Redress Mechanisms in the Public Sector: A Literature Review*. Retrieved from <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/grievance-redress-mechanisms-in-the-public-sector-a-literature-review/> Last Accessed July 2023.
  46. Pfeil, H. & Agarwal, S. (2021). "Fostering the Inclusion of Disadvantaged and Vulnerable Individuals or Groups in Project-Level Grievance Mechanisms." Washington D.C.: World Bank.
  47. Randolph, R. C. & Edjeta, B (2011). "Study on Strengthening Grievance Redress Mechanisms for the Protection of the Basic Services (PBS) Program in Ethiopia." Addis Ababa.
  48. Raphael, A. (2021). *Arbitrating "Just Cause" for Employee Discipline and Discharge in the Era of COVID-19*. *Geo. J. Legal Ethics*, 34, 1237.
  49. Ritambhara, S.(2018). *A study of Corporate Governance and Grievance Handling Procedure at Workplace*, *Referred Journal of Higher Education*,10(1).
  50. Robinson, N. (2014). "Closing the Implementation Gap: Grievance Redress and India's Social Welfare Programs." *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* 53 (2): 321–62.
  51. Rohwerder, R. (2015). *Grievance Redress Mechanisms in Bangladesh*." GSDRC. <https://gsdrc.org/publications/grievance-redress-mechanisms-in-bangladesh/>.
  52. Ruggie, J., (2011). *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations Protect, Respect and Remedy' Framework*. United Nations Human Rights Council. Geneva: 2011.
  53. SSPS. (2020). "Enhancing Social Protection Governance through Grievance Redress System (GRS) - a Pilot Initiative." Dhaka: Social Security Policy Support (SSPS) Programme Cabinet Division and General Economics Division Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.
  54. Thomas, K. (2016). *Conflict and Conflict Management. A Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York, USA: John Wiley and Son. Inc.
  55. Tsevendorj, O. (2011). *Conflict Resolution: A basis for Effective Conflict Management of Banks in Baquio City*. Thesis submitted to St. Louis University, Baquio City, Phillipines.
  56. Uchendu, C. (2013). *Conflict Management and Organisational Performance in Secondary Schools in Cross Rivers State*. *Nigeria Research Journal in Organisational Psychology and Educational Studies*, 2(2), 67-71.
  57. Ufomba, R. E. & Akpan, P. L. (2020). *Grievance Management and Performance of Selected Oil-Producing Companies in Host Communities of Niger Delta, Nigeria (1980-2015)*. Retrieved from [https://phd-dissertations.unizik.edu.ng/repos/81286265850\\_130058025360.pdf](https://phd-dissertations.unizik.edu.ng/repos/81286265850_130058025360.pdf) Last Accessed 17th July 2023.
  58. UNDP. (2017). *Guidance Note UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES): Stakeholder Engagement Supplemental Guidance: Grievance Redress Mechanisms*." NYC: United Nations Development Programme.
  59. Wadhvani S., (2014) *Causes and Effects of Grievance in Small companies*. *International Journal of*



Advanced Information Sciences and Technology. India. June 2014

60. Wilson, E., & Blackmore, E., (2013) Dispute or Dialogue? Community perspectives on Company-led Grievance Mechanisms. Sustainable Community Development: an Interactional Perspective. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), United Kingdom. [www.iied.org/pubs](http://www.iied.org/pubs) Retrieved 17th July 2015.
61. World Bank, (2021). “Grievance Redress System of the Conditional Cash Transfer Program in the Philippines.” Washington D.C.: World Bank; Social Development Department & East Asia Social Protection Unit. <https://socialprotection.org/discover/publications/grievanceredress-system-conditional-cash-transfer-program-philippines>.
62. World Bank, (2021). Insights into Grievance Mechanisms: Findings from a Survey of Grievance Focal Points in Project Implementation Units. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
63. World Business Council on Sustainable Development (WBCSD) (2000). Corporate Social Responsibility [www.wbcsd.org](http://www.wbcsd.org) Retrieved 17th July 2023