

Capacity Building Interventions and Performance of Rwanda Civil Society Organizations: Case of CCOAIB, Kigali-Rwanda

Muneza Nicholas

MPAM student, Mount Kenya University, Rwanda.

Dr Safari Ernest

Senior Lecturer, Mount Kenya, University, Rwanda

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.12.05.2022.p12536

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.12.05.2022.p12536>

Paper Received Date: 20th April 2022

Paper Acceptance Date: 5th May 2022

Paper Publication Date: 14th May 2022

Abstract

The purpose of this study were to examine the capacity building interventions received by CCOAIB, to study the extent to which Capacity building interventions have contributed to CCOAIB's performance and; to evaluate the most contributing capacity building interventions to organization's performance. The researcher used is descriptive research design. The sample size was 169 respondents from a population of 300 employees of CCOAIB within City of Kigali. In selecting the sample size the researcher used purposive sampling technique. Research instruments used included Questionnaire, interview guides, for secondary data, organizational reports, employee capacity development manuals, journal, books and articles were used.. Descriptive statistics were used where distribution through STATA. Interventions received by CCOAIB are under three capacity building levels, individual capacity building interventions comprising of short term training and certified training, Organizational capacity building interventions comprising of staff motivation mechanisms, management style, network systems and technical competencies framework and Institutional capacity building interventions comprising of policies, rules and regulations. Based on the received capacity building interventions below is the extent to which the organization performed based on its objectives, the objective of empowering of members, 55 employees reported that this objective performed below 49%, 69 employees said that the objective performed between 50% and 75%, only 45 respondents said the objective performed between 76 and 100%. The objective of Monitoring development, 90 respondents said its performance was at 49% and below, 60 respondents said

the objective performed between 50% and 75% whereas 19 respondents said the objective had performed between 76% and 100%. Empowering members' objective was performed perfectly well, it scored the highest under the percentage range of between 76% and 100% with 45 respondents confirming this, followed by monitoring development and generating support. We observe significant associations between capacity building interventions and the performance of CCOIAB's set objectives. Organizational capacity building interventions were contributed most to the organization's performance. The research recommends developing a Capacity Needs Assessment, a proper result based management system needs to be developed and carrying out performance evaluation and there is need to invest more efforts and resources in short term courses and certified courses for employees. The findings of the research will be significant in that they will be used for; academic purposes, a guide to policy direction for policy formulators, help policy makers to make informed decisions and it will also be useful to other stakeholders' investment in the Civil Society like donors.

Keywords: *Capacity building, Performance, Non-government Organization, Rwanda Civil Society Organization.*

1. Introduction:

Capacity building is extensively well known, both officially and unofficially, as comprising of a series of scopes, from the knowledge and know-how of persons to institutional ability plus corresponding structures and customs that direct their processes. Capacity building

involves beset and planned modification options that will govern the attainment of an amount of defined outcomes; an important piece in institutional development which emphasizes positive institutional change and performance. Envisioned results would normally develop from human resources purposely deciding on accomplishing their professions inversely and with better capability. Capacity building can either be people or organizational processes centered. Contributing to capacity building as a 'means of conducting business has several inferences on a specific culture; capacity levels are an overall apprehension to all institutions, countries and persons as they describe an institution's performance, granting an advantage to other actors. (Christoplos, 2013).

Rwanda like any sub Saharan African developing country, still is fighting and progressively moving from traits that characterize a developing country such as poverty, illiteracy and limited institutional capacity. In 1994 Rwanda had a devastating genocide that was against the Tutsi, this claimed an estimate of over nine hundred thousand men, women plus Children who heartlessly were murdered in a well-planned Genocide. This cataclysmic event left roughly 500,000 children parentless. Institutional infrastructure were horribly destroyed as a result this made the country grieve, this caused destruction of the rural economy, which involves almost three quarters of the population. The ramifications of the genocide stimulated the Civil Society Organizations to arise targeting to administer to social needs and providing support to victims of the genocide against Tutsi mostly women and children. Rwanda Governance Board (RGB), a government institution that is mandated to register Civil Society Organizations in Rwanda was established. It has a unit that manages local Non-Government Organizations, Religious Based Organizations and political organizations' registering and monitoring the operating of these organizations (UNDP, Capacity building in Rwanda , 2008).

It is after this that the government started to intentionally build the capacity of the local Civil Society organizations through the Rwanda Civil Society Platform and its member umbrellas among other stakeholders that have been giving capacity building to the Rwanda's civil Society Organizations (UNDP, Human Resource Development Report, 2009).

CCOAIB has worked with in Rwanda since 1987, and has built a network of partnerships with stakeholders and donors from the Public sector and Civil Society Organization (both locally and internationally) that have continually supported the initiatives of CCOAIB and those of its member organizations, amongst these include

capacity development of its staff members and member organizations.

Rwandan government and other donor agencies have invested a lot of money in the capacity building interventions aimed at capacitated the Civil Society organizations to be able to perform in accordance to their given mandate. However several reports have highlighted institutional capacity challenges of the Civil Society Organizations. Civil Society Index Rwanda report carried out by CCOAIB, examined the state of civil society in Rwanda under four dimensions: structure, working environment, values, and impact. Within the structure dimension, only charitable giving and collective community action appear to be strong. Significant weaknesses prevail in citizen participation in non-partisan action, volunteering, membership of umbrella bodies, and geographical distribution. Key weaknesses include insufficient material, human, and financial resources; heavy dependence on external financing; precariousness of financial position and need to constantly look for new projects (CCOAIB, Civil Society Index Rwanda report , 2011).

Rwandan government and other donor agencies have invested in capacity building interventions for Civil Society Organizations; there still exists inadequate institutional capacities at levels of individual, organizational and institutional capacity. It is against this background that the researcher considered the need to critically analyze the relationship between the capacity building interventions and the performance of the Civil Society Organization using CCOAIB as the case study organization. To attain this, the following specific objectives were formulated:

- i.To examine the capacity building interventions received by CCOAIB
- ii.To study the extent to which Capacity building interventions have contributed to CCOAIB performance and;
- iii.To evaluate most contributing capacity building interventions to organization's performance.

2. Review of Literature

Ahmad discovered that a specific employee capacity building approach given time and funding for execution had direct exaggerated effect on employee performance. Furthermore studies related to the above are required to purport what is perceived to be true. Employee capacity building can and does have an impact on employee performance. There is practically no question that well

planned capacity building programs transform the performance of employees. Tamir also states that efficiency and effectiveness in employee performance leads to overall growth, capacity building of employees contributes to increased productivity (Tahir, 2014).

Organizations can intentionally encourage their invention and institutional performance through sound determined, deliberate and prudently designated alternatives concerning their capacity creation and utilization method (Murphy, Trailer & Hill, 2012).

According to UNDP, capacity building has three levels and these include; first the institutional level capacity these include the societal arrangements in which the human resources and institutions function. This includes laws, social norms, rules, power relations and policies that direct civic arrangements. This sets the overall capacity building scope. Second to it is the organizational level which looks at internal structures, systems and procedures that control institution’s effectiveness. Third to this is the individual level which entails experience, attitude, skills and knowledge that facilitate a person’s performance. These are in most cases acquired through formal training and education formally while on the other the hand others come informally through observing and acting. (UNDP, Human Resource Development Report, 2009).

NGOs possess the capability of playing a paramount role in delivering local services and acting as advocates for community needs. They are also seen by communities as impartial at a greater rate as compared to government entities and company representatives.

NGOs tend to manage better and resourced better than Community Based Organizations, while as others grapple with capacity matters pertaining to effective management systems, funding, skills and transparency.

The purpose is to improve the skills, knowledge and competencies in their dealings in the communities. NGOs invest in capacity building, linking the gained capacities in short term to a longer term perspective is of paramount importance. If capacity building is operational, NGOs can then apply their learnt skills and experiences to manage future projects in other areas and with other companies or organizations (LenCD, 2011).

3. Material and method

The researcher adopted an analytical and descriptive research design with both qualitative and quantitative data

4. Results

4.1. Examination of capacity building interventions received by CCOAIB

This publication is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.12.05.2022.p12536>

to describe the relationship between capacity building interventions and performance of Rwanda Civil Society Organization.

The total population consisted of 300 respondents all staff members of CCOAIB umbrella organizations in Rwanda, located in Kigali city and its suburbs. A sample size for this study was developed using the formula of Slovin, computed as

$n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$. Where number of samples (n), total population (N), margin

of error (e) Cited by Ngechu (2004). In this case N=300 taking the confidence level of 95% that is with a permissible error of 5%. The researcher got a sample size of 169 using Slovin formular. All the 169 questionnaires distributed were responded to and collected which made the response rate 100%. $n = \frac{N}{1 + (Ne^2)}$ $n = \frac{300}{(1 + 300 * 5\%^2)}$ this gives 169. To cross check and verify the accuracy of the sample size number, the researcher used RAOSOFT online sample size calculator and got the sample size of 169. The researcher used the sample size of 169 respondents.

Table 3.1: Sample size

Category	Researcher’s sample	Percentage
Operational employees	81	48%
Middle managers	53	31%
Senior Managers	35	21%
TOTAL	169	100%

Source: Researcher’s sample design (2020).

Questionnaires were used to collect primary data for the years 2010 to 2022. This data was analyzed using STATA. Face-to-face interview were used for qualitative data collection. Secondary data was collected using documentary techniques aimed at assembling the information collected from books, journals, articles and periodicals;

Approximately 23% of respondents interviewed indicated receiving either a short-term training or a

certified training. The individual capacity building interventions received were subjectively selected and

didn't meet the objective capacity needs of the trainees. Approximately 55% of respondents interviewed reported receiving training (short-term training, certified training and others), whereas 47% received a job promotion. This indicated that employees that receive capacity building are more likely to perform their assigned duties better than their counter parts that received no capacity building and at times get promoted at work.

Organizational capacity building interventions received by CCOAIB employees include; 38% employees received staff motivation mechanisms, 17% reported the organization having received management style, 18% reported the organization having received financial management, 28% reported the organization having received network systems whereas 27% reported the organization having received technical competency frameworks. Staff motivation mechanisms scored the highest percentage of (38%) in performance, this shows that, employees are more likely to be productive when they are recognized, appreciated and rewarded for the good work that they are doing for the organization.

Approximately 50 respondents confirmed that their organization had received capacity support to update policies, rules and regulations whereas 119 respondents

Table 1: Results from a logistic regression for member empowerment

Variables	Mode 1 (individual capacity building)	Model 2 (Organizational capacity building)	Model 3 (Institutional capacity building)
Individual capacity building	-0.160 (0.374)		
Organizational capacity building		0 (.)	
Institutional capacity building			-0.730* (0.342)
Constant	-0.310 (0.178)	-0.326* (0.157)	0.890 (0.599)
Observations	169	167	169

Standard errors in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Source: Primary data (2020).

From the Table 4.4 above, we observe that individual capacity building interventions have a standard error of -0.160 (0.374), showing a negative relationship with member empowerment objective, however, this

said their organization did not receive any capacity support to update policies, rules and regulations. This shows that Institutional Capacity Building interventions are not given much priority as compared to the other capacity building interventions.

With reference to the contribution of policies, rules and regulations to performance, 32 respondents agreed that updated policies, rules and regulations contributed to the performance of the organization whereas 137 respondents did not agree. This confirms the level of the limited attention given to institutional capacity building.

4.2. The extent to which Capacity Building interventions have contributed to CCOAIB's performance

Performance was defined as the ability of CCOAIB to achieve its organization's set objectives which include: Members' empowerment, monitoring members' development and generating support for her members. To determine the extent of members' empowerment objective's contribution, employees were asked if CCOAIB has achieved its objective of empowering its members through the capacity building interventions received. Table 4.4 below shows logistical regression for the objective of member empowerment with the capacity building interventions received at all levels by CCOAIB.

relationship is not statistically significant That is, receiving individual capacity building interventions such as, certified training and short term trainings had no significant effect on the performance and attainment of

CCOAIB’s member empowerment objective as reported by employees, where as Institutional capacity building registered a standard error of -0.730 (0.342) which makes the relationship statistically significant and negative. This shows that Institutional Capacity Building interventions contributed to the attainment of the organization’s objective of member empowerment.

Furthermore, it is emphasized in table 4.5 below, that through institutional capacity building interventions received by the organization, CCOAIB was able to meet its objective that relates to member empowerment. 54% of employees reported that the organization was meeting its member empowerment objective compared to only 36% who said the organization did not receive any form

of institutional capacity building and thus wasn’t meeting its members’ empowerment objective, yielding a significant difference of approximately 18%. Towards the end of quarter three of the year 2019/2020, CCOAIB had a confident record of accomplishments compared to projections. Three objectives were continually implemented with a completion rate of 85% (i.e 47 main activities out of 55).The failure to carry out all planned activities was due to insufficient funds, delay in the disbursement of funds and Covid-19 pandemic crisis (CCOAIB, Annual narrative report period July 2019- June , 2020).

Table 2: T-test results for the three capacity building interventions across member empowerment.

Objective	Capacity building	Groups	Observations	Mean
Member Empowerment	Individual	Received capacity building	39	.4230769
		No capacity building received	130	.3846154
		Difference		.0384615
	Organizational	Received capacity building	167	.4191617
		No capacity building received	2	0
		Difference		-.4191617
	Institutional	Received capacity building	50	.54
		No capacity building received	119	.3613445
		Difference		.1786555**

***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent critical level.

Source: Primary data (2020).

For monitoring member’s development objective, It was noted that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups of employees that reported receiving the different types of capacity building interventions and those that did not report receiving any capacity building interventions. On CCOAIB’s objective of monitoring development of members, the T-test indicated that Individual Capacity Building Intervention contributed a mean score of 0.5128205 registering a difference of –

0.666667, Organizational Capacity Building interventions scored a mean of 0.4670659 registering a difference of -0.4670659 and Institutional Capacity Building intervention scored a mean of 0.46 registering a different of 0.021849.

Those that received capacity building interventions of any type were likely to say that they improved their skills and executed their jobs with ease especially

planned activities under the objective of monitoring members' development as illustrated in table 4.6 below.

The employees that received capacity building at CCOAIB showed high levels of performance and creativity in the way they performed their jobs.

Table 3: T-test results for the 3 capacity building interventions across monitoring development objective.

Objective	Capacity building	Groups	Observations	Mean
Monitoring Development of members	Individual	Received capacity building	39	.5128205
		No capacity building received	130	.4461538
		Difference		-.0666667
	Organizational	Received capacity building	167	.4670659
		No capacity building received	2	0
		Difference		-.4670659
	Institutional	Received capacity building	50	.46
		No capacity building received	119	.4621849
		Difference		.0021849

***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent critical level.

Source: Primary data (2020).

Since the differences are statistically significant, we can say for sure that the capacity building interventions received had an effect on the performance of activities planned under the objective of monitoring development. This evidence proves that there is a positively impactful relationship between capacity building interventions received at CCOAIB and its performance in meeting the set objectives.

4.2.4 Generating Support for members' objective

Employees were asked if CCOAIB achieved its objective of generating support for its members. Similar to the member empowerment objective, employees reported that Institutional Capacity Building interventions received by CCOAIB enabled it to achieve its aforementioned objective.

Table 4: T-test results for the 3 capacity building interventions across generating support objective

Objective	Capacity building	Groups	Observations	Mean
Generating Support for members	Individual	Received capacity building	39	.3589744
		No capacity building received	130	.4846154
		Difference		.125641
	Organizational	Received capacity building	167	.4610778
		No capacity building received	2	0
		Difference		-.4610778
	Institutional	Received capacity building	50	.34
		No capacity building received	119	.5042017
		Difference		.1642017*

***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent critical level.

Source: Primary data (2020).

Table 4.7 above, shows that there is no significant mean difference between employees that received capacity building interventions or didn't with the organization objective of generating support for members. With generating support objective study results show that institutional capacity building interventions scored a mean contribution of 0.3589744 indicating a difference of 0.125641, organizational capacity building

interventions also scored a mean of 0.4610778 indicating a difference of -0.4610778 and institutional capacity building interventions contributed a mean of 0.34 indicating a difference of 0.1642017 illustrating clearly that there is no significant mean difference between the received capacity interventions and the objective of generating support for members.

Table 5: Contribution of Capacity building to performance across respondent characteristics

Outcome variable			Difference	Statistical significance
Gender	Male	Female		
	55%	47%	8%	
Education	Less than Bachelors	Bachelor or more		

	52%	39%	13%	
Experience	Less than 5 years	5 or more years		
	32%	67%	35%	***

***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent critical level.

Source: Primary data (2020).

From Table 4.8 above, we observe that respondents with more work experience (more than 5 years) were more likely to report that the individual capacity building intervention received helped them to improve their performance. 67% of employees with more than 5 years of experience reported capacity building interventions contributing to their performance, compared to only 32% of those with less than 5 years of work experience. We do not see any statistically significant difference across age, gender and level of education.

4.2.5 Performance of CCOAIB set objectives as a result of received capacity building interventions.

a result of the received capacity building interventions, the objective of empowering of members, 55 employees believed that this objective performed below 49%, 69 employees said that the performance of the aforementioned objective had score between 50% and 75%, only 45 respondents said the objective performed between 76 and 100% as a result of capacity interventions received by the organization.

As regard to the performance of the objective of monitoring development, 90 respondents said that the organization objective was performed at 49% and below, 60 respondents said the organization performed between 50% and 75% whereas 19 respondents said the objective had performed between 76% and 100% .

Statistics show that empowering members' objective was performed perfectly well, it scored the highest under the percentage range of between 76% and 100% with 45 respondents confirming this, followed by monitoring development and generating support.

Statistics also show that monitoring development objective performed worst among all the objectives with 70 respondents ranking performance at below 49%, 60 respondent ranked performance between 50% and 75% and finally only 19 respondents ranked 76%-100%.

Generating support registered 70 respondents ranked performance at below 49%, 89 respondents ranked the objective between 50-75% and 10 respondents ranked the objective performance at 76%-100%.

In conclusion, we note some significant associations between capacity building interventions and the CCOIAB's set objectives highlighted in our data. For example, we see that institutional capacity building is positively associated with objectives such as member empowerment and monitoring of development. On the other hand, we did not see clear effects of some capacity building interventions on the objectives, for example, we did not see clear association between individual capacity building and generating support for members, monitoring development of members as objectives.

4.3 To evaluate most contributing capacity building interventions to organization's performance.

Findings from the study show that organizational capacity building interventions received were more relevant in contribution to CCOAIB's organization performance; 167 employees have received Organizational capacity building interventions, 38% employees received staff motivation mechanisms, 17% reported the organization having received management style, 18% reported the organization having received financial management, 28% reported the organization having received network systems whereas 27% reported the organization having received technical competency frameworks. Employees confirmed that organizational capacity building interventions created an enabling environment where they were able to execute their duties thus enhancing their performance. Well planned capacity building strategies enable organizations develop and deliver programs that adhere and measure efficiency and effectiveness of organizations' interventions. These measurement imperatives must be used to evaluate the capacity building strategies implemented to help organizations achieve their goals in an ever changes business environment (Kara DeCorby-Watson & Gloria Mensah, 2018). In this case organizational capacity building interventions can be leveraged to help CCOAIB improve it strategy implementation to achieve its goals and objectives.

5. Discussion

This section attempts to discuss the findings from the study answering the research questions the study was set out to investigate and the major outcomes that were

discovered from the field, findings show that CCOAIB received three types of capacity building interventions which include; individual capacity building interventions, organizational capacity building interventions and institutional capacity building interventions. The organization received more individual capacity building interventions as compared to organizational capacity building interventions and institutional capacity building interventions.

Not all interventions that were implemented at CCOAIB fully helped the fulfillment of the performance of the Organization's set objectives. Findings show that for instance individual capacity building interventions had a negative relationship with member empowerment objective; this relationship was found to be not statistically significant. Whereas for institutional capacity building interventions received, finding showed that these capacity building interventions enabled the organization to perform well and meet its objective of member empowerment.

Findings show that respondents that received capacity building interventions of any type were likely to say that capacity building interventions received improved their performance of these individuals and had a great impact on the attainment of the organizations set objectives.

We also observed that employees with more work experience (more than 5 years) were more reported that the individual capacity building intervention received helped them to improve their performance.

The findings paint a fairly effective picture of capacity building delivery method to CCOAIB. However they were not given enough time and attention which affected excellence. Tahir says that specific employee capacity building approach given time and funding for execution have direct exaggerated effect on employee performance. Employee capacity building can and does have an impact on employee performance. There is practically no question that well planned capacity building programs transform the performance of employees. Tamir also states that efficiency and effectiveness in employee performance leads to overall growth, capacity building of employees contributes to increased productivity (Tahir, 2014).

Furthermore regarding the capacity building level interventions to be developed, organizations should include changes aiming at developing different levels of capacity, that is, information, skills, processes and structures. For required change to be fully implemented, the organization must move through several stages of

capacity building, increasing sophisticated skills, new information, processes and structures (Westat, 2015).

The findings tell of a story that confirms that there is a relationship between capacity building and performance of the Civil Society of Rwanda, organizational capacity building interventions contributing the lion share to the performance of employees, this was confirmed further by employees who said after receiving organizational capacity interventions, they were well suited to execute their duties with ease because of the enabling environment. This is evidence that well planned capacity building interventions whose execution is preceded by a meticulous capacity needs assessment at all levels of capacity contributes to performance of organizations and enables them to meet their set goals and objectives as the study confirms it with the Rwanda Civil Society Organization.

6. Conclusion

The Capacity Building Interventions received by CCOAIB are documented as stemming from the three levels of capacity building that is, Individual Capacity Building (short term trainings and certified trainings), Organizational Capacity Building (staff motivation mechanisms, management style, financial management, network systems and technical competencies frameworks) and Institutional Capacity Building (updated policies, rules and regulations). The extent to which the organization performed was viewed based on the Organization's set objective attainment in line with the capacity building interventions received. Under the objective of empowering of members, 55 employees believed that this objective performed below 49%, 69 employees said that the performance of this objective had scored between 50% and 75%, only 45 respondents said the objective performed between 76 and 100%. As regards to the performance of the objective of monitoring development, 90 respondents said that the organization objective was performed at 49% and below, 60 respondents said the organization performed between 50% and 75% whereas 19 respondents said the objective had performed between 76% and 100%. Statistics show that empowering members' objective was performed perfectly well, it scored the highest under the percentage range of between 76% and 100% with 45 respondents confirming this, followed by monitoring development and generating support.

These results above show that the contribution of the capacity building interventions to the performance of CCOAIB was immense with the Organizational capacity building intervention contributing the most abilities for

the employees through an enabling environment that forced effectiveness and efficiency in the execution of the Organization's planned activities.

The most relevant capacity building intervention in the performance of CCOAIB's objective attainment is the Organizational capacity building interventions; these contributed an enabling environment of CCOAIB employees that enabled them to perform their duties assigned to them effectively and efficiently.

from <https://www2.ed.gov>:
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ose/p/rda/cipp2-conceptualizing-capacity-building-2-10-15.pdf>

Reference:

- 1.CCOAIB. (2011). *Civil Society Index Rwanda report* .
- 2.CCOAIB. (2020). *Annual narrative report period July 2019-June 2020*. Kigali Rwanda: CCOAIB.
- 3.Christoplos. (2013). *Implementation evaluation of the cooperation strategy with Kenya 2009-2013*. Nairobi: SIDA.
- 4.Kara DeCorby-Watson & Gloria Mensah. (2018). Effectiveness of capacity building interventions. *Effectiveness of capacity building interventions: a systematic review* , 13-15.
- 5.LenCD. (2011). *The Bonn workshop Consensus on capacity development*. Len CD.
- 6.Murphy, Trailer & Hill. (2012). Measuring Performance in Entrepreneurship Research. *Journal of Business Research*,. *Journal of Business Research*, 36, 15-23.
- 7.Tahir Ahmad. (2014). Capacity building boost employee performance in banking. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*.
- 8.UNDP. (2008). *Capacity building in Rwanda* . UNDP.
- 9.UNDP. (2009). *Human Resource Development Report*.
- 10.Westat. (2015).
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ose/p/rda/cipp2-conceptualizing-capacity-building-2-10-15.pdf>. Retrieved September 23rd, 2021,