

Assessing Organizational Capacity in Housing Provision: a Survey of Public Housing Agencies in Ogun State, Nigeria

*Eziyi O. Ibem, O. Solanke
College of Science & Technology, Covenant University, Canaan Land, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria,
*eziyioffia@yahoo.com

Abstract: Organizational capacity is essential for effective implementation of policies and programmes. Consequently, assessment of organizational capacity helps organizations to identify their strength and weakness in order to make informed decisions about how best to address challenges they face. The goal of this study was to assess the status of organizational capacity of public housing agencies in housing provision in Ogun State Southwest Nigeria. It was motivated by a gap in literature on the specific areas that contribute most to organizational capacity of public agencies in housing provision in Nigeria. Using questionnaire as the principal data collection instrument, primary data were collected from randomly selected 90 staff members involved in the design, planning, implementation and management of public housing projects in four public housing agencies in the study area. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics, and the result showed that most respondents felt that the overall organizational capacity of the agencies in housing provision was adequate. Management capacity was found to be slightly higher than resource capacity with the agencies having most strength in leadership style and weakness in the methods of administration of funds for housing projects. Substantial need and capacity building was found in critical areas such as funding, staff motivation and methods of dispensing of funds for housing projects. The paper suggests that partnerships with private sector organizations, robust staff well-fare schemes and re-training of staff can enhance organizational capacity of public agencies in public housing provision in Nigeria and other developing countries.

Keywords: *Organizational Capacity, Public Housing Agencies, Housing Provision, Capacity Building, Management Capacity, Resource Capacity, Ogun State*

1. Introduction

One of the burgeoning challenges posed by rapid urbanization in many developing countries, including Nigeria, is inadequate provision of decent and affordable housing for the teeming urban population. Over the years, developing countries have emphasized public housing provision on the premise that governments operate benevolently and seek to address social problems that are not met by the markets (AHURI, 2010). However, in spite of concerted efforts by government to address increasing housing challenges, there is a consensus that the housing crisis in many less developed countries is essentially one of inadequacy in quantity and quality (Rondinelli, 1990; UN-HABITAT, 2006; Ibem, 2010). Consequently, the widening gap between expectation and capability to address these challenges have heightened concern among stakeholders, particularly on the capacity of public housing agencies to match the scale of housing production with increasing demand (Mukhija, 2004; UN-HABITAT, 2006).

For organizations to be viable and effective in the performance of their primary assignments there is need for regular evaluation of their strength and weakness in the context of their purpose and context. In Nigeria for instance, there are divergent views on the areas of strength and weakness of public housing agencies. While Onibokun (1985) observed that public housing agencies in Nigeria have challenges of inadequate manpower, others are of the opinion that mismanagement of funds (Bana, 1991; Mustapha, 2002), poor implementation of housing programmes (Ikejiofor, 1999; UN-HABITAT, 2006), low inter-agencies collaborations (Akinmoladun and Oluwoye, 2007; Ademiluyi and Raji, 2008; Ibem et al., 2011) are the critical challenges confronting public housing agencies in this country. Bana (1991) and Emerole (2002) also opined that the inability of public agencies to deliver on their housing mandate in Nigeria is because of low capacity organizational. It can be inferred from the foregoing that public housing agencies are confronted with the challenge of how best to develop adequate capacity to address increasing urban housing crisis in this country. It is on this premise that several authors have emphasized the need for organizational capacity building for

enhanced productivity in public-sector housing in Nigeria (Chukwujekwu, 2005; Akinmoladun and Oluwoye, 2007).

Besides the divergent views expressed by several authors on the capacity of public housing agencies in Nigeria as cited in the preceding paragraph, it is noted that there appear to be very few empirical studies on the organizational capacity of public housing agencies in this country. This has contributed to obscuring our understanding of the specific areas of strength and capacity building needs in public housing agencies. This is a research gap that needs to be filled in our quest to improve public housing provision in Nigeria. This study therefore sought to examine the adequacy level of organizational capacity of key public housing agencies in housing provision in Ogun State Southwest Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study was to examine the personal characteristics of members of staff directly involved in the design, planning, execution and management of public housing projects in selected government agencies; the adequacy level of resource and management capacities of the agencies in public housing provision as perceived by their staff; and to identify which capacity attributes contribute most to adequacy of overall organizational capacity of the agencies. Findings of this study are expected to extend our understanding of the specific areas of weakness and strength in organizational capacity of government housing agencies in housing provision. It is also important in providing housing policy makers with directions to follow in capacity building for enhanced productivity in public-sector housing in Nigeria.

2. Literature Review

Public housing agencies are by nature organizations created to assist governments in addressing housing needs of citizens who cannot afford housing provided by the markets through the provision of subsidized housing (Balchin et al., 2000; Liu, 2007). Consequently, for many years governments have provided funding for these agencies through budgetary allocations, grants and subventions (Bachin et al., 2000; UN-HABITAT, 2006) to enable them undertake important roles in the provision of housing in many developing countries (Sengupta and Tipple, 2007). However, changing global and local economic situations as well as continuous internal organizational restructuring have combined to influence the capacity of government agencies in public housing. The implication of this is that public sector agencies are continuously seeking effective strategies for enhancing their capacities to deliver decent and affordable housing to those who are in dire need of housing.

Although, the capacity of organizations is a critical factor in measuring their performance and productivity in the provision of goods and services as well as meeting development challenges (Judge and Elenkov, 2005; Wanyama and Mutsotso, 2010), there are different views on the meaning of organizational capacity in the literature. While some authors (Rowe et al., 1999; Mackay et al., 2002; Glickman and Servon, 2003) argue that capacity is the technical and managerial capabilities to carry out primary functions and accomplish set goals, others contend that capacity is the resources, knowledge and processes used by organizations and institutions in carrying out their activities and programmes (Lusthaus et al., 1995; Yunga et al., 2008). However, Eisinger (2002) who noted that organizational capacity is a set of attributes that enable organizations to fulfill their missions and justify their existence provided what looks like a holistic conception of organizational capacity. All these definitions are important in pointing out that organizational capacity is multi-dimensional concept that describes a wide range of capabilities, knowledge and resources organizations use in carrying out specific assignments, activities or programmes. In fact, the preceding definitions are very emphatic in describing organizational capacity as an attribute associated with resources and skill endowments as well as the ability to properly utilize such resources and skill in achieving organizational goals. It is on this premise that this study views organizational capacity as the inherent ability of public housing agencies to mobilize human, material and financial resources for effective and efficient public housing provision.

There is also a divided opinion on the key elements of organizational capacity in the literature. This is probably due to a paucity of generally accepted capacity-measuring instrument and standards as White et al. (2005) pointed out. The implication of this is that what constitutes organizational capacity vary from one context to another; suggesting that the findings of organizational capacity assessment are highly contextual and most useful when they identify specific areas in which capacity building is needed for enhanced

productivity and performance. Notably, previous studies (Lusthaus et al.1995; Walker and Weinheimer, 1998) have shown that organizational capacity encompasses attributes such as strategic leadership, specialized skills, organizational structure, human resources, financial resources, physical infrastructure, programme process management and inter-institutional linkages. Staff complements, management processes (Mackay et al., 2002), ability to mobilize sufficient external resources, good mechanisms for evaluation and feedbacks as well as strong internal staffing resource (Rowe et al., 1999) have also been identified as some of the key components of organizational capacity. Furthermore, other components of organizational capacity identified in the literature include job descriptions, personnel skills, operational costs, and information systems as well as what an organizations do (such as strategic planning, financial management, service delivery, personnel policies, operation and maintenance, auditing and procurement) (Japan Bank for International Cooperation, 1999). In specific terms, Japan Bank for International Cooperation (1999) identified three key components of organizational capacity to include expertise, specificity of authorities and responsibilities as well as incentives. While expertise consists of capacity of organizations and their staff members and includes technical knowledge and experience; specificity represents how clearly and transparently authority and responsibility are defined and practiced in organizations. Incentives on the other hand, are the willingness of organizations to execute a given project. These submissions clearly show that organizational capacity comprises resources (material, human and financial) endowment, the strategies and processes as well as linkages used by organizations in carrying out of their respective short, medium and long-term activities and programmes.

In the assessment of organizational capacity, Lusthaus et al. (2002) and Wachira (2009) suggested that the different capacity attributes could be categorized into two main components: resource and management components. On the one hand, the resource component is concerned with the ability of organizations to increase, manage and sustain funding of their operations (Glickman and Servon, 2003). It comprises human resource, staff morale, work environment, equipment, technological expertise and finance. On the other hand, the management component deals with management skills, and consists of attributes such as leadership style, role assignment to staff, information management strategies, process management and monitoring strategies, innovation, communication channels, staff evaluation and reward system and capacity building process among others (Wachira (2009). In addition, Kellecher (2010) also noted that the key elements of organizational capacity that promote high performance include leadership style, positive culture and climate among front line workers, external motivation for improvement, and information infrastructure that allows for feedback loops, performance appraisal and benchmarking against self and others. The general inference that can be deduced from the foregoing is that organizational capacity can be measured from a multidimensional framework of human capital and resources (finance and material) capacities. Drawing on the foregoing, this study assessed organizational capacity based on staff members' perception of the levels of adequacy of both resource and management components of public housing agencies.

Generally, empirical studies have stressed the correlation between organizational capacity and performance of tasks (Lusthaus, 2002; Robin, et al., 2003; Green, 2006; Anderson, et al., 2008; Wanyama and Mutsotso, 2010). In Nigeria, evidence from the review of literature shows that the performance of public agencies in housing provision has been adversely affected by a number of capacity building challenges (Ibem, et al., 2011). Onibokun (1985) reported that defunct Regional Housing Corporations were unable to make their services available to majority of Nigerians due to lack of personnel and poor funding. Other authors also believe that lack of managerial capacity to utilise available funds (Bana, 1991; Mustapha, 2002) and undertake proper implementation of housing programmes (Ikejiofor, 1999; UN-HABITAT, 2006) are the key challenges of public housing agencies in this country. These views are all pointing to the fact that government agencies involved in housing provision in Nigeria have inadequate capacity in the areas of funding, human resource and managerial ability. However, not much is known of the specific areas that contribute most to organizational capacity of these agencies in housing provision. This study has attempted to bridge this gap in literature.

3. Methodology

This study based on a survey of four key public housing agencies: Ogun State Ministry of Housing (MOH), Ogun State Housing Corporation (OSHC), Ogun State Property and Investment Corporation (OPIC) and

Gateway City Development Company Limited (GCDCL) in Ogun State Southwest Nigeria. The survey was conducted between December 2009 and February 2010. Staff members of the aforementioned agencies directly involved in the design, planning, execution and management of public housing projects in the study area were selected as the key informants. To ensure that this target population really participated in the survey and reliable data were obtained for the current research, the human resource and/or personnel departments of these agencies were involved in the identification of this category of staff members. From the review of literature, it was found that organizational capacity can be assessed based on management and resource components (Lusthaus et al., 2002) as well as exogenous factors: social, economic and political (Wachira, 2009). In line with this, capacity audit was conducted in the four public housing organizations based on two principal capacity components: management and resource components. However, the exogenous factors were not considered in the current research.

Primary data were collected from the respondents using well-structured questionnaires. The questionnaire was divided into two main sections. Section-1 contained questions related to personal characteristics of the respondents: age, gender, income, educational qualifications, job status, and work experience. Section-2 consisted of questions on twenty key organizational capacity attributes. The respondents were specifically asked to rate their perception of the levels of adequacy of thirteen attributes under management and seven attributes under resource components of organizational capacity in their respective agencies based on a 5-point Likert scale : 1 = Very inadequate, 2 = Inadequate, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Adequate, 5 = Very Adequate. The questionnaires were administered through personal visits to the offices of the agencies. One hundred staff members (25 from each agency) representing around 19 percent of the overall staff strength and 77 percent of the target population in all the agencies put together were randomly selected for the survey. 92 questionnaires representing 92 percent of the questionnaires distributed were retrieved. However, two of the questionnaires were invalid and not used in the analysis.

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Assessment of overall organizational capacity was done by computing the adequacy levels of all the twenty capacities attributes as rated by the respondents. The sum of individual respondents' score on all the capacity attributes was used in computing individuals' overall score (IS) while the total scores on a given capacity attribute by all the respondents' was used in computing the attribute score (AS). Whereas the IS was used in assessing overall organizational capacity in housing provision, the AS was used in assessing the level of contribution by each of the twenty attributes to overall organizational capacity. To test the reliability of the scale of measurement of the questionnaire instrument, the Cronbach's alpha test was carried out. The result showed high Cronbach's alpha value of 0.9, which is more than 0.7 recommended as acceptable reliability coefficient. Therefore, the research instrument used in collecting data for the study was considered reasonably reliable.

4. Results

(a) Personal Characteristics of the Respondents: The result of the analysis on the distribution of the respondents across the four agencies sampled shows that about 26.7 percent of them were in the Ministry of Housing (MOH), 25.6 percent in Ogun State Housing Corporation (OSHC) and Ogun State Property and Investment Corporation (OPIC) while 22.2 percent were in Gateway City Development Company Limited (GCDCL). The result further shows that majority (73.3 percent) of the respondents were males, 26.7 percent females and 81.1 percent were married. Table 1 also reveals that most (60 percent) of the respondents were between the age bracket of between 31 years and 45 years, 47.8 percent and 44.5 percent were low-income and middle-income earners respectively. However, 6.7 percent of the respondents were high-income earners. Similarly, the result indicates that majority (86.6 percent) of the respondents had a minimum academic qualification of Higher National Diploma (HND), 67.8 percent were senior technical and management staff, while 54.4 percent had more than ten years of work experience. Furthermore, about 62.3 percent of the respondents were found to have been trained in the core built environment disciplines of architecture, building technology, civil engineering, estate management, quantity and land surveying as well as urban and regional planning.

Table 1: Personal Profile of the Respondents

Personal Attributes	Frequency	Percentage
Age (Years)		
18-30	9	10.0
31-45	54	59.8
46-50	14	15.0
51-60	13	14.0
Average Monthly Income (Naira)		
No Response	1	1.1
Below N37,000 (Low-Income)	43	47.8
N38,000-N71,000(Middle Low-Income)	32	35.6
N72,000-N145,000 (Middle High-Income)	8	8.9
Above N145,000 (High-Income)	6	6.7
Highest Educational Qualifications		
No Response	1	1.1
National Diploma (ND)	7	7.8
National Certificate of Education	22	2.2
Higher National Diploma	38	42.2
Bachelor Degree	22	24.4
Masters Degree	18	20.0
Other qualifications	2	2.2
Areas of Specialization		
Accounting /Finance	12	13.3
Administration	10	11.1
Architecture	14	15.6
Building Technology	8	8.9
Civil Engineering	8	8.9
Information & Communication Tech.	1	1.1
Estate Management	9	10.0
Land Surveying	5	5.6
Law	3	3.3
Marketing	4	4.4
Mechanical Engineering	1	1.1
Public Relations	1	1.1
Purchasing and Supply	1	1.1
Quantity Surveying	4	4.4
Research and Documentation	1	1.1
Urban and Regional Planning	8	8.9
Job Status		
Directors	8	8.9
Deputy Directors	8	8.9
Heads of Departments	6	6.7
Senior Technical Staff	32	35.6
Management/Administrative Staff	20	22.2
Deputy Heads of Departments	6	6.7
Estate Officers	5	5.0
Permanent Secretary	1	1.0
Others	4	4.4
Work Experience (Years)		
Less than 10	41	45.6
10-15	19	21.1
16-25	17	18.9
More than 25	13	14.4

Source: Field Work

(b) Organizational Capacity of the Agencies in Public Housing Provision: Table 2 shows the respondents' perception of the overall adequacy level of organizational capacity of the four agencies put together. It is evident from this result that majority (62.23 percent) of the respondents rated the organizational capacity of the agencies as adequate, 33.33 percent indicated that the organizational capacity of these agencies was neither adequate nor inadequate (neutral) while very few (4.44 percent) of the respondents felt that the organizational capacity of the agencies was inadequate. This result vividly shows that majority of the respondents felt that the overall organizational capacity of the agencies in public housing provision in the study area was adequate.

Table 2: Overall Organizational Capacity

Adequacy Scores	Rating	Frequency	Percentage
20-35	Very Inadequate	2	2.22
36-51	Inadequate	2	2.22
52- 67	Neutral	30	33.33
68-83	Adequate	47	52.23
84 -100	Very Inadequate	9	10.00
Total		90	100

Source: Field Work

Table 3 shows the result of adequacy level of management component of the agencies. It is evident from the result that about 47.78 percent of the respondents felt that management component of the organizational capacity was neither adequate nor inadequate. Although, about 45.56 percent of the respondents indicated that the management component of the organizational capacity was adequate, very few (6.66 percent) of the respondents indicated that management component was inadequate. This result shows that the proportion of respondents who felt that management component of organizational capacity of the agencies was neither adequate nor inadequate was slightly higher than those who felt that this was adequate.

Table 3: Adequacy of Management Component

Adequacy Scores	Rating	Frequency	Percentage
12.0-21.0	Very Inadequate	2	2.22
22.6-31.0	Inadequate	4	4.44
32.0 -40.0	Neutral	43	47.78
41.0-50.0	Adequate	37	41.12
51.0 -60.0	Very Inadequate	4	4.44
Total		90	100

Source: Field Work

Contrary to the result obtained in the management component, Table 4 shows that 46.66 percent of the respondents rated the resource component of the organizational capacity as adequate while around 44.44 percent were of the view that the resource component in these agencies was neither adequate nor inadequate. Again, very few (8.89 percent) of the respondents perceived the resource component as inadequate. This result shows that majority of the respondents rated resource component of the organizational capacity of the agencies as adequate.

Table 4: Adequacy of Resources Component

Adequacy Score	Rating	Frequency	Percentage
8.0-14.0	Very Inadequate	2	2.22
14.0-20.0	Inadequate	6	6.67
21.0-27.0	Neutral	40	44.44
27.0-33.0	Adequate	38	42.22
34.0-40.0	Very Inadequate	4	4.44
Total		90	100

Source: Field Work

(c) Contributing Attributes to Overall Organizational Capacity: The study also investigated the level of contribution of each of the twenty capacity attributes to overall organizational capacity of the agencies. The result on Table 5 shows the attribute scores (AS) for all the capacity attributes arranged in descending order of their contributions to the overall organizational capacity. It is evident from the result that the first five attributes with the most contribution to organizational capacity are related to management component; suggesting that management component contributed most to overall organizational capacity. The result specifically shows that Leadership Style with the highest Attribute Score (AS) of 348 on Table 5 contributed the most to organizational capacity, followed by Clarity of Organizations' Goal in Public Housing Delivery (335), Housing Process Management and Monitoring Strategies (322), Level of Innovation in Public Housing Delivery (316) and Communication Channels (315) respectively. However, Methods of Fund Disbursement for Housing Projects with the lowest AS of 210 contributed the least to the overall adequacy level of organizational capacity in the agencies. Other attributes related to management component with very low contribution to overall organizational capacity are Staff Incentives and Reward System and Staff Motivation.

With respect to the contribution of attributes related to resource component to the overall organizational capacity, Table 5 also shows that of the seven resource attributes arranged in descending order of their contribution to overall organizational capacity, Working Environment for Staff has the highest attribute score of 313; suggesting that it contributed the most to adequacy of resource component, followed by the Level of Technology and Know-how in Public Housing with AS of 301, Office Spaces and Furniture (300) and Human Resource Capacity (299) respectively. However, Fund for Housing Projects with AS of 266 contributed the least to the level of adequacy of resource component.

Table 5: Contributing Attributes to Overall Organizational Capacity

S/N	Capacity Attributes	Attribute Score (AS)	Capacity Components
1	Leadership Style	348	Management
2	Clarity of Organizations' Goal in Public Housing Delivery	335	Management
3	Housing Project Process Management and Monitoring Strategies	322	Management
4	Level of Innovation in Public Housing Delivery	316	Management
5	Communication Channels	315	Management
6	Working Environment for Staff	313	Resources
7	Methods of role assignment to Staff	313	Management
8	Level of Technology and Know-how in Public Housing	301	Resources
9	Office Spaces and Furniture	300	Resources
10	Human Resource Capacity	299	Resources
11	Staff Morale and Attitude to work	298	Resources
12	Institutional Capacity Building Process	297	Management
13	Information Management System	294	Management
14	Staff Performance Appraisal Procedure	283	Management
15	Operational Equipment and Vehicles	274	Resources
16	Staff Development Programme	268	Management
17	Fund for Housing Projects	266	Resources
18	Staff Incentives and Reward System	263	Management
19	Level of Staff Motivation	252	Management
20	Method of Disbursement Funds for Housing Projects	210	Management

Source: Field Work

Discussion: The result of this study has shown that most of the respondents in the survey were male professionals and administrators; suggesting that more male professionals and administrators than their female counterparts are involved in building procurement related activities in public housing agencies in the study area. This finding can be explained in the context of the fact that men in the study area dominate building construction and related activities. Similarly, the result also revealed that most of the respondents were middle-aged, low and middle-low-income workers and core built environment professionals (architects, building technologists, civil engineers, estate managers, urban and regional planners and quantity surveyors).

This result is to be expected going by the target population of the study. Notably, the observed higher proportion of relatively younger respondents involved in the agencies' housing projects could mean that the capacity of these agencies to engage in public housing provision is not jeopardized by a large proportion of ageing work force. This is indeed very advantageous for continuity and survival of these agencies. From the result (Table 1) is evident that about 54 percent of the respondents had over ten years of work experience and about 87 percent had minimum academic qualifications of Higher National Diploma (HND). One possible explanation for this is that majority of the respondents were senior technical and management staff. This goes to suggest that members of staff involved in the design, planning, execution and management of public housing projects in these agencies are highly qualified and experienced professionals and administrators. Hence, the agencies can be considered as having the right crop of technical and managerial staff to oversee the successful initiation and implementation of public housing projects. This finding is very significant, as it appears to be inconsistent with the notion in the literature (Onibokun, 1985) suggesting that public housing agencies in Nigeria lack adequate labor to effectively engage in public housing provision.

We also found that over 61 percent of the respondents felt that the overall organizational capacity of the agencies in public housing provision was adequate. Again, this appears to be in disagreement with findings of previous studies (Bana, 1991; Emerole, 2002) suggesting that public housing agencies in Nigeria have low capacity to deliver on their housing mandate. However, the result generally shows that those who felt that the resource capacity of the agencies was inadequate were slightly more than those who felt that the management capacity was inadequate. Based this result, it can be inferred that management capacity of the agencies was rated slightly higher than resource capacity by the workers. This finding appears to provide support to earlier assertion that the agencies sampled had the right crop of technical and managerial staff to undertake public housing provision schemes.

On the contributions of each of the twenty capacity attributes to overall organizational capacity, the result clearly shows that the first five attributes with the most contribution to organizational capacity are related to management components. In fact, Table 5 shows that Leadership Style in these agencies contributed the most to overall organizational capacity, followed by Clarity of Organizational Goals in Public Housing Delivery and Housing Projects Process Management and Monitoring Strategies respectively. One possible explanation for the observed level of contribution of leadership style to the overall organizational capacity this is that the leadership in these organizations consist mainly of experienced professionals and technocrats who clearly understand the modus operandi of these agencies. Contrary to this result, it was also found that Methods of Disbursement of Funds for Housing Projects contributed the least to the overall adequacy level of organizational capacity. Therefore, apart from suggesting that management component contributed more than resource component to the level of adequacy of organizational capacity; the result also indicates that the agencies had adequate strength in leadership style but were weak in the administration of funds meant for public housing projects.

On the one hand, Work Environment for Staff was found to be the resource component that contributed most to overall organizational capacity. This result is to be expected going by the quality office spaces, furniture and facilities provided in the corporate offices of these agencies; suggesting that the work environment is befitting in line with the academic qualifications, job status and experience of most of the respondents. On the other hand, Funding for Housing Projects made the least contribution to resource component of the organizational capacity. This is also to be expected going by the unfavorable economic situation in Nigeria which has adversely affected the availability of funds for many public agencies to execute public housing programmes. This finding appears to provide support to finding of previous studies (UN-HABITAT, 2006; Ibem et al., 2011) indicating that inadequate supply of housing finance constitutes a critical challenge in public housing provision in Nigeria. Arguably, it is on this premise that most of the respondents in the survey felt that the Methods of Disbursement of Funds for Housing Projects (which is a management component) contributed the least to overall adequacy of organizational capacity of public housing agencies in the study area. On the other hand, this finding appears to be in agreement with the notion in literature (Ikejiofor, 1999; UN-HABITAT, 2006) suggesting that public housing agencies in Nigeria lack adequate financial management capacity to implement public housing schemes.

Relating the result on the level of contribution of Funding for Housing Projects to the overall adequacy level of organizational capacity of the agencies, the result also shows that attributes including Staff Motivation; Staff Incentives and Reward System; Staff Development Programme and Staff Performance Appraisal Procedure (management component) as well as Operational Equipment and Vehicles (resource component) made very minimal contributions to overall organizational capacity. As would be expected, the aforementioned capacity attributes have strong links to availability of funds; suggesting that inadequate funding of housing projects could have also contributed to poor remuneration and motivation of staff as well as inadequate provision of operational equipment and vehicles as well as inadequacy of Methods of Disbursement of Funds for Housing Projects. It is based on evidence from this study that one can conclude that the agencies are in dire need of capacity building in the areas of funding and management of available human and financial resources at their disposal.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study assessed the status of organizational capacity of four key public housing agencies in Ogun State Southwest Nigeria. It has shown that the organizational capacity of the agencies was rated as adequate, with management capacity higher than resource capacity. Findings of the study have indicated that the public housing agencies investigated had most strength in leadership style but were deficient in the areas of funding, administration of funds for public housing projects as well as staff welfare and motivation. The implications of these findings are that leadership style showed no positive relationship with adequacy of methods of administration of funds for housing projects in the agencies. Hence, regular re-training of senior management staff on financial management aspect of construction project management is required to equip this cadre of staff with up to date techniques and strategies for proper management funds for housing projects.

In addition, the findings imply that most of the staff directly involved in the design, planning, execution and management of public housing projects in the agencies are not adequately and properly motivated in terms of welfare and compensation packages. Since employees' productivity is known to correlate with level of their motivation; robust staff welfare packages such as higher wages, appropriate reward system and staff development programmes are required to boost staff morale and enhance their productivity and efficiency in the performance of their assignments. Lastly, the agencies lack adequate financial capacity for effective public housing provision. Consequently, partnerships with private sector organizations are suggested in order to improve the agencies' financial and human capital base for effectiveness in public housing provision. In conclusion, this study has identified the specific areas that contribute most and least to overall organizational capacity of public housing agencies in the study area, which previous studies have not taken note of. Thus, the study can be considered as having provided pathways to addressing organizational challenges confronting public housing provision in Nigeria and other developing countries.

References

- Ademiluyi, A. I. & Raji, B. A. (2008). Public and Private Developers as Agents in Urban Housing Delivery in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Situation in Lagos State. *Humanity & Social Sciences Journal*, 3(2), 143-150.
- Akinmoladun, O. I. & Oluwoye, J. (2007). An Assessment of Why the Problems of Housing Shortages Persist in Developing Countries: A case of Study of Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science*, 4(4), 589-598.
- Anderson, D., Raine, K. D., Plotnikoff, R. C., Cook, K., Barrett, L. & Smith, C. (2008). Baseline Assessment of Organizational Capacity for health Promotion within Regional Health Authorities in Alberta, Canada. *Promotion & Education*, 15(2), 6-14.
- Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI). (2010). What Future for Public Housing? A critical Analysis. *Research Paper*. Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute: Southern Research Centre.
- Balchin, P. R., Isaac, D. & Chen, J. (2000). Urban Economics: A Global Perspective. New York: Palgrave
- Bana, P. M. (1991). Housing the Urban Poor in Nigeria. *The Nigerian Institute of Architects Journal*, 6(1), 22-25.

- Chukwujekwu, I. E. (2005). The Role of Housing Corporations in Housing Delivery: A case Study of Kogi Investment and Properties Ltd. *The Journal of the Association of Housing Corporations of Nigeria* 1(9), 6-9.
- Eisinger, P. (2002). Organizational Capacity and Organizational Effectiveness among Street Level Food Assistance Programs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 31(1), 115-130.
- Emerole, C. G. (2002). Restructuring Housing Development and Financing in Nigeria: The Role of Partnership In addition, Collaboration Strategies. *The Journal of the Association of Housing Corporations of Nigeria* 1(5), 26-29.
- Glickman, N. & Servon, L. J. (2003). By the Numbers: Measuring Community Development Corporations Capacity. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22, 240-250.
- Green, E. E. (2006). Texas Public Housing Authorities: Assessing Their Effectiveness in Affordable Housing Efforts at the Community Level. Applied Research Projects, Texas State University-San Marcos. Paper 113. Downloaded from <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/arp/113> on 25 March 2011.
- Ibem, E. O. (2010). An Assessment of the Role of Government Agencies in Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Housing Delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 15(2), 23- 48.
- Ibem, E. O., Anosike, M. N. & Azuh, D. E. (2011). Challenges in Public Housing Provision in the Post-Independence Era in Nigeria. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 8(2), 421-443.
- Ikejiofor, U. (1999). The God that Failed a Critique of Public Housing in Nigeria, 1975-1995. *Habitat International*, 23(2), 177-188.
- Japan Bank for International Cooperation. (1999). Organizational Capacity of Executing Agencies in Developing Countries-Case Study on Bangladesh, Thailand and Indonesia. JBIC Research Paper 2. Research Institute for Development and Finance, Japan Bank for International Cooperation.
- Judge, W. & Elenkov, D. (2005). Organizational Capacity for Change and Environmental Performance: an Empirical Assessment of Bulgarian Firms. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 893-901.
- Kellecher, K. (2010). Organizational Capacity to Deliver Effective Treatments for Children and Adolescents. *Administrative Policy Mental Health*, 37, 89-94.
- Liu, H (2007) .The Redistributive Effect of Public Housing in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies*, 44(10), 1937-1952.
- Lusthaus, C., Anderson, G. & Murphy, E. (1995). Institutional Assessment: A framework for Strengthening Organizational Capacity for IDRC's Research Partners. Canada: International Development Research Centre.
- Lusthaus, C., Marie-Helene, A., Anderson, G., Carden, F. & Montalvin, G. P. (2002) Organizational Assessment A Framework for Improving Performance, Canada: International Development Research Centre.
- Mackay, R., Horton, D., Duleich, L. & Andersen, A. (2002). Evaluating Organizational Capacity Development. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 17(2), 121-150.
- Mukhija, V. (2004). The Contradictions in Enabling Private Developer of Affordable Housing: a Cautionary Case from India. *Urban Studies*, 4(11), 2231-2244.
- Mustapha, I. (2002). Overview of Housing and Urban Development Programme since Independence. *Journal of the Association of Housing Corporations of Nigeria*, 1(6), 28-30.
- Onibokun, A. G. (1985). Housing Needs and Responses: A Planners' Viewpoints in A.G. Onibokun (Ed.) *Housing in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Nigerian Institute for Social and Economic Research (NISER), 66-83.
- Robin, L. M., Bedney, B. J. & Guenther-Grey, C. (2003). Assessing Organizational Capacity to Deliver HIV Prevention Services Collaboratively: Tales from the Field. *Health Education Behaviour*, 30(5), 582-600.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (1990). Housing the Urban poor in Developing Countries: Other policy options for National Shelter Strategies Are Examined since Conventional one is inadequate. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 49 (3), 257-269.
- Rowe, W. E., Jacobs, N. F. & Grant, H. (1999). Facilitating Development of Organizational Productive Capacity: A role for empowerment evaluation. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, Special Issue. 69-92.
- Sengupta, U. & Tipple, A. G. (2007). The Performance of Public-sector Housing in Kolkata, India, in the Post - Reform Milieu. *Urban Studies*, 44(10), 2009-2037.
- Walker, C. & Weinheimer, M. (1998). Community Development in the 1990s. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

- White, M. D., Fisher, C., Hafield, K., Saunder, J. & Williams, L. (2005). Measuring Organizational Capacity among Agencies Serving the Poor: Implications for Achieving Organizational Effectiveness. *Justice Policy Journal*, 2(2), 1-39.
- UN-HABITAT. (2006). National Trends in Housing –Production Practices Volume 4: Nigeria. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements: Nairobi.
- Wachira, E. (2009) .Organizational Capacity Audit Tool. Global e-Schools and Communities Initiative. Downloaded on 11 November 2009 from: <http://www.gesci.org/assets/files/organizational%20Capacity%20Audit%20Tool.pdf>.
- Wanyama, K. W. & Mutsotso, S. N. (2010). Relationship between Capacity Building and Employee Productivity On Performance of Commercial Banks in Kenya. *African Journal of History and Cultrure*, 2(5), 73-7.
- Yunga, B., Leahyb, P., Deasonc, L. M., Fischerd, R. L., Perkinse, F., Clasenf, C. & Sharmag, M. (2008). Capacity-Building Needs of Minority Health Nonprofits. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 31(4), 382-391.