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Abstract
The increasing waves in global violence by the various terrorist and armed struggling groups has led to an increase in the number of internally displaced persons and refuges worldwide with Africa and Nigeria in particular having high toll of IDPs as a result of series of communal clashes, and above all the violence by the dreaded Bokoharam terrorist. These led to the displacement more than 1.5 million people in Borno state. the resultant effect of this created humanitarian crises is the incapacitation of National Emergency Management Authority (NEMA) and Borno state Emergency Authority (BOSEMA) to provide basic necessary services to the IDPs a situation that open space for influx of Nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) with varieties of humanitarian interventions. This development no doubt created room for synergy between government and nongovernmental agencies in the area of providing scours to the IDPs. This paper therefore examines the challenges of interagency collaboration in the management of internally Displaced persons in Borno state. The paper is a survey research where data for the study were gathered through questionnaire, key informant interview and focused group discussion. For data analysis both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were utilised. The paper established that although there is Communication gap among agencies, such gap has not impeded on service delivery by the agencies in the management of IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno state. It is clear to conclude that although conventional practice in other parts of the world shows that interagency collaboration in the management of IDPs is affected by a lot of factors such as communication gap, need to protect corporate identity, organisation capacity among others the situation in Borno state revealed that these factors have not served as challenges to interagency collaboration in the provision of social services to the IDPs. The study recommends among others the need for; a workable template among agencies with clearly defined roles and areas of coordination in order to eliminate the barriers to collaboration especially as organisational capacity is concern.
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Introduction
Inter-agency collaboration is one of the concepts that have won global currency in recent time especially among thinkers and practitioners working in human service systems. Historically, the 1970’s recognised the complexity and interrelated problems in the need for human services as a result of the escalation of conflict in the world. This has prompted different agencies providing various services to the needs of the people, to come together to solve the problem of mankind (Miller, Scott, Stage & Birkholt, 1995).

Globally, the contemporary growth and changing nature of governmental responsibilities as well as a change in the nature and extent of conflicts, and the need for a proactive response to the plight of those affected by conflicts has brought with it the need for re-organisation. The political and economic pressures to reduce the size and scope of government responsibilities and to cut expenditures and the lack of capacities by most countries ravaged by these conflicts informed the restructuring. The need for inter-agency collaboration as part of the restructuring has received serious attention, especially in human services. Inter-agency collaboration is put in place to ensure more predictable funding, strengthening coordination mechanisms, adoption of better preparedness measures and improved common services in the response to humanitarian crisis.

Inter-agency collaboration is the synergy or relationship between or among agencies working together to achieve common goals. Collaboration brings together government and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) to achieve common objectives. This Collaboration usually comes in distinct forms which are based on the organisational goals and means to achieving them. Collaboration could be cooperative: If the goals and means are similar; complementary: If the goals are similar but the means are dissimilar; cooperative: If the goals are dissimilar and means are similar and confrontational: If the goals and means are both dissimilar. The relationship types are not mutually exclusive; there might be both cooperative and confrontational relationships at the same time within the same relationship (Najam, 2000). Whatever the form collaboration takes, its major goal is to ensure that common goal is achieved.

With more than 66 million Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in 31 countries as at the end of 2016, sub-Saharan Africa is one of the region worst affected by internal displacement caused by conflict and violence. Since the beginning of the Syrian crisis, the number of IDPs in the region has reached a record of 12 million, almost five times the figure a decade ago. There were 40.8 million IDPs worldwide due largely to conflict and violence at the end of 2015 – an
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increase of 28 million on the figure in 2014, and the highest figure ever recorded (IOM, 2016). In 2016 the number of IDPs has doubled in the Middle East as result of the activities of Islamic State of Iraq and Levant. The figure proves that Internal Displacement is unarguably a serious humanitarian crisis and it is fast engulfing nations all over the world, with large proportion in Africa as a result of terrorist activities and other conflicts. In Nigeria the phenomenon has manifested in the emergence of conflict between farmers and herdsmen inter communal clashes and above all the Boko Haram terrorist group which has attracted global attention. Nigeria has one of the highest numbers of displaced persons in Africa in 2016 and accounts for about 15 million internally displaced by conflict and generalised violence (Bilak et al., 2016). This does not include internal displacement induced by development projects that are regulated by states. NEMA (2013) reports that Boko Haram terrorists alone had forced residents of various communities in Borno state to take refuge in Maiduguri, Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba, Yobe and Abuja but as at July 2016, about 1.5 million IDPs are being camped in various public school premises, newly-completed but yet-to-be-commissioned housing estates, as well as among host communities in Maiduguri, Borno state.

Since internally displaced persons remain within the territorial jurisdiction of their own countries, the primary duty and responsibility for the management and humanitarian assistance to them without discrimination and in accordance with international human rights and humanitarian law lie with the National and Sub-National authorities concerned. However, global trends for the management of IDPs has called for restructuring in terms of collaboration along with others to enhance cooperation between governmental agencies and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) with shared responsibilities and overlapping jurisdictions.

The United Nations Guiding Principle (1998), The Kampala Convention (2009) and Nigerian Policy of IDPs (2012) as part of their implementation framework for restructuring the management of IDPs, provides for an institutional mechanism for collaboration, including the establishment of a collaborative and coordination framework, designation and strengthening of a lead internal displacement coordination institution, creation of humanitarian coordination sectors and prescription of terms of reference for harmonious working relationship among the agencies. The principles recognised that states may work in tandem with NGOs in the management of IDPs especially in their efforts to provide protection and humanitarian assistance.

The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) was established and mandated to among other responsibilities to champion the cause for the management of IDPs in Nigeria. In carrying out its statutory duties, it
collaborates with the State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMA), which is established in each of the states of the Federation. NEMA and SEMA are mandated as enshrined in the UN Guiding Principle and the Kampala convention, to work with NGOs in carrying out their responsibilities. The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and Borno State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) are no doubt playing significant roles in the management of these IDPs. Despite the acts of terror still experienced in the state, Borno State has attracted many NGOs; local, national and international, who are playing complementary roles in the management of IDPs in camps. There is however glaring evidence that the large quantum of influx by nongovernmental organisation into north east in general and Borno state in particular has left much to be desired. This become manifest in the plethora of crises of coordination among the collaborating agencies with heavy toll on the expected service delivery in the area of livelihood, education, health services and protection. It is against this background that this paper examines the challenges faced by interagency collaboration in the management of internal displaced persons in Borno state Nigeria.

Objective of the Study
The main objective of the study is to examine the barriers to collaboration among state and non-state agencies in the management of IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno state.

Research Hypothesis
The paper hypothesised that \( H_01: \) Communication gap does not significantly exist among agencies in the provision of humanitarian services in Maiduguri, Borno state.

Conceptual Issues
Inter-Agency Collaboration
There is sporadic growth of interest among scholars in the area of interagency collaboration this has made the concept not only full of nuances but conflated with divergent scholarly views. This has no doubt resulted in lack of consensus on the meaning of the concept. Gazley and Brudney (2007) view the concept as the process by which organisations with a stake in a social problem or issue seek a mutually determined solution aiming at objectives they could not achieve by working alone. Similarly, Najam’s (2000) states that a four Cs model, offers a more detailed view of inter-agency collaboration by examining the extent to which their organisational goals and means overlap: Cooperative: If the goals and means are similar, then government and NGOs develop a cooperative relationship. Complementary: If the goals are similar but the means are dissimilar, then a complementary relationship between government
and NGOs emerges. Co-operative: If the goals are dissimilar and means are similar, then government tries to build a co-operative relationship with NGOs, and Confrontational: If the goals and means are both dissimilar, then government and the NGOs are in a confrontational relationship. The relationship types are not mutually exclusive; there might be both cooperative and confrontational relationships at the same time within the same relationship. The definition as given by the author presents relationships as the result of strategies that both state organisations and NGOs use.

One perspective of inter-agency collaboration is that collaboration is a result of resource dependency. According to Tseng (2004), the primary driver for organisations to collaborate is to survive. Agencies seek inter-agency collaboration for resources they need while trying to preserve their autonomy. Rivard, Johnson, Morrissey, and Starrett (1998) while supporting this perspective define inter-agency collaboration as the extent to which organisations exchange two primary resources: client referrals and information.

Another angle from which inter-agency collaboration can be viewed is in the area of coordination among the agencies in the domain of service delivery. Flynn and Harbin (1987) suggest that inter-agency collaboration is a general concept that describes a variety of efforts to reform the current categorical service delivery system. The choice of the word categorical service delivery system was informed by the fact that such agencies working together to achieve a similar goal are seen doing it together for the betterment of humanity. Hence, Gray and Wood (1991) point out that inter-agency collaboration is a process through which parties that see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible. Similarly, Peterson (1993:90) stated that to engage in inter-agency collaboration, “two or more agencies synchronise their activities to promote compatible schedules, events, services, or other kinds of work that contribute to the achievement of each agency’s individual mission and goals”. The authors positioned that for there to be effectiveness, the actors in the human service system must synchronise their activities towards helping the poor and most vulnerable in the society.

**Internally Displaced Persons**

The concept of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) has equally gained currency in the field of social and management sciences. The concept started gaining currency in the 1980’s as a result of changing dimension in the conflict in nations. Hitherto, the conflict was inter-states but this period witnessed a change to intra-state conflict. Hence, United Nation Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (1998:1) states that IDPs are “Persons or groups of
persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised state border.” United Nations Human Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) describes internally displaced persons (IDPs) as probably the largest group of vulnerable people in the world (UN, Guiding Principle, 1998). This definition although universally accepted fails to recognised those who were displaced by the perceived feelings to threat

In his reconceptualisation of IDPs, Ibeanu (1998), conceives it as “internal population displacement” as an integral part of a single general theory of population displacement. Internal should not be understood as defining a category of displaced persons as in IDPs (internal) distinct from refugees (external). Neither should it be understood as a formulation of a regional theory of internal population displacement. Rather, it should represent an attempt to build into a general theory population displacement the purely secondary parameter of the exact location of a displaced population.

Under the following working definition of IDPs, which was developed by the Special Rapporteur on IDPs as there is at present no specific international legislation devoted to that issue, displaced persons are deemed as Persons or groups of persons forced to flee their homes or places of habitual residence suddenly or unexpectedly as a result of armed conflict, internal strife, systematic violations of human rights or natural or man-made disasters, but have not crossed an internationally recognised state border (UNAID, 2004).

**Agencies in the Management of IDPs**
This section will focus on the issues of identifying the agencies responsible for the management of IDPs during emergencies. This will be submerged into two broad categories, the national government, and the NGOs.

**Governmental Organisation in the Management of IDPs**
National responses towards IDPs vary immensely. Clearly, those countries with weak governments and poor urban infrastructure will be less well equipped to deal with IDP populations. That being said, the world saw thousands of internally displaced persons in New Orleans left without sufficient assistance following the effects of hurricane Katrina. Evidently, the plight of IDPs is not confined to the developing world and deliberate effort must be put in place by the government no matter the level of advancement to cater for such emergencies
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Margesson, Sharp and Bruno (2007), reports that in Iraq, government ministries providing assistance to the displaced within Iraq include the Ministries of Trade, which is in charge of the allocation of food rations, the ministry of interior, which provides documentation for services, such as registration for food rations, and the ministry of education, which is in charge of registering school children, many of whom have been displaced and need to be enrolled in local schools. The Honduran government created the inter-institutional commission for the protection of displaced persons by violence in 2013, tasked with formulating policies and adopting measures to prevent displacement and to assist and protect IDPs and their families (IDMC, 2014).

In Nigeria, the governmental organisations saddled with the responsibilities of managing IDP in Nigeria are NCFR, NEMA, and SEMA. National efforts to respond to displacement and mitigate its long-term effects on IDPs and host communities tend to be fragmented, uncoordinated and inadequate, however (Ladan, 2010). Most assistance IDPs receive, regardless of the cause of their displacement, is provided by host communities (IDMC interview with UNHCR, October 2014). SEMAs have only limited resources and capacity, and there is no law or policy framework setting out responsibilities in terms of IDPs’ protection and assistance beyond the initial phase of displacement. In the absence of clear roles for the ministries, departments, and agencies involved in any response, they often compete with each other for the limited funding available.

The response to IDPs’ assistance and protection needs is generally implemented via disaster management mechanisms. NEMA is mandated under the 1999 National Emergency Management Agency Act to provide emergency relief to victims of “natural or other disasters” and to assist in their rehabilitation. It tends to oversee the provision of assistance during the first two to four weeks of displacement (IDMC interview with NEMA, May 2013). It has recently expanded its role to coordinate, and in some cases deliver, assistance to displaced communities. NEMA collaborates with federal, state and local agencies, with SEMAs being the primary responders on the ground. The notable exception to this is in Borno state, where NEMA has responded to the crisis directly during much of 2014 (NEMA, 2014). NEMA’s role is meant to supplement the emergency response while SEMAs deliver. SEMAs exist in most of the 36 states, usually distributing relief supplies provided by NEMA or the state. SEMAs also manage camps and collect data, but their capacities vary widely and few are able to respond effectively to displacement crises (IDMC, 2013).

National Commission for Refugees (NCFR) works to support IDPs after the emergency phase in their pursuit of durable solutions. It assists the most
vulnerable communities with the reconstruction or repair of infrastructures such as homes, clinics, schools and boreholes, and by providing livelihood support including boats, fishing nets, and farming tools. It has also commissioned training centers for IDPs in several states (NCFR, 2013, on file with IDMC). NCFR’s activities are meant to complement NEMA’s and to be coordinated with them. In reality, however, this rarely happens, in part because of a lack of clarity surrounding NCFR’s mandate (Enwereji, 2011). NRCS is present throughout the country and maintains branches and volunteers in each state. It has rapid response capacity for humanitarian crises and provides relief supplies.

Non-Governmental Organisation in the management of IDPs
National governments have the primary responsibility for the protection and assistance of its citizens and residents. When the state is unwilling or unable to fulfil its obligations, however, the responsibility falls to the non-governmental organisations especially international community to protect those in need. Internally displaced persons no longer fall between the gaps of international protection to the extent they used to. Several developments have encouraged and enabled the non-governmental to play a bigger role in protecting and assisting IDPs. International attention on IDPs remains limited, however (Olagunju, 2006).

In 1992 the UN appointed Francis M. Deng as Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of internal displacement, who was succeeded by Walter Kalin in September 2004. The Representatives have undertaken numerous visits and reported on the situation of IDPs in many countries hosting large IDP populations. They have thus been able to develop and disseminate a normative framework for protection and assistance of IDPs, raise the profile of IDPs on the international stage, and foster further research into the plight of IDPs globally.

The Special Representative was responsible for shaping the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. International and intergovernmental organisations have been very positive towards the Principles. The African Union, ECOWAS, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD, 2012), the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe have all shown strong support. Furthermore, the United Nations has also called on states to respect the Principles (Kalin, 2006).

In 1997 the UN assigned overall responsibility to the Emergency Relief Coordinator, and soon afterward IDPs were also being monitored by the UN’s
Inter-agency Standing Committee (IASC). In January 2002 OCHA established an Internal Displacement Unit and renamed the Internal Displacement Division. UNHCR’s involvement in IDP operations dates back to engagement in Sudan in 1972, despite the fact that its original 1951 mandate makes no explicit reference to IDPs. The principal criteria governing UNHCR’s involvement with IDPs are set out in Resolution 53/125 (December 1998). This resolution effectively extended the mandate of the agency in “providing humanitarian assistance and protection to internally displaced persons…with the consent of the State concerned.” In relation to IDP situations, UNHCR has made a commitment to act as ‘cluster lead’ in the areas of protection, camp management and coordination and emergency shelter.

With support from UN agencies, international humanitarian organisations and NGOs, NEMA published a joint humanitarian action plan (JHAP) in September 2013 to respond to emergencies caused by hazards and conflicts (NEMA, 2013). The plan established nine sectorial working groups to coordinate data collection and the response to humanitarian needs, with the government, the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), IOM, the UN Food, and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) co-leading quarterly working groups. It aims to provide a common platform for the government and humanitarian community to address the challenges they face in a principled, timely and coordinated way. These agencies are expected to collaborate for the effective management of the IDPs.

**Barriers to Collaboration**

Collaboration seems to have a positive disposition especially among agencies wishing to improve common services. However, there are many reasons why collaborative attempts fall short the ideal or are never been initiated (Gray, 1989). Gray argues that collaboration is an appropriate approach under certain circumstances. This includes when stakeholders are unwilling to work together when there is little consensus on action steps or solutions, when substantial power differentials exist, when maintenance of inter-organisational relationship represents significant costs to partners, or when a legitimate facilitator or mediator cannot be found.

McLaughlin and Covert (1984) itemise a number of undesirable characteristics of participating organisations that have potentials to impede collaboration. These include competitive spirit, parochial interest, and personal resistance to change, inadequate orientation and negative staff attitude. Gray list several risks believed collaboration to be susceptible to including; differing protocols, structures, system cultures and values of individual agencies; exclusion of any important stakeholder from the collaborative process; overload resulting from a continuing stream of new initiative; and tight timeframes. Gibbs (1999)
considers the “common problems” that characterise interagency arrangements, including collaboration. These include the existence of ideological differences; absence of purpose and clarified responsibilities, lack of communication, and dominance by one or more participating organisations. Bardach (1998) refers to two “conditions” that have the ability to disrupt what he calls “inter-organisational collaborative capacity”. According to him the barriers to collaboration include slow pace in developing collaborative capacities because of complex issues and scarce resources and emerging vulnerabilities such as hazard in maintaining a new infrastructure or problems emanating from changes in the political and fiscal environment.

The opportunity cost in collaboration among organisations to invest resources, including energy, intellectual capital and/or financial resources, into developing and maintaining the collaboration can form a significant barrier to collaboration for some of them (Nowland-Foreman, 2008). Collaboration takes time and often different organisations with different agendas working at different speeds (Wilcox, 2009). A tight timeframe has been noted as a factor for failure to successfully collaborate (Gray, 2002).

High staff turnover has been noted as a barrier to collaboration, and each staff member who moves on represents a loss of institutional knowledge (Hosley, Gensheimer & Yang, 2003). Some organisations are at full capacity and due to financial limitations and a lack of funding, collaboration may be a low priority in workload (Gray, 2002). There can be instability and uncertainty among small community-based organisations regarding shifting priorities and competition for funds which reduces their ability to commit to long-term collaboration. One thing that is clear among these authors is that lack of funding and institutional capacity hinders the possibilities of successful collaboration in spite of its promising nature.

Organisational Capacity as Barrier to Collaboration
Accordingly, organisational capacity can be a significant barrier to effective collaboration. Effective collaboration also depends on the key participants having a wide range of skills to enable them to work well together, and skills/knowledge to build and manage the collaboration (Foster-Fishman, Berkowitz, Lounsbury, Jacobsen & Allen, 2001). Many organisations often have a limited pool of people with sufficient management skill and commitment to be involved in strategic development meetings of collaboration. There is potential for volunteer fatigue. Conflict has been identified as a barrier to collaboration. Accordingly, the sorts of issues that can occur include: imbalances of power, turf and territorial issues, differences in organisational norms and procedures, lack of or
miscommunication, loss of identity or independence, differential power relations, logistical issues, difficulties in maintaining community accountability, and identifying appropriate community representation.

These factors can arise from the differing protocols, structures, systems, cultures and values of individual agencies (Hosley et al., 2003). Conflicts can arise from differing worldviews. Territorial issues can arise from miscommunications between organisations working in a similar area, for example, one organisation may feel threatened when another organisation starts a similar venture in a community they feel they are covering. The existing organisation may not be leaning, in those situations, to seek to collaborate with the new faction. Funders can purposely create these types of tensions if they themselves do not communicate effectively on what they are funding in particular geographic areas, or specialist areas of interest (Nowland-Foreman, 2008).

**Communication Gap**

The success of collaboration lies in clear, open and frequent communication. A lack of information and the inability to maintain open and frequent communication can all be barriers successful and effective collaboration. Insufficient knowledge and experience of the substantive tasks conducted by partners can result in unsuccessful collaboration (Copps, 2009). Numerous potentials impediment to collaboration have been identified, but it is clear that the absence of genuine willingness on the part of persons in agencies to work closely with each other is a major factor. Where the agencies perceive that collaboration among others is a waste of time and money or loss of organisational identity, it is foreseeable that they will result in it. In this regard, historical tension or ideological difference can result in an adversarial relationship that precludes collaboration.

**Empirical Studies**

Several studies have been conducted on the subject matter based on data collected from the primary source. Here an attempt will be made to review these studies based on their author, titles objectives, theory/model, methodology, results, and conclusions.

Olagunju (2006) studied the “Challenges faced by the Nigerian Government and NGO’s in addressing the Problems of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). The research examined the management of IDPs (internally displaced persons) in Nigeria based on the February/May 2000 communal conflict at Kaduna, Northern Nigeria, as the focus of the study. The challenges faced by the IDP’s and by the various government agencies and NGOs involved in responding to the needs of the IDPs were assessed, documented, compared
and analysed. Two sets of questionnaires were administered to the IDPs, and
government agencies and NGOs. The study found out that government
agencies and NGOs responded to the emergency of taken care of the IDPs.
Similarly, the study found out that poor documentation and access to the IDPs
in their times of need is the major challenged faced by the IDPs. IDPs lack
access to food, water, basic shelter, and sanitation. Finally, the study revealed
that governments were quick to dismantling the camps without adequate
resort to ending the conflict. The study recommends among others that better
responses to the management of IDP needs should be given for the use of
relevant governmental and NGO agencies. The contribution by Olagunju is
commendable especially in the area of contribution to knowledge.

In a similar study supervised by Babagana (2016) titled “Coordination barrier
among agencies in relief administration to the Internally Displaced Person’s
in Maiduguri” examined the barriers to vertical coordination among the
agencies in the administration. Purposive sampling was employed to obtain
105 respondents to represent the population (84,320) of the study. The
questionnaire was the main tool used to obtain information from the
respondents while chi-square was employed to test the hypothesis given 0.05
level of significance. The study found out that information sharing among the
participating agencies is not adequate. The result of the study similarly
revealed that there is a high level of duplication of effort and materials among
participating agencies while the test of hypothesis rejected the null hypothesis
and thus concludes that barriers among the agencies (capabilities, information
monopoly, and commitment) have significantly hindered relief administration
to the IDPs. The study recommends among others that instead of each
agencies working alone, the mechanism should be developed to coordinate
the participation of all stakeholders. The effort put in by Babagana has
contributed in terms of expansion in knowledge in the area. The fundamental
weakness of this study is it methodological lapses especially its heavy
dependency nominal statistical tool for analysis.

Rajput (2013) conducted a study titled “Issues and the Challenges of the
Displaced Kashmiri Pandit Community”. Ninety-four person interviews were
conducted with the national-level policymakers, non-governmental
organisations (NGOs), members of host communities, and IDPs themselves.
The challenges and issues that surfaced during the interviews represent the
views of a range of IDPs living in the camps of Delhi, Jammu, and Srinagar.
The study found out that difference of opinions emerged among the IDP
community. For example, some lived in semi-integrated communities, some
dreamed of returning to the Valley, and some felt insulted by the notion of
returning to the same place that "humiliated their identity" (KP Family, Muthi
Camp) and expelled them. The study found out that water and food remained the major challenges of the IDPs living in the camp

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this paper is obligatory Humanistic Theory. This theory was propounded by Carolyn Pope Edwards (1985). The major disposition of this theory hinges on the assumption that: there exists a moral imperative to aid the structurally dispossessed and functionally abused. Within anthropology and normative public administration, the origin of moral obligation in the assistance of others can be traced to the work of Carolyn Pope Edwards (1985) and Ronald Cohen (1989). In the first instance, Edwards (1985) creatively addressed the issue of ethical discourse. Couched within a discussion of ethical relativism, the author stressed the importance of understanding and comparing discourses associated with rights and morals. The author also was interested in the research methodologies that might be employed in assessing these. One key issue is the author’s cogent statement of the following, ‘Ethical discourse’ can be defined as a string of…arguments containing ‘moral statements’ (statements about what actions or attitudes are obligatory or virtuous) and/or ‘ethical statements’ (statements about why those actions or attitudes are morally right or wrong). In the second instance, Cohen (1989) built his argument upon considerations of human rights and cross-cultural variations in their interpretation. Both these authors stressed early-on that the use of empirical, case-based data is essential.

A theory of obligation can be centred around one foundational assumption: that there exists a moral imperative to aid the structurally dispossessed and functionally abused. Other theories of obligation might emphasis different, more utilitarian approaches. This theory does not think to entertain a highly controversial assumption. Indeed, the moral imperative to assist others has been codified in international human rights laws which have been widely ratified and have garnered global (even if often rhetorical) attention and support (Donnelly, 2006).

In turn, a theory of obligation structures response to the moral imperative to give aid. At its simplest, the obligation is found in basic human interactions and expectations. Friendship entails obligation, often accompanied by feelings of gratitude. Gratitude, in turn, is expressed for acts of kindness (Epstein, 2006). Such understandings provide a framework within which can operate ethically and effectively not only in everyday interactions but to benefit the dispossessed and abused and to guarantee their human rights. Thus the theory of obligation has two major components: a moral/ethical element which informs decisions as to which issues are appropriate for humanitarianism and which actions are morally permissible in pursuing them;
and a pragmatic element which guides in evaluating the most effective use of available resources. The overlap between the two components, the morally possible and the materially possible, consists of those actions that are obligated, as representatives of humankind, to pursue.

When evaluating what actions are materially possible, it is of primary importance to recognise the need for pragmatism: the acknowledgment of real-world conditions that constrain actions and impact the results of those actions, coupled with the acceptance of the idea that the value of ideas and actions is found in their real-world consequences. As it is obviously physically impossible to resolve every humanitarian issue at once, setting realistic, achievable goals that can be met on the ground is vital (Smillie & Minear, 2004). Sustainability is a key in the choice of initiatives that are able to be supported and sustained over time. Sustainability depends on access to reliable resources, the presence of staff and/or volunteers who are sufficiently committed to the mission, and an “indigenous connective-ness” to the mission in order to address felt needs. Thus workable solutions are context-based.

Because an emphasis on pragmatic humanitarianism implies a need to acknowledge the inability to solve all of the world’s problems at once, there must be some mechanism determining where to apply scarce resources, where to “triage” our activity. Again, the ethical principle of obligation to assist can structure our response. In assessing the environment where assistance is to be delivered we look for the areas where the available resources can be of most assistance.

The assessment of the felt needs of intended beneficiaries is a key component of a theory of obligation. Central to this is the assumption that the needs and interests of the beneficiaries are of greater importance than those of the humanitarian organisation, its board, its staff, or its donors. Therefore, recognising and incorporating the voices of intended recipients through an assessment of their felt needs is fundamental to the theory. “Felt needs” are those needs that represent beneficiaries’ worldviews; felt needs are expressed in unfiltered fashion and may not conform to service providers’ visions. They often are not evident to a detached observer. They are exemplified in the needs expressed by a poor woman in the Bosnian village of Brezik. They were not food, water, sanitation, clothing, or shelter, but seed money to buy chicks to start a micro-enterprise of chicken breeders, itself intended to raise enough money to run a women’s cooperative. Who would have known? What outsider could have guessed?

So long as the supply and demand mind-set rules the disbursement of aid from donors and its receipt by NGOs or host governments, such confusion
regarding accountability is likely to continue. A shift in theoretical orientation is called for. Instead of viewing the transaction as economic – a transfer of scarce resources to the most efficient humanitarian use – it must be acknowledged that humanitarian aid is, fundamentally, a moral relationship based on the obligation of “those who have” to address the felt needs of “those who have not.”

Finally, when implementing programs and policies, the network of service providers and associated infrastructure also must be considered. These networks are an integral part of the local context that structures humanitarian action. Verdirame and Harrell-Bond (2005) argue that the social context includes a multiplicity of actors, each standing in a particular relationship of power vis-à-vis the other, which the study assumed it was necessary to unravel. An assumption that studying humanitarian organisations required not only examining the policy documents emanating from ‘headquarters’ but also the practices of regional and local offices down to the actions of individuals working at the (IDPs) camp level (Verdirame & Harrell-Bond, 2005).

In many humanitarian situations, and especially in refugee and IDPs situations, there are a multiplicity of aid organisations, governmental actors, and local actors that form a complex web of service providers and service obstructers. It is a vital task in the context of limited resources and a finite amount of infrastructure, understanding who has the capacity and the willingness to perform which tasks enables greater efficiency in resource distribution. It also allows humanitarians to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the existing networks so that they can be further developed to benefit people at risk.

**Materials and Methods**

The sources of data for this study are both primary and secondary. The primary source was obtained from response of government officials, NGOs, and IDPs while secondary data were from, documents from NEMA, and SEMA. The population of the study comprises of a governmental official, NGOs, and IDPs. The first category of the population consists of a staff of NEMA, Borno SEMA, the staff of Ministries of health, and education, security personnel and civilian JTF totalling 1973. The second category of the population is 45 NGOs in Maiduguri. The last category of the population consists of 64065 adult registered IDPs living in official camp; and 34642 living in unofficial camp. The total population of IDPs as at the time of data collection in August, 2017 is 98,707. The total population of the study is 100695 (SEMA, 2017).

The sample size for the study is of 333 officials of government agencies), 398 IDPs and 16 NGOs (purposively obtained). The sample is 747. A multistage
sampling technique was adopted to select the sample. Simple random sampling technique and proportional sampling techniques were applied to select 333 respondents both officials and non-officials in the camps. Purposive sampling technique was used to select All NGOs that have been in Maiduguri since 2014 whose core competencies are within the scope of this study. Convenient and proportionate sampling techniques were used to select 398 IDPs based on the local government and camp location. Thus, a total of 747 respondents constituted the sample population comprising of camp officials, NGOs and IDPs. The study is a survey research and data was collected using four major instruments; Questionnaire, interview, focus group discussion, and participatory observation. The questionnaire was distributed to camp officials (government agencies); the interview was conducted with non-governmental organisations, while Focus Group Discussion was conducted with the IDPs. A semi-structured interview was conducted with the selected NGOs. Each of the NGOs has its particular responsibilities (core competencies) therefore; the interview was structured in such a manner as to elicit for information as regards the barriers to collaboration.

Focus group discussions were also conducted with the IDPs to corroborate the finding on the assessment of inter-agency collaboration in the management of IDPs in Borno state. The IDPs for the focus group discussion were selected by the research team. The composition of the group took care of demographic factors. Research assistants fluent in Kanuri, Hausa, and Marghi were trained on data coding and collection in focus group discussions. The data collected in this study was analysed by both descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics consisted of percentage, frequency distribution, tables, bar charts and pie charts which were used for presentation of data. The inferential statistics that was used is chi-square.

Results and Discussion
This section presents data collected from governmental agencies, NGOs and IDPs using questionnaires, Interview and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) respectively in eleven (11) camps settings. A total of three hundred and thirty-three (333) questionnaires were distributed to the officials of government while three hundred and eight (308) were retrieved as valid and used for data analysis. All the sixteen (16) NGOs presented were interviewed while three hundred and ninety-eight (398) IDPs participated in the FGD. The data is presented in sections A, B, and C. Section A highlighted the analysis of the responses of the governmental agencies; section B, on the other hand, presented the interview conducted while section C dealt with data on FGD.
Section A
Presentation of the findings in the questionnaire administered to the officials of government agencies responsible for the management of IDPs in camps in Maiduguri.

Barriers to collaboration among agencies in Borno state
This section sought to provide an answer to the question what are the barriers to inter-agency collaboration in the management of IDPs in Borno state? The researcher enquired to know whether Inter-agency collaboration has been a failure due to organisational capacity. Most of the organisation differ incapacity; in this view, this study will examine the effect of the difference in organisational capacity on collaboration. Most agencies do not collaborate for fear of losing their corporate identity as a result of dominance by other organisations. This study also enquired to know whether they need to preserve corporate identity by most agencies has been a barrier to collaboration. The study enquired to know from the respondents whether values of individual agencies tend to impede on collaboration. This is view to know the effect of individual agency values on collaboration among agencies.

![Figure 1: Barriers to Collaboration](source: Field Survey, 2017)

Figure 1 shows the effect of organisation capacity on collaboration among agencies. The figure shows that 39(13%) and 54(18%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that Inter-agency collaboration has been affected by
organisational capacity, while 27(9%) are undecided. The figure also shows that 129(42%) and 59(19%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Inter-agency collaboration has been a failure due to organisational capacity. The inference from the figure showed that Inter-agency collaboration has been affected by organisational capacity. The implication of the finding is that agencies despite their capacity have a space in the collaboration cycle in human services in Borno state.

Moreover, the figure shows the effect of preservation of corporate identity on inter-agency collaboration. The table shows that 56(18%), 87(28%), 33(11%), 102(33%) and 30(10%) representing strongly agreed, agreed, undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Fear of identity loss by most agencies has been a barrier to collaboration. The majority disagreed; therefore, preservation of corporate identity by most agencies has not been a barrier to collaboration. The implication of the finding is that uses of visibilities assuage this fear; hence, inter-agency collaboration goes unhindered.

Furthermore, the figure shows the extent to which the philosophy and values of individual agencies tend to impede on collaboration. The figure shows that 52(17%) and 69(22%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that values of individual agencies tend to impede on collaboration. The table also shows that 111(36%) and 42(14%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Values of individual agencies tends to impede on collaboration. Analysis of the table revealed that the philosophy and values of individual agencies do not impede on collaboration in Maiduguri. The implication of the finding is that the core values of agencies encourage collaboration with other agencies.

**Communication Gap among Agencies**

The study sought to know from the respondents whether Communication gap among agencies has impeded on service delivery. This is with the view to testing the hypothesis that states that communication gap among agencies results in poor service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agreed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreed</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagreed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2017
Table 1 show the effect of communication gap among agencies as a barrier to collaboration which normally results in poor services. The table shows that 33(11%) and 47(15%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that communication gap among agencies has impeded on service delivery. The table also shows that 152(49%) and 45(15%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that communication gap among agencies has impeded on service delivery. Analysis of the finding showed that Communication gap among agencies has not impeded on service delivery by the agencies in the management of IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno state. The implication of the finding is the there is the strong communication link between and among agencies of government.

**Section B**

The presentation of the interview was done here based on interaction with the heads of NGOs based on their core competencies (areas of specialisation).

What are the barriers to inter-agency collaboration in the management of IDPs in Borno state?

This section examines the barriers to inter-agency collaboration in the management of IDPs in Borno state. All the selected agencies of both the government and NGOs provided a response in other to provide an answer to this research question.

**Organisational capacity**

The researcher enquired to know from the interviewee whether inter-agency collaboration has been a failure due to organisational capacity. This is with the view to knowing the effect of the capacity of collaboration. The interviewees were quick to note that collaboration has never been affected by the capacity of the organisation. All the agencies especially NGOs collaborate with each other either they are local or international, there is synergy among them. In terms of capacity, one of the interviewee from local NGOs pointed out, they received equal treatment with other international NGOs and are not treated on the basis of weaker organisational capacity. The inference from the analysis pointed out that inter-agency collaboration has not been a failure due to organisational capacity. The implication of the study suggested that organisational capacity is not a requirement for collaboration among agencies.

**Preservation of Corporate Identity**

The researcher sought to know whether the fear of identity loss by most agencies has been a barrier to collaboration, especially between the government and NGOs. The finding of the study reveals that the identity or visibility of agencies is very important to them and none negotiable. Most
agencies have this understand and will not collaborate with others if this is going to be compromised. One of the interviewees who spoke from the perspective of the government agency stated that the government does not in any way try to overshadow other agencies but rather a level playing ground is provided in the humanitarian sector. In agreement to this, the interviewees who are part of the NGOs also pointed out that their identity has never been compromised by others. Therefore, the need to preserve the corporate identity of the organisation is not a barrier to collaboration among agencies in Maiduguri.

The finding from the interview also shows that the government registers NGOs in Borno state, so as to ensure compliance with local rules and regulation but does not in any way dominate or regulate humanitarian activities. Some of the NGOs pointed out those whose activities were in any areas that are devoid of governmental huge presence, for example, un-official camps; it does not in any way control or tries to control the activities of NGOs in the state. The finding, therefore, revealed that overbearing governmental dominance has not been a barrier to collaboration among and between agencies in response to humanitarian needs in Borno state. The implication of this finding is that government does not influence the activities of NGOs in humanitarian services.

**Philosophy and Values of Agencies**

The researcher enquired to know from the interviewees whether the values of individual agencies tend to impede on collaboration. This is with the view to knowing the extent to which collaboration can be affected by the core values of humanitarian actors in Borno state. The researcher found out that collaboration is usually affected by the core values of the individual agencies. Some of the core values of the NGOs, for example, stop them from collaborating with the governmental agencies in other to maintain their neutrality. This equally explains why they are not in official camps that are manned by the government. Analysis of the finding showed that values of individual agencies tend to impede on collaboration. The implication of the finding is that because of the value of some of the NGOs, they will never respond to certain emergencies.

**Communication Gap among Agencies**

The researcher sought to know from the interviewees whether communication gap among agencies has impeded on the desirability of collaboration. This is with the view to testing the hypothesis that states communication gap does not exist among agencies in the provision of humanitarian services in Borno state.
Table 2: Communication Gap among Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagreed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2017

Table 2 shows that 11(69%) disagreed that communication gap does exist among agencies in the provision of humanitarian services in Borno state. The table also shows that 4(25%) strongly agreed that communication gap does exist among agencies in the provision of humanitarian services in Borno state while 1(6%) are undecided. Analysis of the table indicated that communication hiccups have been minimised among agencies in the provision of humanitarian services in Borno state. The implication of the finding showed that is no barrier to communication among agencies.

Section C

The data from the FGD was collected and presented below. The IDPs as the direct beneficiaries of agency collaboration were asked probing question to elicit their response in the direction of agency collaboration with the assumption that they may not understand the nature of collaboration. The essence of this exercise is to actually know if the efforts of the various agencies have affected the livelihood of the IDPs.

Re- H₀1: Communication gap does not exist among agencies in the provision of Humanitarians Services in Borno state

Table 3: Chi-square Summary of Collaboration and Communication gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>(O-E)^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154.4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2017

X² at 4 df at 0.05 level of significance = 9.488

Decision= X² at 4 df at 0.05 level of significance =9.488, since the calculated value = 1.914 is less than the table or critical significant difference, the null
hypothesis is accepted and therefore conclude that communication gap does not exist among agencies in the provision of Humanitarians Services in Borno state.

Discussion

There are so many factors that might act as barriers to collaboration among agencies. The hypothesis of the study tested was accepted and a conclusion that communication gap does not exist among agencies in the provision of Humanitarians Services in Borno state. The hypothesis corroborates the finding in table 5.5 with 197(64%) response of government officials that Communication gap among agencies has not impeded on service delivery by the agencies in the management of IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno state. Similarly, the response of NGOs in table2 with 15(94%) opined that communication gap does not exist among agencies in the provision of humanitarian services in Borno state. The study by Copps, (2009) corroborates the finding of this study that the success of collaboration lies in clear, open and frequent communication which enhances effective coordination. A lack of information and the inability to maintain open and frequent communication can all be barriers successful and effective collaboration. This is refuted by the study by Babagana (2016) their communication gap is largely a barrier to functional coordination among agencies providing humanitarian services to IDPs in Maiduguri.

Most often the capacity of the organisation affects its ability to collaborate with others. This study found out in figure 5.9 with 188 (61%) response of government officials that inter-agency collaboration has been affected by organisational capacity. However, the response of NGOs in interview 5.17 pointed out that inter-agency collaboration has not been a failure due to organisational capacity. This contradicts the work of Foster-Fishman et al. (2001) that effective collaboration depends on the key participants having a wide range of skills to enable them to work well together, and skills/knowledge to build and manage the collaboration. In Borno state all the humanitarian agencies possess the skills to effectively manage collaboration; hence, organisational capacity is not a barrier to collaboration in Maiduguri.

Collaboration among and between agencies is always affected by the need for the preservation of the corporate identity of the organisation. This occurs when one organisation consume the other. The study found out in figure 5.9 that need for preservation of the corporate identity of agencies has not been a barrier to collaboration. This corroborated by the finding of the response of NGOs in Interview 5.18 that fear of identity lost is not a barrier to collaboration among agencies in Maiduguri. Copps (2009) point out that loss
of identity and/or independence has acted as a barrier to collaboration among humanitarian aid workers. However, identity lost has not affected collaboration among aid agencies in Maiduguri. This is because there is a high usage of visibilities in project execution in Maiduguri. The value establishing the organisation often time acts as a barrier to collaboration. The study found out in figure 5.9 that values of individual agencies do not impede on collaboration in Maiduguri. However, the response of the NGOs refutes this claim in interview 5.19 showed that values of individual agencies tend to impede on collaboration.

Conclusions
Based on the forgoing the following conclusion became eminent to conclude that although conventional practice in other parts of the world shows that interagency collaboration in the management of IDPs is affected by a lot of factors such as communication gap, need to protect corporate identity, organisation capacity among others the situation in Borno state revealed that these factors have not served as challenges to interagency collaboration in the provision of social services to the IDPs

Recommendations
The IDPs should be made a part of decision-making process and not just at the implementation stage. Representatives of the IDPs should be allowed to be part of the inter-sectorial meeting of the agencies. Collaboration also depends on the key participants having a wide range of skills to enable them to work together as a team, and acquire the skills/knowledge to build and manage this collaboration. The skills of the IDPs to participate in decision making should therefore be built and developed. This can be done through capacity building programmes integrated in the culture of the people. This will enhance their self-worth.

Finally, a workable template should be worked among agencies to eliminate the barriers to collaboration especially as organisational capacity is concern. The international NGOs should partner with local NGOs with the view to promoting collaboration as well as building their capacities. This is with view to enhancing the capacity of the NGOs to respond to emergencies in Africa.
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