

# CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT, GOVERNANCE, AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH SUDAN

By Dr Gabriel Alier Riak Achot PhD\* and PhD Candidate Dut Bol Ayuel Bill  
Upper Nile University

*\*Corresponding Author: -*

---

## DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

**Capacity development:** This is the process through which individuals, organizations, and societies obtain, strengthen, and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives overtime (Ranz, 2009).

**Governance:** Governance has to do with the manner in which responsibility is discharged. Such a responsibility may be acquired through election, appointment, or delegation in the public domain, or in the area of commerce (i.e., corporate governance) (Mbaku& Smith, 2012).

**Sustainable development;** it refers to a mode of human development in which resource use aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment so that these needs can be met not only at present but also for generations to come (Todaro,2010).

## **Abstract: -**

*This study aimed at establishing the impact of Capacity development, Governance and Sustainable development in South Sudan with a particular reference of UNHCR and UNDP in South Sudan. The objectives of the study were to; examine the relationship between Capacity development and Sustainable development, examine the relationship Governance and Sustainable development and to analyse the factor structure of Capacity development and Governance on Sustainable development.*

*The study employed a cross sectional and descriptive design while using qualitative and quantitative approaches. The study population was 48,689, selected using purposive and simple random sampling technique. The sample size determination was made using Krejcie and Morgan Table (1970) formula. The sample size was 280. The data analysis was made using Statistical package for social scientists (SPSS 20).*

*The major findings of the study were that there was a positive relationship between; capacity development and sustainable development in the South Sudan ( $r = 0.701$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ), Governance and Sustainable development ( $r = 0.680$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) and lastly variables explained ( $R= 0.654$ ) a combination of Capacity development and Governance in assessing the level to which they can predict the level of Sustainable development in the Country like South Sudan.*

**Keywords: -** *capacity development, governance, sustainable development*

## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION AND BACK GROUND TO THE STUDY

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the introduction, back ground of the study, problem statement, purpose of the study, general and specific objectives, research questions, scope of the study, significance of the study and the conceptual frame work.

The term capacity development gained prominence in the 1990s, in part due to the growing realization that providing technical solutions and/or funding are not sufficient in themselves to address most development challenges. This led to a renewed focus on the underlying human and organizational capabilities that need to be strengthened, through working more closely with the individuals, organizations and societies that were the intended beneficiaries of development support. As a conceptual approach, capacity development was also linked to the search for viable alternatives to the dominant 'top-down' aid model, by refocusing attention on the crucial role of local professionals and support structures both governmental and non-governmental in driving sustainable development. Capacity development has been described variously as: "the ability [of an organization] to function as a resilient, strategic and autonomous entity" (Kaplan, 1999); "the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully" (OECD, 2006); or "the ability of a human system to perform, sustain itself and self-renew" (Ubels et al, Earth scan/SNV, 2010). The emergence of the capacity development as a distinct field of thinking and practice has gone hand in hand with advances in human resources and institutional development, and can be distinguished by five important strands: training and human resources development participatory approaches organizational development policy and institutional development multi-actor processes and systems.

### 1.1 Background to the study

Capacity development is the process through which individuals, organizations, and societies obtain, strengthen, and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives overtime, UNDP, (2010). According to Canadian international development agency capacity development is defined as the process of strengthening their abilities of individuals, organizations and societies to make effective use of resources, in order to achieve their own goals on a sustainable basis. The attributes used to measure Capacity development are knowledge, competencies, capabilities and innovations basing on (OECD, 2006) violence.

Governance as the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority in the management of a country's affairs at all levels (UNDP, 2006). For UNDP governance "comprises the complex mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, mediate their differences and exercise their legal rights and obligations. Union Development Agency, defines governance as the ability and capacity of a government to fulfill its mission (Mbaku& Smith, 2012). According to Brinkerhoff, the design and implementation of governance reforms in post-conflict states target three areas; reconstituting legitimacy, re-establishing security and rebuilding effectiveness (Ranz, 2009). According to Brinkerhoff & Derick, (2008) a government is essential to providing security, justice, economic, and social functions and to channeling the will, energies, and resources of both the indigenous population and the international community (Ranz, 2009). Good governance is related to a set of values such as participation, accountability, responsiveness and rule of law by (World development report, 2011).

Capacity development is the process through which individuals, organizations, and societies obtain, strengthen, and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives overtime, UNDP, (2010). According to Canadian international development agency capacity development is defined as the process of strengthening their abilities of individuals, organizations and societies to make effective use of resources, in order to achieve their own goals on a sustainable basis. The attributes used to measure Capacity development are knowledge, competencies, capabilities and innovations basing on (OECD, 2006) model.

Sustainable development refers to a mode of human development in which resource use aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment so that these needs can be met not only at present but also for generations to come (Todaro, 2010). Community development takes place only when local community people are committed to investing themselves and their resources in the effort (Bartelmus, 2012). Therefore the goal of identifying assets is to empower residents to recognize and make use of their abilities to build self-reliance and take control in the transformation of their community (Jacob, 2009). Chung, (2009) suggests that when the focus is inside, rather than outside, it puts residents in control. Consequently, the development of the community is dependent upon, and a direct result of, the power of the people (Grobe, 2011). Sustainable development requires building ones well-being without creating problems for others in the future and it call for careful planning of resource use so that future generations do not suffer the lack of enough resource use because of the present users. Sustainable development is measured using availability, stability, freedom and Quality (Todaro, 2010).

### 1.2 Statement of the problem

In both developing and developed countries, sustainable and livelihood of people has become a major challenge; there are persistent implementation gaps relating to poverty eradication, food security, and effects of political instability (World Summit for Sustainable Development, 2012).

However the political instability like the one in South Sudan hinders the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and, more generally, social, economic, political and human development (UNSG, 2009). The costs of political instability and leadership styles are diverse and far-reaching. Poor capacity development affects all societies, cities and population groups at all income levels. According to recent estimates, at least 740,000 people die annually directly or indirectly due to bad governance and poor capacity building. As such, lack of proper sustainable development can result to the loss of fixed assets, the disruption of formal and informal labor markets, reductions in (or absence of) foreign and domestic investment, declining tax revenues and diminishing service-delivery capacities. In short, armed violence undermines development (UN's MDG Review Summit, September, 2010).

The United Nations conservatively estimated that more than more 700,000 people had been displaced by the conflict in South Sudan, with the real figure likely much higher, given limited access to civilians outside population centers (UNOCHA, 2014). Delivering assistance to those in need is a top priority for relief agencies, where security allows. Hygiene and sanitation have emerged as problems in areas where the displaced are gathering, and U.N. officials indicate that food, water, healthcare, and shelter are urgently needed a fact which shows that political instability, Governance, Capacity building and Sustainable development have been put at stake.

### 1.3 Purpose of the study

The study aims at establishing the impact of Capacity development, Governance and Sustainable development in South Sudan with a particular reference of Juba county in South Sudan.

#### 1.4 Research objectives

- i) To examine the relationship between Capacity development and Sustainable development
- ii) To examine the relationship between Governance and Sustainable development
- iii) To analyse the factor structure of Capacity development and Governance on Sustainable development

#### 1.5 Research questions

- i) What is the relationship between Capacity development and Sustainable development?
- ii) What is the relationship between Governance and Sustainable development?
- iii) What is the factor structure of Capacity development and Governance on Sustainable development?

### 1.6 Scope of the study

#### 1.6.1 Content scope

The study was limited to Capacity development, Governance and Sustainable development

#### 1.6.2 Geographical scope

The study was conducted in South Sudan with a particular reference of Juba county in South Sudan. It targeted both employees and beneficiaries of the two organizations.

#### 1.6.3 Time scope

This study covered the period of seven years from 2007-2014. This research was carried from March 2015 to August 2015.

### 1.7 Significance of study

- i. Researchers, Academicians and organizations: The documented information can provide the basis for further studies/researches by the academicians, researchers and organizations involved in promoting Political instability, Governance and Capacity development on Sustainable development. And enriches the researcher with knowledge and information from a wide range literatures studied.
- ii. Leaders and managers of International organizations learnt from the research and improve on strategy formulation and implementation as a modality for attaining sustainable development in South Sudan.
- iii. Government: The study can help government to enact policies that enhance and encourage capacity development and governance on Sustainable development.

**CHAPTER TWO  
LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.0 Introduction**

This chapter reviews the existing literature put forward by different scholars and personalities on Capacity development and governance on Sustainable developments well as the relationship among the three variables based on the objectives of the study.

**2.1 The relationship between Capacity development and governance**

**2.1.1 Capacity development**

Capacity development is a concept which is broader than organizational development in that it includes an emphasis on the overall system, environment or context within which individuals, organizations and societies operate and interact (and not simply a single organization)(UNDP, 1998). It can also be the process of developing competencies and capabilities in individuals, groups, organizations, sectors or countries which will lead to sustained and self-generating performance improvement (Aus AID, 2004). Capacity building is badly needed in South Sudan. Much of the adult population spent its youth in war with a minority having access to education abroad; therefore, everything from education, technical training, business training, entrepreneurship and other capacity is required. Anyone doing business in South Sudan should definitely consider a strong CSR element in capacity building, which could take various forms: vocational training, mentoring, or supplementary training. Note that due to the length of the war, there is a general absence of skilled labor or a work ethic in South Sudan. Startup companies may need to consider importing some skilled labor, or trying to identify individuals returning from various Diaspora with the requisite skills (USAID, 2012). Capacity development has the following attributes; Knowledge, Skills, Competencies, Capabilities and innovations

- **Knowledge**

Knowledge is closely related Capacity development is recognized by many as involving much more than training and knowledge transfers. It involves people as well as the organisation and very much depends on the surrounding environment that influences the extent to which individuals or organisations have the ability to acquire new skills and adapt to new ways. Many institutions (DAC, 2006; World Bank, 2009; UNDP, 2009) agree that capacity development occurs at three levels, Organizational, Individual and societal. When people acquire knowledge and skills and work together over time this builds organizational capacity. The individuals that make up organisations and societies need the skills, knowledge and experiences to grow and transform that around them (JICA, 2006).

- **Competencies**

Engel 2007 makes distinctions between capacities at different levels. Competencies refer to the individual skills and abilities. The OECD 2005 states that a competency is more than just knowledge and skills;It involves the ability to meet complex demands, by drawing on and mobilising psychosocial resources (including skills and attitudes) in a particular context

- **Capabilities**

Capabilities refer to a broad range of collective skills of organisations or systems. This can include policy analysis, technical analysis, financial resource management, which can be regarded as hard elements and the ability to earn legitimacy, to adapt, create meaning and identity, which can be regarded as the soft elements.

- **Innovations**

Social innovation can be defined as the development and implementation of new ideas (products, services and models) to meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations (EC, 2013). It represents new responses to pressing social demands, which affect the process of social interactions. It is aimed at improving human well-being. Social innovations are innovations that are social in both their ends and their means. They are innovations that are not only good for society but also enhance individuals' capacity to act. They rely on the inventiveness of citizens, civil society organisations, local communities, businesses and public servants and services. They are an opportunity both for the public sector and for the markets, so that the products and services better satisfy individual but also collective aspirations (EC, 2013).

The relationship between Political instability, Capacity development and Sustainable development is pointed on by Rao,(2007) who says that community-based approaches lead to capacity development which is important because it is a way by which people, organizations and society systematically stimulate and develop their capability over time to achieve social and economic goals, including through improvement of knowledge skills, systems and institutions-Within a wider social and cultural enabling environment (EC, 2013).Make their lives easier (Butkiewicz, James and Yanikkaya, 2010). This in turn results in modification of what is accepted as part of social stability in the long run

**2.1.2 Sustainable development**

The 1987 Brundtland Report defined sustainable development as “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Bartelmus, 2012). At the heart of this concept is the belief that over the long term, social, economic and environmental objectives should be complementary and interdependent in the development process. In 1992, the Rio Summit established sustainable development as the guiding vision for development in both industrialized and developing countries, and for international development co-operation (Chung, 2009).

Sustainable development is not just about the environment. It entails balancing the economic, social and environmental objectives of society; the three dimensions of sustainable development integrating them wherever possible, through mutually supportive policies and practices, and making trade-offs where it is not possible (Donovan, 2009).

This includes, in particular, taking into account the impact of present decisions on the options of future generations (Jacob, 2009). The pursuit of sustainable development thus requires policy changes in many sectors and ensuring coherence between them (McMaster and Pollard, 2011). However, sustainable development has often been interpreted narrowly as an environmental issue without implications for more than a small group of society (Boulanger, 2008). In many countries, the responsibility for sustainable development issues has been given to environmental ministries and departments — often amongst the weakest and least influential in government. This has hindered the necessary process of cross-sectoral policy integration (Grobe, 2011).

Thus, while sustainable development is a universal challenge, practical responses can only be defined nationally and locally (World development report, 2011). Approaches to sustainable development reflect the diversity of the social, economic and environmental challenges faced by developing countries (Grobe, 2011). This is why there are many interpretations of sustainable development, deriving from different values and interests in different societies (Donovan, 2009).

Achieving sustainable development will require deep structural changes and new ways of working in all areas of economic, social and political life (Jacob, 2009). This will include promoting pro-poor economic growth and reforming fiscal policies which negatively affect the poor or promote environmental damage (Grobe, 2011). In the longer term, countries will have to ensure that their net wealth (including natural, manmade and human capital) remains constant or increases (World development report, 2011). This will require ensuring that market prices reflect the full social and environmental costs of production and consumption (Boulanger, 2008).

Issues of inequity and inequality of access to assets and resources need to be confronted. For example, it may be necessary to reform land tenure policies so as to increase access to disadvantaged and marginalized groups. Equally, it may be important to strengthen social capital and formal safety nets to cope with both external and domestic shocks (Grobe, 2011).

Sustainable development has important political, institutional and capacity implications. At the national and local level, it requires cross-sectoral and participatory institutions and integrating mechanisms which can engage governments, civil society and the private sector in developing shared visions, planning and decision-making (Boulanger, 2008). Governments, corporations and development co-operation agencies will also need to be more open and accountable for their actions (Jacob, 2009). Innovation and investment in actions which promote sustainable development should be encouraged (Boulanger, 2008). More generally, economic planning and policy-making will have to become more participatory, prudent and transparent, as well as more long-term-oriented, so as to respect the interests of future generations (Grobe, 2011). Sustainable development is measured using the following attributes;

• **Availability**

Availability means the ability of the services to be readily available or access to available resources like lean and safe water, education and food (Todaro, 2010). This attribute answers sustainable development in the economic aspect (Grobe, 2011). Development is deemed sustainable if people have access to clean and safe water and other basic necessities, their ability to access resources that can meet their needs without compromising the ability of the future generation to access these is always evidence of sustainable development (Boulanger, 2008).

• **Stability**

This answers the sustainable development questions on the environment whereby environmentalists maintain that for development to be accepted as sustainable, meeting the needs of the current generation should not interfere with the steady progress of environmental factors like rainfall distribution and growth of features like forests as well as existence of natural water bodies (Grobe, 2011). This is the ground zero for both environmentalists and development practitioners as they all agree that development in whatever aspect should aim at improving the standards of the environment if it is to be agreed as sustainable (World development report, 2011).

• **Freedom**

Freedom means having the power or right to speak or think as one wants. It's the power of self-determination attribute to the will, the quality of being independent of fate or necessity (Todaro, 2010). This focuses on the social aspect of development whereby the development of a society/ community should not interfere with the social freedoms of people (Grobe, 2011). People should live freely without anyone interfering with their social freedoms in terms of what they do and how they do it, in fact, they should feel that development is done for them. This means that development should only be considered sustainable if it respects and responds to people's social freedoms (Donovan, 2009).

• **Quality**

In manufacturing, a measure of excellence is brought about by strict and consistent commitment to certain standards that achieve uniformity of a product in order to satisfy specific customer or user (Grobe, 2011). Sustainable development is based on having quality resources which means that for it to be effective, there must be quality resources and needs (Donovan, 2009). Jacob, (2009) suggests that quality leads to a perceived sustainable development improvement of the people.

There is a relationship between Capacity building and Sustainable development because capacity building empower people, organizations and society to systematically stimulate and develop their capabilities over time to achieve social and economic goals since capacity building is the development of knowledge, skill and attitude in individuals and groups

of people relevant in the design, development and maintenance of institutional and operational infrastructures and processes that are locally meaningful for sustainable development (UNDP, 2010).

## **2.2 The relationship between Governance, Capacity development and Sustainable development**

### **1.9.3 Governance**

Governance has to do with the manner in which responsibility is discharged. Such a responsibility may be acquired through election, appointment, or delegation in the public domain, or in the area of commerce (i.e., corporate governance) (Mbaku & Smith, 2012). Therefore, good governance is taken here to mean condition whereby such responsibility is discharged in an effective, transparent, and accountable manner, while bad governance is associated with maladministration in the discharge of responsibility (Mbaku & Smith, 2012). Good governance entails the existence of efficient and accountable institutions—political, judicial, administrative, economic, corporate and entrenched rules that promote development, protect human rights, respect the rule of law, and ensure that people are free to participate in, and be heard on, decisions that affect their lives (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008).

Through good governance, a new generation of enlightened leaders is aiming to reverse that trend (Ranz, 2009). Respect for human rights and democratic principles, honest and good quality administration, and protecting the rights and freedoms under the rule of law are concerned with values that apply equally to every state and citizen (World development report, 2011).

Democracy, for example, is a universally recognized ideal, based on values common to people everywhere regardless of cultural, political, social, or economic differences (IPU). These transcend the functional importance of aspects of good governance, such as for sustainable development (Mbaku & Smith, 2012).

Quite clearly, growth and development cannot be achieved in the absence of good governance (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008). Among other things, good governance ensures the most efficient utilization of already scarce resources in the promotion of development; enhances participation, responsibility, and accountability; and has the potential to emancipate people from poverty as state legitimacy is recognized and entrenched (Ngware & Kironde, 2010). In fact, any effort to reduce poverty and sustain development must start with, and build upon good governance (Mbaku & Smith, 2012). Good governance can therefore be also regarded as governance on behalf of development-oriented policy (World development report, 2011).

According to Ngware & Kironde, (2010), the government's role to sustainable development is by ensuring that its legitimacy and credibility are intimately tied to a transparent and representative process of policy making by a council of democratically elected community leaders that enjoys legal recognition as an established corporate entity. According to the author, if this is achieved, leaders are likely to be respected and trusted and this can help to bridge divergent interests and ideas which are fundamental for peace building.

Mbaku & Smith, (2012) pointed out that sustainable peace building can be achieved by governments if they develop ability to touch the daily lives of citizens through improved delivery of services. The authors believe that an important characteristic of effective local government is its proximity to the recipients of the basic services it provides. Thus, if government is well-recognized for its role in providing basic infrastructure such as drinking water, waste management, construction of latrines and public convenience facilities, recreational facilities and parks, and local roads, it is likely to unite people to work together for peace (Brandi & Clara, 2008).

Mbaku & Smith, (2012), noted that the government can also ensure peace by strengthening public participation for peace building. Good governance is related to a set of values such as participation, accountability, responsiveness, transparency and transparency by (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008). Governance is measured using the following attributes;

#### **• Participation**

Participation approaches may be adopted to foster and institutionalize elements of good governance (EC, 2013). In this situation, inclusive participation and representation, transparency and accountability, and capacity for local dispute resolution are seen not as simply means to fulfill immediate needs but also as ends in themselves. There is some evidence to support links between community-based interventions and progress in governance (World Bank, 2006). Government should be able to allow participation of all the citizens in all the activities.

#### **• Accountability**

Accountability is the process whereby public sector entities, and the individuals within them, are responsible for their decisions and actions, including their stewardship of public funds and all aspects of performance and submit themselves to appropriate external scrutiny. It is achieved by all parties having a clear understanding of those responsibilities, and having clearly defined roles in a robust structure. Both internal and external accountability and reporting structures are attributes of sound financial management (Ranz, 2009). King, (2002) made a distinction between accountability and responsibility by stating that one is liable to render an account when one is accountable and one is liable to be called to account when one is responsible. Accountability, therefore, is enforced by law, policy or statute and responsibility by conduct and a positive relationship with its stakeholders. King 2002 also referred to the latter as Social Responsibility.

**• Responsiveness**

This refers to the willingness to help the public and provide prompt service (Mbaku& Smith, 2012). Responsiveness is a core value of the transformed public service. Its application in practice will have a profound effect on the way national departments and provincial administrations operate (Ranz, 2009). The key to implementing the responsiveness principle lies in being able to identify quickly and accurately when services are falling below the promised standard and having procedures in place to remedy the situation (Mbaku& Smith, 2012).

**• Rule of law**

Rule of law is an approach that brings together the police, civil society and local communities to jointly take responsibility for and develop solutions to local safety and security (World development report, 2011). The country's laws have to be adopted and respected for de-mining and weapons collection. De-mobilised combatants have to be involved in de-mining as a way to facilitate local reintegration (USAID, 2007). This approach articulates peace building in post conflict transitioning societies.

Drawing on Mbaku& Smith, (2012), on the relationship between Governance, Capacity development and Sustainable, it can be noted that good governance, in all its facets, has been demonstrated to be positively correlated with the achievement of better growth rates, particularly through the building of institutions in support of markets. Recent empirical analysis suggests a positive correlation between democratic governance and levels of income, investment, human capital, economic liberalization, and distributive income growth in society (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008).

Indeed, some analysts, such as Alfred Zack-Williams, have successfully argued that good governance, particularly its aspects of democratic consolidation, is a sine qua non for development. Consequently, the new maxim for Africa in the twenty-first century should be "no democracy, no development" (Mbaku& Smith, 2012). Similarly, United Nations (U.N.) Secretary-General Kofi Annan has said that "good governance is perhaps the single most important factor in eradicating poverty and promoting development" (Ranz, 2009). Secretary-General Kofi Annan has said that "good governance is perhaps the single most important factor in eradicating poverty and promoting development" (Ranz, 2009).

**2.3 The factor structure of Governance and Capacity development on Sustainable development**

According to the World development report, (2011), capacity building with good governance advances sustainable development for three reasons. First, enjoying political freedom and participating in the decisions that shape one's life are fundamental human rights (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008). In those African countries where leaders are not elected or selected by election, or where elections are flawed choices are severely restricted (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008). The denial of these rights is a denial of human development. Second, good governance helps to protect people from economic and political catastrophes, such as famines, and other crises (Brandt & Clara, 2008).

There is a direct correlation between bad governance and famines, for example, in Africa. In other words, those countries frequently suffering from famines in Africa tend not to have good governance (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008). Third, good governance can promote sustainable development by empowering citizens to influence policies that promote growth and prosperity and reflect their priorities.

Capacity development which is important because it is a way by which people, organizations and society systematically stimulate and develop their capability over time to achieve social and economic goals, including through improvement of knowledge skills, systems and institutions-Within a wider social and cultural enabling environment.

**CHAPTER THREE  
METHODOLOGY**

**3.0 Introduction**

This chapter presents the research methodology that was applied in conducting the study. This involved the research design, target population, sampling design and sample size, data collection procedures and instrument, determination of reliability and validity as well as data analysis techniques.

**3.1 Research Design**

The research design was across- sectional and descriptive and using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Quantitative approach was employed using questionnaires. This is mainly used to quantify and analyze the data in order to get in depth understanding of how the variables under study impact sustainable development and Qualitative tools were mainly the interview and observation which was used in the research because of necessity to arrive at the in-depth conclusions about the relationships of the study.

**3.2 Research Population**

The research population of 48,689 included 90 NGO staffs from their main headquarters in Juba City. The researcher clustered the NGOs population to 50 UNDP staff and 40 UNHCR Staff; 28,843 UNDP Beneficiaries and 19,756 UNHCR Beneficiaries as elaborated in the table below;

**Table 3.1: Population**

Target population	Population Size(N)
UNDP staff	50
UNHCR staff	40
UNDP Beneficiaries	28,843
UNHCR Beneficiaries	19,756
<b>Total</b>	<b>48,689</b>

*Source: Primary Data*

**3.3 Sampling Procedure**

The researcher used both probability and non-probability sampling techniques so as to be exhaustive in the research findings. Random sampling was used as a probability technique to obtain a good representative sample of the area population of the residents. Random sampling which is simple random was used to pick mainly community members, community leaders and county officials. Non-probability sampling which is convenient sampling was used to select NGO officials and politicians.

**3.4 Sample size**

The sample size was calculated using Sekaran (2000), the Krejcie and Morgan table (1970) for determining sample size as this gives a practical ratio according to the population size. The researcher will cluster the NGOs population to 50 UNDP staff and 40 UNHCR Staff; 100 UNDP Beneficiaries and 100 UNHCR Beneficiaries in Juba city. This is in collaboration with Sekaran&Bougie, (2010) who asserted that if the population is above 10,000 then a sample of 100 is adequate. In this case a sample of 280 were used for the entire population of 48,689.

**Table 3.2: Sample Size**

Target population	Population Size(N)	Sample size
UNDP staff	50	44
UNHCR staff	40	36
UNDP Beneficiaries	28,843	100
UNHCR Beneficiaries	19,756	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>48,689</b>	<b>280</b>

*Source: Primary data*

**3.5 Sources of Data**

The researcher used both primary and secondary data sources.

**3.5.1 Primary data**

The researcher gathered this data from the field through questionnaires, interviews and observation. This was carried out with both leaders and beneficiaries of the two NGOs under study.

**3.5.2 Secondary data**

The researcher will collect this data from printed materials such as books, reports and journals from reliable sources which are used to further justify and confirm data gathering from the field.

**3.6 Research Instruments**

**3.6.1 Questionnaires**

The researcher used Self-Administered Questionnaires (SAQ) where by respondents filled on their own and Administered Questionnaires in which the Research Assistants and the Researcher recorded down responses from the respondents. Questionnaires were chosen because of their ability to reduce any bias and the collection of authentic data important for data analysis. The researcher used closed ended aimed at testing the performance petroleum companies in the country. They contained both open and close ended questions. The close ended questions were based on the 5- point Likert Scale format.

**3.6.2 Interview method**

This is a purposeful discussion between the researcher and the respondent. Interviews are face to face meetings (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). This approach was guided by the consideration that interview method of gathering information can be used to solicit the opinions and suggestions of the respondents. It was also used as a means of probing of some interesting and unexpected behavior (Silverman, 2001). These were used to collect data from bank managers. A set of questions in English will be asked to respondents and responses were recorded. This helped explain issues under study in depth.

**3.7 Validity and Reliability of Research instruments**

To ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument, the researcher employed expert judgment method. After constructing the questionnaire, the researcher contacted experts in this area to go through it to ensure that the instrument is clear, relevant, specific and logically arranged. Also a pre-test was conducted in order to test and improve on the reliability and validity of the instrument. Cronbach’s Alpha test will be employed to measure the reliability

A formula for Lawshewas used to measure the validity of research, as indicated below:

$$CVR = (n - N/2) / (N/2)$$

Where CVR= Content Validity Ratio,

n= number of respondents indicating “essential”,

N= total number of respondents

**Table 3.3: Validity and Reliability of the Instrument Variable**

Variable	Anchor	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient	CVR(Content Validity Ratio)
Capacity building	5 point	0. 8150	0.8352
Governance	5 point	0.8225	0.7231
Sustainable development	5 point	0.7525	0.7423

*Source: Primary data*

Since all Content Validity indices for all experts and Alpha coefficients were above 0.7, then the items/questions selected for the study were relevant to the study variables

**3.8 Measurement of the Variables**

- Capacity development which is the intervening variable was measured using a 5-point Likert Scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) basing on attributes that include is measured basing on (OECD, 2006) model and the attributes include; skills, knowledge, competencies, capabilities and innovations).
- **The Governance variable was** measured using a 5-point Likert Scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) basing on attributes like; participation, accountability, responsiveness and rule of law that were used by (Ranz, 2009).
- Sustainability which is the intervening variable was measured using a 5-point Likert Scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) basing on (Todaro, 2010)’s measure of sustainable development and the attributes include; Availability, Stability, Freedom and Quality.

**3.9 Data Analysis**

The data was collected from the field, coded, edited and analyze using descriptive analysis options of Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version (18.0). Cross tabulation was used to show the differences between beneficiaries and employees with respect to their demographic aspects. The descriptive approach was used for qualitative forms of data. The data was then be presented using Spearman’s correlation’s statistical techniques which was used to test and establish whether there exists a relationship between Political instability, Governance and Capacity development on Sustainable development while multiple regression analysis was used to test the potential predictors of the dependent variable.

**3.10 Ethical Considerations**

Attrition was ensured to observe ethical principles to ensure that bias is eliminated and maximize meaning of information provided. Respect for all intellectual property where the primary was properly documented and referenced. The assistant researcher recognized the rights of individuals to privacy, personal data protection and freedom of movement. The “Do no harm” principle was followed during research. Any risks were clearly communicated to subjects involved. Finally, all the data collected was destroyed after capturing and analysis.

**3.11 Limitations of the study**

Limitations might be faced by the researcher include;

- (i) Some respondents found the questionnaire hard to understand that the researcher had to take more time to explain to them. However the researcher tried to interpret where need be.
- (ii) There was unwillingness to complete questionnaires by respondents as they saw the exercise unbeneficial to them. However the researcher will try to persuade them that the study is for academic good.
- (iii) Some respondents felt the information required is sensitive and can affect their working environment if revealed. However, the researcher made an effort to convince respondents that the information exchanged would be very confidential.
- (iv) Unwillingness to fill the questionnaires; some respondents were unwilling to share information about their leaders, supervisors, workmates and the service system. The researcher however endeavored to emphasize that it was a purely academic research and confidentiality would be upheld.

**CHAPTER FOUR  
INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF STUDY FINDINGS**

**4.0 Introduction**

This chapter discusses the response rate, Bio data, Pearson correlation, factor loadings, Standard and Deviation

**4.1 Respondents’ Bio Data**

The response rate was 280 respondents.

**4.1.1 Gender of respondents**

Table 4.1 below presents the gender distribution of the respondents.

**Table 1.1: Gender by respondent distribution**

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	184	65.7
Female	96	34.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Primary Data Computed*

The results in table 4.1 indicates that at 65.7% were males and 34.3% were females.

**4.1.2 Age Group of the Respondents**

Table 4.2 below presents the age of the respondents

**Table 4.2: Age Group of the Respondents**

Age group2	Frequency	Percent
41 - 50 years	99	35.4
31 - 40 years	75	26.8
21 - 30 years	59	21.1
50 + years	47	16.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Primary Data Computed*

The results in table 4.2 indicate that 35.4% of respondents were between the age ranges of 41 – 50 years. In addition, those within the age bracket of 21 – 30 were 26.8%. Those who were between the age range of 31 – 40 years were ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> with a statistical representation of 21.1%. And 16.8% were between the age range of 50 and above.

**4.1.3 Marital Status of the Respondents**

The table below 4.3 presents marital status of respondents

**Table 4.3: Marital Status of the Respondents**

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Married	169	60.4
Single	75	26.8
Separated	25	8.9
Divorced	11	3.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Primary Data computed*

The result in table 4.3 indicates that 60.4% of respondents were married, 26.8% were single and 8.9% had separated from their partners while the remaining 3.9% had divorced from their partners.

**4.1.4 Respondents' Number of Biological children**

The table below 4.4 presents the number of biological children for the respondents.

**Table 4.4: Respondents' Number of Biological children**

Number of children	Frequency	Percent
1 to 3	109	38.9
4 to 6	95	33.9
Above 6	45	16.1
None	31	11.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Primary Data computed*

The results in table 4.4 above indicate that 38.9% of the respondents were with biological children ranging from 1 to 3. In addition, 33.9% had 4 to 6 biological children, 16.1% had above 6 children and 11.1% had no children.

**4.1.5 Respondents' Number of Dependants**

The table below 4.5 presents the number of dependants for the respondents.

**Table 4.5: Respondents' Number of Dependants**

Number of Dependants	Frequency	Percent
1 to 3	98	35.0
4 to 6	85	30.4
Above 6	75	26.8
None	22	7.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Primary Data computed*

The results in table 4.5 above indicate that 35% of the respondents were with dependants ranging from 1 to 3. In addition, 30.4% had 4 to 6 dependants, 26.8% had above 6 dependants and 7.9% had no dependants.

**4.1.6 Respondents' Level of Education**

The table below 4.6 presents the educational levels of the respondents.

**Table 4.6: Respondents' Level of Education**

Level of Education	Frequency	Percent
Diploma	75	23.8
Tertiary	66	23.6
Secondary	59	19.6
Certificate	45	16.1
Masters	35	12.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Primary Data computed*

The results in table 4.6 above indicates that 23.8% of the respondents had attained diplomas, 23.6% were holding a degree as their level of education, 19.6% had stopped in secondary school, 16.1% were holding certificates as their education while the remaining 12.5% had master degrees.

**4.1.7 Respondents' Number of years spent in the County**

The table below 4.7 presents the number of years the respondents have been working/ staying in Juba County

**Table 4.7: Respondents' Working Experience**

Number of years spent in the County	Frequency	Percent
Above 6 Years	105	37.5
5 - 6 years	96	34.3
3 - 4 years	39	13.9
1 - 2 years	25	8.9
Less than 1 year	15	5.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Primary Data computed*

The results in table 4.7 above show that 37.5% of the respondents had been working/ staying in Juba County over 6 years. In addition, 34.3% had been working/ staying in Juba County for 5 to 6 years, 13.9% had 3 to 4 years of experience, followed by respondents who had been working/ staying in Juba County for 1 to 2 years 8.9% and 5.4% as the least who had been working/ staying in Juba County for 1 year.

**4.2 Relationship between Study Variables**

Spearman correlation coefficient was used to determine the degree of relationship between the study variables as shown in the table 4.8 below.

**Table 4.8 Spearman's zero order correlation matrix**

	1	2	3	4
Capacity development	1.000			
Governance(2)	.629**	1.000		
Sustainable development (3)	.701**	.680**	1.000	

\*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

*Source: primary data*

**4.2.1 The relationship between Capacity development and Sustainable development**

The results in table 4.8 above indicate a positive relationship between capacity development and sustainable development in the South Sudan ( $r = 0.701$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) which implies that with improved capacity building by various NGOs leads to sustained development of a Country.

**4.2.2 The relationship between Governance and Sustainable development**

The results in table 4.8 above indicate a significant positive relationship between Governance and Sustainable development ( $r = 0.680$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) which implies that good governance advocated for by NGOs leads to sustainable development in a Country like South Sudan.

**4.2.3 The factor structure of Capacity development and Governance and on Sustainable development**

Regression analysis was used to examine the level at which Capacity development and Governance determine the sustainable development in South Sudan.

**Table 4.9 below shows the regression model for Capacity development and Governance and Sustainable development**

Model	Un-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig
Constant	92.152	52.773		1.746	.141
Capacity development	.899	1.297	.587	.693	.519
Governance	.792	1.168	.388	.479	.328
<b>R= 0.654 R- Square =0.418, Adjusted R- square = 0.229, F= 4.422, Sig = 1.221</b>					

Source: Primary data computed

Results in table 4.8 above show (R= 0.654) a combination of Capacity development and Governance in assessing the level to which they can predict the level of Sustainable development in the Country like South Sudan. These variables explained 65.4% of the variance of Sustainable development in the Country (R Square =.418). The most influential predictor of Sustainable development was Capacity development ( $\beta = .587$ , Sig. 519). Governance is less likely to influence People’s livelihoods since it portrays low significance ( $\beta = .388$ , Sig. 328) in the model.

A unit change in Capacity development processes will contribute to a change in the possibility of Sustainable development in the Country by (.587) while a one unit change in and Governance will contribute to a change in the Sustainable development in the Country like South Sudan (.388).

**4.4 The factor loadings of Capacity development, Governance and Sustainable development**

This research used factor loading in order to check how much a variable loads into its corresponding factor. To understand how each item is loaded into its relevant principal component we use table 4.9 for the factor loading of each item. Straub et al (2004) suggest to us that value of each item in factor loading should be at least 0.50 into its relative principal component.

**4.4.1 Factor Analysis of Capacity building**

**Table 4.10: Factor Analysis of Capacity building**

Variables	Knowledge	Skills	Competencies	Capabilities
I have adequate self-help knowledge to help others in my society	<b>.936</b>			
Training is done to equip people with knowledge of various activities	<b>.902</b>			
Am always given more training by the organisation to be able to train others in the society	<b>.888</b>			
Skills training is done by professionals		<b>.915</b>		
Different skills are imparted to individuals from all women and youth groups		<b>.908</b>		
I have had an impact on my society as a leader because of the skills I have		<b>.866</b>		
I have a common knowledge or an understanding of basic techniques and concepts in your work			<b>.896</b>	
I have the level of experience gained in a classroom and experimental scenarios or other trainings			<b>.863</b>	
Competent teams are hired to train the various special groups			<b>.807</b>	
I am capable of planning ahead and making choices				<b>.868</b>
I have empathy, sensitivity and friendship skills				<b>.841</b>
I have the ability to quickly make smart decisions				<b>.823</b>
<b>Eigen Value</b>	<b>2.119</b>	<b>1.503</b>	<b>1.101</b>	<b>0.853</b>
<b>Variance %</b>	<b>67.58</b>	<b>16.18</b>	<b>11.25</b>	<b>4.99</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>67.58</b>	<b>83.76</b>	<b>95.01</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary data computed**

The result in table 4.10 above shows the factor analysis results of Capacity building, four factors were extracted, component one (Knowledge) explained 67.6%, followed by Skills with 16.2%, then Competencies 11.3% and the last Capabilities with 4.9% of the variance of Capacity building.

The factor analysis results of Capacity building, under Knowledge stability attribute were explained that; I have adequate self-help knowledge to help others in my society 94%, Training is done to equip people with knowledge of various activities 90% and that I am always given more training by the organisation to be able to train others in the society 89%. Under Skills attribute, they were explained that; skills training is done by professionals 92%, Different skills are imparted to individuals from all women and youth groups 91% and that I have had an impact on my society as a leader because of the skills I have 87%.

Then under Competencies attribute, they were explained that; I have a common knowledge or an understanding of basic techniques and concepts in your work 89%, I have the level of experience gained in a classroom and experimental scenarios or other trainings 86% and that competent teams are hired to train the various special groups 81%.

Lastly under Capabilities attribute, they were explained that; I am capable of planning ahead and making choices 87%, I have empathy, sensitivity and friendship skills 66% and that I have the ability to quickly make smart decisions 62%.

**4.4.2 Factor Analysis of Governance**

**Table 4.11 Factor Loadings of Governance**

Variables	Participation	Accountability	Transparency	Responsiveness
Because of the government initiatives, citizens have started living together in a harmony and peaceful environment	<b>.880</b>			
The government does not allow citizens to be involved in development programmes	<b>.873</b>			
All stakeholders' participation helps in sustainable development of the society	<b>.843</b>			
Public sector entities, and the individuals within them, are responsible for their decisions and actions		<b>.860</b>		
There is stewardship of public funds		<b>.851</b>		
All our leaders have a clear understanding of their responsibilities, and have clearly defined roles		<b>.831</b>		
All stakeholders have confidence in the decision-making processes and actions of public sector entities			<b>.842</b>	
I have confidence in my leaders at the centre			<b>.773</b>	
There is meaningful communication and consultation with all stakeholders at the centre			<b>.733</b>	
Leaders provide prompt service to the people				<b>.753</b>
There is transformed public service in South Sudan				<b>.738</b>
People are able to quickly identify and accurately when services are falling below the promised standard				<b>.644</b>
<b>Eigen Value</b>	<b>2.118</b>	<b>1.315</b>	<b>0.941</b>	<b>0.230</b>
<b>Variance %</b>	<b>67.38</b>	<b>15.12</b>	<b>11.302</b>	<b>3.66</b>

<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>67.38</b>	<b>82.50</b>	<b>93.802</b>	<b>100</b>
-------------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	------------

**Source; primary data**

The results in table 4.11 above show the factor analysis results of Governance variables, four factors were extracted, component one (Participation) explained 70.5%, followed by Accountability with 23.1%, then Transparency with 32% and the last (Responsiveness) with 6.4% of the variance of Governance.

The factor analysis results of Governance under Participation attribute were explained that; Because of the government initiatives, citizens have started living together in a harmony and peaceful environment 88%, the government does not allow citizens to be involved in development programmes 87% and that all stakeholders’ participation helps in sustainable development of the society 84%.

Under Accountability attribute, they were explained that; Public sector entities, and the individuals within them, are responsible for their decisions and actions 86%, there is stewardship of public funds 85% and that all our leaders have a clear understanding of their responsibilities, and have clearly defined roles 68%.

With Transparency attribute, the results were explained that; all stakeholders have confidence in the decision-making processes and actions of public sector entities 84%, I have confidence in my leaders at the centre 77% and that there is meaningful communication and consultation with all stakeholders at the centre 74%.

Lastly under Responsiveness attribute, the results were explained that; Leaders provide prompt service to the people 75%, there is transformed public service in South Sudan 74% and that People are able to quickly identify and accurately when services are falling below the promised standard 64%.

**4.4.3 Factor analysis results: Sustainable development**

**Table 4.12 Factor Loadings of Sustainable development**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Availability</b>	<b>Stability</b>	<b>Freedom</b>	<b>Quality</b>
There is clean and safe water in my society	<b>.863</b>			
Development has improved people’s standards of living	<b>.814</b>			
Development programs from government respond to people’s needs	<b>.786</b>			
Water bodies are protected		<b>.801</b>		
People are sensitized about the role of development		<b>.771</b>		
There are rules against environmental degradation		<b>.730</b>		
People do what they want in the community without any interference			<b>.792</b>	
People’s actions aim at environmental protection			<b>.744</b>	
There are limits to social freedoms in the society			<b>.701</b>	
Quality management is about measuring excellence in the company				<b>0.723</b>
There is strict and consistent commitment to certain standards that achieve uniformity of products				<b>0.699</b>
Whichever production is done, is always in the interest of the clients				<b>0.655</b>
<b>Eigen Value</b>	<b>3.212</b>	<b>2.041</b>	<b>1.652</b>	<b>0.923</b>
<b>Variance %</b>	<b>64.39</b>	<b>19.16</b>	<b>13.28</b>	<b>3.17</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>64.39</b>	<b>83.55</b>	<b>96.83</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source; primary data**

The results in table 4.12 above show the factor analysis results of Sustainable development variables, four factors were extracted, component one (Availability) explained 64.4%, followed by Stability with 19.2%, then Freedom with 13.3% and the last (Quality) with 3.2% of the variance of Sustainable development.

The factor analysis results of Sustainable development under Availability attribute were explained that; There is clean and safe water in my society 86%, Development has improved people’s standards of living 82% and that development programs from government respond to people’s needs 79%.

With Stability attribute, the results were explained that; Water bodies are protected 80%, Water bodies are protected 77% and that there are rules against environmental degradation 79%.

Then under Freedom attribute, the results were explained that; People do what they want in the community without any interference 79%, People’s actions aim at environmental protection 74% and that There are limits to social freedoms in the society 70%.

Lastly under Quality attribute, the results were explained that; Quality management is about measuring excellence in the company 81%, there is strict and consistent commitment to certain standards that achieve uniformity of products 77% and that whichever production is done, is always in the interest of the client’s 74%.

## **CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS**

### **5.0 Introduction**

This chapter presents interpretation of the study findings.

#### **5.1 Bio Data**

##### **5.1.1 Gender of the respondents**

The results indicated that at 65.7% were males and 34.3% were females. This implied that most of the employees at the organisations were males. However, obtaining information from both male and female is an indicator that the information contained in this report is gender sensitive hence the report data being genuine.

##### **5.1.2 Age group of the respondents**

The results indicated that 35.4% of respondents were between the age ranges of 41 – 50 years. In addition, those within the age bracket of 21 – 30 were 26.8%. Those who were between the age range of 31 – 40 years were ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> with a statistical representation of 21.1%. And 16.8% were between the age range of 50 and above. This implied that most of the employees and beneficiaries that participated in the study were between the age range of 41 - 50 years, an indicator that the organisations employ mature and energetic people who can effectively carry out all possible policies of capacity building as well as approaches towards better governance to bring about improved sustainable development. Therefore, presentation of data obtained from mature respondents of above 41 years means that data contained in this study is good and reasonable.

##### **5.1.3 Marital Status of the respondents**

The result indicated that 60.4% of respondents were married, 26.8% were single and 8.9% had separated from their partners while the remaining 3.9% had divorced from their partners. This implies that most of the employees engaged in implementing policies for capacity building as well as approaches towards better governance to bring about improved sustainable development, which is a sign of responsibility.

##### **5.1.4 Number of biological children for the respondents**

The results indicated that 438.9% of the respondents were with biological children ranging from 1 to 3. In addition, 33.9% had 4 to 6 biological children, 16.1% had above 6 children and 11.1% had no children. This implied that most of the employees and beneficiaries of the organisations were responsible people since most of them had a number of children to take care of.

##### **5.1.5 Number of dependents for the respondents**

The results indicated that 35% of the respondents were with dependants ranging from 1 to 3. In addition, 30.4% had 4 to 6 dependants, 26.8% had above 6 dependants and 7.9% had no dependants. This implied that most of the employees and beneficiaries of the organisations were responsible people since most of them had dependents to cater for.

##### **5.1.6 Education levels of the respondents**

Results indicated that 23.8% of the respondents had attained diplomas, 23.6% were holding a degree as their level of education, 19.6% had stopped in secondary school and 16.1% were holding certificates as their education while the remaining 12.5% had master degrees. This implied that the workers had acquired some skills to work in the organisations since some of the workers had acquired a reasonable level of education. However the leaders in the organisations needed to lay strategies to improve education of the beneficiaries. The results also indicated that the information got during the research can be depended on as majority of the respondents were educated with capability of researching and making independent decisions.

##### **5.1.7. Number of years the respondents have been working with the Juba County**

The results showed that 37.5% of the respondents had been working/benefiting in organizations in South Sudan over 6 years. In addition, 34.3% had been in organisations for 5 to 6 years, 13.9% had 3 to 4 years of experience, followed by respondents who had been in organisations for 1 to 2 years 8.9% and 5.4% as the least who had in organizations for 1 year. Most of the respondents who participated in this study had stayed in the organisations for 6 and above years, an indication

that data obtained was from people who were mature with working experience in the organisations and that information got from them was not biased.

## 5.2 The relationship between the variables

### 5.2.1 The relationship between Capacity development and Sustainable development

The results in table 4.8 above indicate a positive relationship between capacity development and sustainable development in the South Sudan ( $r = 0.701$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) which implied that with improved capacity building by various NGOs leads to sustained development of a Country.

The results are supported by UNDP, (2010) which stated that capacity building empower people, organizations and society to systematically stimulate and develop their capabilities over time to achieve social and economic goals since capacity building is the development of knowledge, skill and attitude in individuals and groups of people relevant in the design, development and maintenance of institutional and operational infrastructures and processes that are locally meaningful for sustainable development.

### 5.2.2 The relationship between Governance and Sustainable development

The results in table 4.8 above indicate a significant positive relationship between Governance and Sustainable development ( $r = 0.680$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) which implied that good governance advocated for by NGOs leads to sustainable development in a Country like South Sudan.

The results are in line with Baku & Smith, (2012) who noted that good governance, in all its facets, has been demonstrated to be positively correlated with the achievement of better growth rates, particularly through the building of institutions in support of markets. Recent empirical analysis suggests a positive correlation between democratic governance and the levels of income, investment, human capital, economic liberalization, and distributive income growth in society (Brinkerhoff & Derick, 2008).

Mbaku & Smith, (2012) argued that good governance, particularly its aspects of democratic consolidation, is a sine qua non for development. Consequently, the new maxim for Africa in the twenty-first century should be “no democracy, no development.

### 5.2.3 The regression analysis of Capacity development, Governance and Sustainable development

Results showed ( $R = 0.654$ ) a combination of Capacity development and Governance in assessing the level to which they can predict the level of Sustainable development in the Country like South Sudan. These variables explained 65.4% of the variance of Sustainable development in the Country ( $R\text{ Square} = .418$ ) such that a unit change in Capacity development processes will contribute to a change in the possibility of Sustainable development in the Country by (.587) while a one unit change in and Governance will contribute to a change in the Sustainable development in the Country like South Sudan (.388).

The results are in line with Brinkerhoff & Derick, (2008) who said that capacity building with good governance advances sustainable development for three reasons. First, enjoying political freedom and participating in the decisions that shape one’s life are fundamental human rights. The denial of these rights is a denial of human development. Second, good governance helps to protect people from economic and political catastrophes, such as famines, and other crises (Brandt & Clara, 2008).

Brinkerhoff & Derick, (2008) who said that capacity development which is important because it is a way by which people, organizations and society systematically stimulate and develop their capability over time to achieve social and economic goals, including through improvement of knowledge skills, systems and institutions.

## 5.3 Conclusions

The study established that in general terms variables including capacity building and incorporate good governance play a big role in improving sustainable development in any Country. This trend shows that there is actually a need for implementation of good policies to improve people’s capacities and promote good governance as the best way for improve sustainable development in South Sudan. The challenge however, is that there are no such policies for improve people’s capacities and promote good governance as the best way for improve sustainable development in any society or Country.

Therefore Countries should set and implement clear and effective policies for improved capacity building and improve good governance policies by setting up institutions for capacity building and governance which will ultimately lead to sustainable development in South Sudan and Juba County in particular.

## 5.4 Recommendations

Basing on the study findings and the conclusions, the researcher derived the following recommendations:

### 5.4.1 Objective one: Capacity development and Sustainable development

The results indicate a positive relationship between capacity development and sustainable development in the South Sudan ( $r = 0.701$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) which implied that with improved capacity building by various NGOs leads to sustained development of a Country. The study therefore recommends that;

- i) Results indicated that good governance and capacity building in the society promotes sustainable development and so leaders of organisations and South Sudan as a whole, should try to embrace a democratic governance which promotes

good values such as participation, accountability, responsiveness, transparency and rule of law leads to tranquility, harmony and capacity building programmes so as to build sustainable development.

- ii) Leaders should endeavor to set up capacity building programmes for the people through education and other social-economic programmes for self-reliance.

#### **5.4.2 Objective two: Governance and Sustainable development**

The results indicated a significant positive relationship between Governance and Sustainable development ( $r = 0.680$ ,  $P\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) which implied that good governance advocated for by NGOs leads to sustainable development in a Country like South Sudan. The study therefore recommends that;

- i) The government should try to provide security, justice, economic, and social functions and to channeling the will, energies, and resources of both the indigenous population and the international community and should endeavor to support peace building through encouraging institutional participation in peace building and democratic process of their countries.
- ii) Economic activities that are sustainable in the area and can be afforded by the vulnerable like women are advocated for. Sustainable economic activities will give them a certain degree of financial stability which will strengthen their capacity for sustainable development.

#### **5.4.3 Objective three: Capacity development, Governance and Sustainable development**

Results showed ( $R = 0.654$ ) a combination of Capacity development and Governance in assessing the level to which they can predict the level of Sustainable development in the Country like South Sudan. These variables explained 65.4% of the variance of Sustainable development in the Country ( $R\text{ Square} = .418$ ). The study therefore recommends that;

- i) The government of South Sudan should ensure that its legitimacy and credibility are intimately tied to a transparent and representative process of policy making by a council of democratically elected community leaders that enjoys legal recognition as an established corporate entity aiming at improving sustainable development in the Country.
- ii) NGOs should aim at establishing capacity building programmes which empower the people for sustainable development of the societies.

**REFERENCES**

- [1] Bartelmus, P., (2012): *Environment, Growth and Development: The Concepts and Strategies of Sustainability*. Routledge. London and New York.
- [2] Beck, T., G. Clarke, A. Groff, P. Keefer and P. Walsh (2012): "New tools in comparative political economy: the database of political institutions." In *The World Bank Economic Review* 15 (1), 165–176.
- [3] Besley, T., T. Persson and D. Sturm (2011): "Political Competition and Economic Performance: Theory and Evidence from the United States." *NBER working papers*, No. 11484. National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA.
- [4] Brinkerhoff, Derick W. *Governance in Post-Conflict Societies: Rebuilding Fragile States*. Routledge. 2008.
- [5] Cavallo, Alberto F. and Eduardo A. Cavallo, (2010): "Are Crises Good for Long-Term Growth? The Role of Political Institutions." In *Journal of Macroeconomics* 32 (3) 838-857.
- [6] Cernea, M., (2010): *The Sociologist's Approach to Sustainable Development*. In: *Finance and Development*. December Issue. pp.11–13.
- [7] Chung, M., (2009): *Population and Sustainable Development in the Pacific Islands Countries*. Paper prepared for the Fourth Pacific Islands Conference of Leaders, Tahiti, French Polynesia, 24–26 June 1993.
- [8] Donovan Finn: *Our Uncertain Future: Can Good Planning Create Sustainable Communities?*; University of Illinois, (2009); p. 3
- [9] Finau, S., (2009): *Appropriate health workforce for sustainable development*. Paper prepared for the Regional Technical Meeting for Asia and the Pacific preparatory to the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, Port Vila, 31 May–4 June, 2009.
- [10] Jacobs, M., *Sustainable Development as a Contested Concept*, in A. Dobson, *Fairness and Futurity: Essays on Environmental Sustainability and Social Justice* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, (2009).
- [11] Mbaku, J.M & Smith, J.E, (2012). *South Sudan - One Year after Independence: Opportunities and Obstacles for Africa's Newest Country*. Brookings Africa Growth Initiative.
- [12] McMaster, J. and S. Pollard, (2011): *Managing government for sustainable development*. Paper prepared for the Fourth Pacific Islands Conference of Leaders, Tahiti, French Polynesia, 24–26 June.
- [13] Paul-Marie Boulanger (2008). "Sustainable development indicators: a scientific challenge, a democratic issue. S.A.P.I.E.N.S. (1)". Sapiens.revues.org. Retrieved 2011-09-28.
- [14] Ranz, T., (2009), 'Evaluation of the Community Development in Eastern Afghanistan, Nangarhar Province, Afghanistan', Final Report, Carried out on behalf of Deutsche Welthungerhilfe
- [15] Ulrich Grober: *Deep roots - A conceptual history of "sustainable development" (Nachhaltigkeit)*, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, (2010); pp. 8–9
- [16] *World development report 2011* (2010), World Bank, 2005, 'The Effectiveness of World Bank Support for Community-Based and –Driven Development', an OED Evaluation, World Bank, Washington,
- [17] World Bank, *World development report* (2011).
- [18] *World development report 2011* (2010). World Bank, 2010, 'The Effectiveness of World Bank Support for Community-Based and –Driven Development', an OED Evaluation, World Bank, Washington,

**Section B: Capacity development**

Please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements. Tick the scale		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>Knowledge</b>						
1	I have adequate self-help knowledge to help others in my society					
2	Training is done to equip people with knowledge of various activities					
3	The knowledge offered is more practical and less of theory					
4	Research is done to expand on the body of knowledge					
5	Am always given more training by the ministry to be able to train others in the society					
<b>Skills</b>						
6	I have the skill to start up a personal venture					
7	I have acquired skills to improve my job productivity					
8	Skills training is done by professionals					
9	Different skills are imparted to individuals from all women and youth groups					
10	I have had an impact on my society as a leader because of the skills I have					
<b>Competencies</b>						
11	I have a common knowledge or an understanding of basic techniques and concepts in your work					
12	I have the level of experience gained in a classroom and experimental scenarios or other trainings					
13	Competent teams are hired to train the various special groups					
14	Am competent that I can make a change in my society					
15	I am not expected to ask for help when performing this skill					
<b>Capabilities</b>						
16	I am capable of planning ahead and making choices					
17	I have empathy, sensitivity and friendship skills					
18	I have the ability to quickly make smart decisions					
19	I am confident and can freely associate with any one					
20	I can stand my position and resist any influence					
<b>Innovation</b>						
21	Innovativeness is a vital attribute for self-development					
22	I have great innovational art					
23	Innovation is highly required and treasured in the ministry					
24	People like working with me because of my innovativeness					
25	Innovation leads to sustainable development in any society					
<b>Resources</b>						
26	There are productive resources required to accomplish any activity					
27	With enough resources, we are able to achieve the desired outcome					
28	The company has got enough staff					
29	The products/services provided by the company reflect the resources put in					

**Section C: GOVERNANCE**

<i>Please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements. Tick the scale</i>		<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Not Sure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Participation</b>						
1	There is inclusive participation and representation of all the stakeholders					
2	The government allows participation of all the citizens in all the activities.					
3	Because of the government initiatives, citizens have started living together in a harmony and peaceful environment					
4	The government does not allow citizens to be involved in development programmes					
5	All stakeholders' participation helps in sustainable development of the society					
<b>Accountability</b>						
6	Public sector entities, and the individuals within them, are responsible for their decisions and actions					
7	There is stewardship of public funds					
8	All our leaders have a clear understanding of their responsibilities, and have clearly defined roles in a robust structure					
9	There is sound financial management at the center					
10	There is a law, policy or statute that enforces accountability among the leaders and other parties					
<b>Responsiveness</b>						
11	Leaders are always willing to help the public					
12	Arrangements based on security to trust that can sustain peace and democracy have been made					
13	Leaders provide prompt service to the people					
14	There is transformed public service in South Sudan					
15	People are able to quickly identify and accurately when services are falling below the promised standard					
<b>Transparency</b>						
16	All stakeholders have confidence in the decision-making processes and actions of public sector entities					
17	I have confidence in my leaders at the centre					
18	There is meaningful communication and consultation with all stakeholders at the centre					
19	We have freedom of speech at the centre					
20	Governance cannot be effective without the transparent disclosure of accurate information to all the various stakeholders					
<b>Rule of law</b>						
21	There is a mutual relationship between the police, civil society and local communities					
22	The police, civil society and local communities jointly take responsibility for development solutions and local safety security					
23	The country's laws have to be adopted and respected for de-mining and weapons collection					
24	De-mobilised combatants have been involved in de-mining as a way of facilitating local reintegration					
25	The governance of the country has led to peace building in post conflict transitioning societies.					

**Section D: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

<i>To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Tick the scale</i>		<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Not sure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>AVAILABILITY</b>						
1	People acknowledge the need for development					
2	There is clean and safe water in my society					
3	Development has improved people’s standards of living					
4	Development programs from government respond to people’s needs					
5	Natural resources are available for exploitation					
<b>STABILITY</b>						
6	Climatic conditions are constant					
7	There is growth of new forests					
8	Water bodies are protected					
9	People are sensitized about the role of development					
10	There are rules against environmental degradation					
<b>FREEDOM</b>						
11	People do what they want in the community without any interference					
12	People’s actions aim at environmental protection					
13	There are limits to social freedoms in the society					
14	People are sensitized on the need for social development					
15	People enjoy their freedom with special consideration					
<b>QUALITY</b>						
16	Quality management is about measuring excellence in the company					
17	There is strict and consistent commitment to certain standards that achieve uniformity of products					
18	Whichever production is done, is always in the interest of the clients					
19	Citizens recommend the services offered by the ministry					

**Thank you very much for your time**