

Innovations

Evaluation of Security Management Strategies Used by Principals to Safeguard School Resources in Crisis Prone Area of Makurdi Metropolis

Ogwu Hannah Inikpi Ph.D

Dept. of Educational Foundations
Kogi State University, Anyigba

Enefu, Samuel Muhammed Ph.D

Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Foundations
Kogi State University, Anyigba

Achimugu, Lawrance

Faculty of Education
Department of Science Education
Kogi State University, Anyigba

&

Okaforcha, Choice Chima (Ph.D)

Department of Educational Foundations,
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University
Igbariam, Anambra State.

Corresponding author: Ogwu Hannah Inikpi Ph.D

Abstract

The resources of secondary schools in Makurdi's suburb settlements have been threatened by the crisis. Farmers' strikes and inter-communal violence are to blame for the problem, which has continued for the past five years. As a result, a research on how to protect school resources is necessary. Twenty secondary schools in all, one from each of Makurdi's five crisis-prone neighborhoods, were chosen at random to participate in the study. Data from the chosen schools was collected using a well-structured questionnaire. To direct the study, two hypotheses and four research questions were developed. Research questions were addressed using means and standard deviations. The main conclusions showed that the measures taken by the majority of schools can be summed up as the following: gathering information on threats to school resources through cooperation between the school, community, and security agents; sensitizing the school community on security threats and their responsibility; and using various measures to protect school resources. According to research, providing proper security is essential for protecting school resources. The safety of people and property both within and outside of schools should be guaranteed by the government.

Keywords: 1.Security, 2.Management, 3.Strategies, 4. Resources for Schools

Over the past ten years, Nigeria has faced several difficulties with regard to the security of life and property. The government's efforts to intervene have not spared the education sector; attacks on educational institutions have persisted. Teachers, students, and educational facilities are no longer safe in the school environment, which is intended to be conducive. The breakdown of peace has led to the kidnapping or abduction of schoolchildren in order

to demand a ransom, the murder of pupils and teachers, and in certain cases, the total destruction of school infrastructure.

The attack on Mamudo Government secondary school in Yobe on the 6th of July, 2013, is one example of a herdsmen attack, banditry, and kidnapping activity that has been documented in certain schools, according to the Human Right Watch Report (2012) and Mbah (2012) the July 6, 2013, attack by alleged Boko Haram militants on Mamudo Government Secondary School in Yobe, which resulted in the deaths of 41 students and a teacher. 59 students perished in the Islamist gunmen's attack on the Federal Government College in BuniYadi, Yobe state, on February 25, 2014. 27 pupils, three teachers, and twelve members of the school staff families perished in the attack on Government Science College in Kagara, Niger State. In the aforementioned schools, there were casualties in addition to damage to the school's infrastructure (Adams et al, 2021).Based on information about Nigeria's security condition, school has become a major issue since effective teaching and learning cannot take place in an unsecured environment. The noble goals of education according to Lehr (2004) can only be achieved in a conducive and peaceful school environment. Where a feeling of insecurity within and outside the school environment exists, both students and teachers are likely to be deterred, and may affect academic performance of the students.

The success of secondary school teaching and learning objectives depends critically on the availability of school resources. These priceless resources can be divided into human and physical resources. Omemu (2020) defines human resources as the stock of people whose behaviors have changed as a result of education and reading and who are available to be used in order to attain specific goals. Infrastructural facilities, according to Mbipomin Uko (2015), comprise buildings, equipment, grounds, surroundings general appearance which include the flower beds, paths orchards, shrubs, playgrounds, classrooms, assembly hall, dining halls desks and school farms. It primarily consists of the academic staff, supporting staff, and students. According to Asiabaka (2008), these amenities make up the majority of the direct and indirect components of the learning environment. The availability or lack of school amenities has an impact on students' academic achievement, to guarantee that the claims are adequately safeguarded. It is necessary to have a security management strategy.

According to Roger (2009), security is concerned with the methods employed to protect against undiluted risk. According to Manafa and Obikeze (2019), security refers to actions taken to safeguard a nation, a structure, or a person against attack and peril. Applying the idea above to schools, Aryu (2000) defines school security as the creation and upkeep of safeguards that guarantee a condition of inviolability from hostile acts of influence. School security is defined by Manafa and Ohamobi (2020) as the defense provided to the school community by the school administration. School administrators must make sure that every aspect of all personnel, pupils, and visitors remain safe.

According to Trump (2010), school security management is concerned with the strategy for protecting students, teachers, administrators, and school infrastructure facilities from crime and accidents through the use of well-developed regulations that should be managed. According to Vellani (2019), its scope includes all facets of risk management for an organization's assets, including computers, people, buildings, and other assets. It includes things like threat assessment, workplace violence, and the gathering and processing of intelligence.

A security management strategy is essentially the plan that is used to accomplish the goal of preserving assets, and it comprises school principals making sure that every component of the plan is in place. The strategy often starts with the identification of these assets, followed by the creation and implementation of policies and procedures for their protection, maintenance of these programs over time, and their maturation. According to Rogers and Schoeman (2010), security risk analysis is typically done after assets are identified in order to detect vulnerable assets and security flaws. Calculating the likelihood that security risks may materialize and the ramifications if they do are key components of this research. The right steps that can help protect the assets will subsequently be taken after this. The process may alter differently in a school setting where all resources are essential to teaching and learning but management and security personnel are just trained employees rather than experts.

According to Uko (2015), secondary school principals have a significant role to play in the security architecture of schools since, as managers, they are typically responsible for the academic and administrative affairs of the institution. The Federal Ministry of Education's National Policy on Safety, Security, and Violence-Free Schools with its Implementing Guidelines (2021) suggested creating a school security management committee in addition to the principals. Secondary school administrators in Makurdi's suburbs have had to deal with a variety of crises, including confrontations between members of the same and other communities and farmer's head clashes. These crises have had an impact on academic activity and compromised school resources. Due to these persistent problems, several portions of the Makurdi metropolitan have come to be characterized as crisis-prone zones. Communities like Agbo, Demekpe, Adaka, Apir, and Agan are just a few of them. Principals are expected to implement a strong security management strategy that will secure the safety of school assets in order to protect school resources in the event of a crisis that affects schools in crisis-prone locations. Identifying the precautionary actions that should be taken. This study set out to investigate the various security management tactics implemented by principals located in the crisis-prone area of Makurdi metropolitan in order to determine the protective measures put in place by principals.

Statement of the Problem

In order to achieve the educational purpose of teaching and learning, good school management is necessary. However, over the past five years, there has been a continual danger to the resources of secondary schools in suburban areas that have seen conflicts between farmers and headers and inter-communal violence. Principals, employees, students, parents, and communities have all expressed serious concerns about this. If school resources are to be kept secure, effective security management solutions are a must. The purpose of teaching and learning is hampered when such precautions are not taken and school resources are lost because schools' facilities are so crucial. In order to advocate the use of suitable security management solutions, this study attempted to analyze various strategies employed by principals to secure school assets.

Objectives of the Study

In order to protect and lessen the effect of crises on school resources, this study will look at the various techniques used by principals in Makurdi's crisis-prone neighborhoods. The study specifically aimed to:

- I. Examine the procedure used by principals in crisis prone area of Makurdi to gather information on thereat to school resources.
- II. Ascertain the sensitization approached used by principals to provide information to the school community on threat to school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.
- III. Determine the measures used by principals in crisis prone areas to safeguard school resources.
- IV. Determine factors affecting the utilization of the different measures used to safeguard school resources.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study

- I. How do principals in crisis prone areas of Makurdi metropolis gather information on threat to school resources?
- II. How is the sensitization of school communities on the threat to school resources carried out by principals in crisis prone areas of Makurdi?
- III. What are the different measures used by principals in crisis prone area to safe guard school resources?
- IV. What are the impediments to the implementation the different methods used to safeguard school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance:

- I. There is no significance difference the response of the principal and the head of the school security management committee on the different methods used to protect school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.
- II. There is no significance difference between the response of the principals and head of the school security management committee on the factors affecting measures used to safeguard school resources, in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.

Methodology

The descriptive survey design was used for the investigation. The study was carried out in Makurdi Benue state, Nigeria. In the crisis-prone region of the Makurdi city, the school security committee was led by 45 principals and 45 teachers. Using a simple random sampling technique, a sample of 25 (55.5%) principals and 25 (55.5%) teachers leading the school security committee from 25 secondary schools in the crisis-prone area that may be securely evaluated was chosen. A well-constructed questionnaire with the name "Security Management Strategy Questionnaire" served as the data collection tool (SMSQ). There are two sections in the questionnaire: A and B. The names and locations of the schools are detailed in Section A, and the study questions are detailed in Section B. The instrument was built using a four-point scale with the following weights: strongly agree (SA) = 4, agree (A) = 3, disagree (DA) = 2, and strongly disagree (SD) = 1.

Three experts, two from educational management and one each from the measuring and evaluation unit at Kogi State University Anyigba and University of Agriculture, Makurdi—validated the instruments. Ten principals and the head of the school security management committee participated in a trial test activity to check the instrument's internal consistency in schools outside the research area. Cronbach Alpha was used to assess the instrument's dependability, and the result was a reliability coefficient of 0.80. This was deemed suitable for the investigation. The researcher, together with two research assistants who had received training on how to use the instrument, gathered the data for the study. 40 copies of the instrument in all were duly filled out and collected, yielding an 80.0% return rate. To find the answers to the study questions, the acquired data were analyzed using the mean and standard deviation. Any mean score above 2.50 was recognized and adopted as agreed upon, according to the decision rule that 2.50 was taken.

Presentation of Results

The results were analyzed and interpreted in line with the research questions and hypotheses as follows:

Research Question One: How do principals in crisis prone areas of Makurdi metropolis gather information on threat to school resources?

Table 1: mean ratings and standard deviation on the response of principals and head of school security management committee on the procedure used in gathering information on threat to school resources.

| S/No. | Item description | Principals = 20 | | | Head of school security management committee = 20 | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|------|----------|---|------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | Decision | \bar{X} | SD | Decision |
| 1 | Existence of is school infrastructural safety and security committee. | 3.00 | 0.97 | Agree | 3.10 | 0.97 | Agree |
| 2 | The committee is made up of community members, parents, teachers and student representative. | 3.20 | 0.89 | Agree | 3.05 | 0.99 | Agree |
| 3 | The committee gathers, process, information on threat to school infrastructural facilities and past same to school management. | 3.20 | 0.83 | Agree | 2.95 | 0.99 | Agree |
| 4 | Emergency phone lines for receiving information on threat to school infrastructure exists. | 2.85 | 0.93 | Agree | 2.65 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 5 | Channels for Reporting of people in possession of school facilities during crisis to appropriate authorities, and committee members exist. | 3.15 | 0.81 | Agree | 3.05 | 0.83 | Agree |
| 6 | Information on threat to school resources are shared with Security personnel such as the (NPF and Civil Defense corps). | 2.95 | 1.05 | Agree | 2.65 | 1.23 | Agree |
| Grand Mean | | 2.53 | 0.92 | Agree | 2.91 | 1.00 | Agree |

Data in Table 1 shows the mean ratings of principals and Head of school security management committee on the procedure used to gather information on threat to school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis. Generally, both groups agree that all the items are linked to procedures used in gathering security threat information with the grand mean rating of 2.53 and 2.91 for principals and head of school security management committee respectively, which are above the decision level of 2.50. Implying that the respondents did not have divergent opinion on method used to gather information of security threat to school resources.

Research Question Two: How is the school communities sensitized by principals on the threat to school resources in crisis prone areas of Makurdi?

Table 2: mean ratings and standard deviation on the response of principals and head of school security management committee on the sensitization of school community on threat to school resources.

| S/No. | Item description | Principals = 20 | | | Head of school security management committee = 20 | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|------|----------|---|------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | Decision | \bar{X} | SD | Decision |
| 7 | The school community members are sensitized through verbal and written instructions on threat to school resources and role expected of them. | 3.05 | 0.89 | Agree | 2.80 | 1.01 | Agree |
| 8 | Parents and community members within the neighborhood of the school are sensitized on security threat to school resources during joint PTA and Community meetings. | 3.25 | 0.72 | Agree | 3.15 | 0.75 | Agree |
| 9 | School community members are sensitized on how to safeguard themselves during crisis in the school or within the community. | 3.25 | 0.72 | Agree | 3.15 | 0.75 | Agree |
| 10 | School community members are aware of emergency escape routes and facilities that can keep members safe in case of crisis. | 3.10 | 0.85 | Agree | 3.15 | 0.86 | Agree |
| 11 | Students and staff are educated on emergency evacuation drills in case of attack on school. | 2.95 | 0.83 | Agree | 2.70 | 0.92 | Agree |
| 12 | Members of the school community are sensitized on the conduct of security audit and head count to establish missing staff and student in case of an attack. | 2.75 | 1.12 | Agree | 2.65 | 1.18 | Agree |
| Grand Mean | | 3.06 | 0.85 | Agree | 2.93 | 0.91 | Agree |

Table 2 shows the mean ratings of principal and head of the school security management committee on the sensitization of school community on threat to school resources. Data in Table 2 indicates that the respondents had high mean ratings of more than 2.50 for all the items (7- 12) and a grand mean rating of 3.06 and 2.93 for principals and head of school security management committee respectively. It shows that sensitization of the school community on threat to school resources is carried out by schools in the crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.

Research Question Three: What are the different measures used by principals in crisis prone area to safe guard school resources?

Table 3: mean ratings and standard deviation on the response of principals and head of school security management committee on the measures used to safeguard school resources during crisis.

| S/No. | Item description | Principals = 20 | | | Head of school security management committee = 20 | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|------|----------|---|------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | Decision | \bar{X} | SD | Decision |
| 13 | Burglary bars are used on windows and doors to protect school properties. | 3.35 | 0.59 | Agree | 3.20 | 0.77 | Agree |
| 14 | School facilities are engraved with institution's names in a conspicuous way, to help deter theft and vandalization during crisis. | 3.30 | 0.73 | Agree | 3.00 | 1.03 | Agree |
| 15 | Security is provided around school facilities during crisis, by appropriate law enforcement agents, to protect life and prevent vandalization of such facilities. | 3.20 | 0.77 | Agree | 3.10 | 1.02 | Agree |
| 16 | Surveillance cameras (CCTV) are installed and used in the school. | 2.40 | 0.99 | Disagree | 2.55 | 1.10 | Agree |
| 17 | Access to school compound is well secured with perimeter fence and school gate. | 3.45 | 0.69 | Agree | 3.40 | 0.88 | Agree |
| 18 | The use of ID cards by staff and students at entry and exit point is strictly enforced at the gate | 2.85 | 1.14 | Agree | 2.95 | 0.89 | Agree |
| 19 | Security towers are provided at strategic locations to enhance vigilance by security personnel. | 2.35 | 0.81 | Disagree | 2.40 | 1.00 | Disagree |
| Grand Mean | | 2.99 | 0.82 | Agree | 2.94 | 0.95 | Agree |

Data in Table 3 show the mean rating of principals and head of school security management committee on the measures used to safeguard school resources. Generally, both groups agreed on all the measures used to protect school resources presented as item (13-19) except item 19, where both respondents disagree on the use of towers and item 16 where principals have divergent view on the use of surveillance cameras (CCTV) because mean values of item 16 and 19 were less than 2.50, used to Agree with measures listed. However, the grand mean rating of 2.99 and 2.94 was obtained for principals and head of school security management committee respectively.

Research Question Four: What are the impediments affecting the implementation the different strategies used to safeguard school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis?

Table 4: mean ratings and standard deviation on the response of principals and head of school security management committee on impediments to the different measures used to safeguard school resources during crisis.

| S/No. | Item description | Principals = 20 | | | Head of school security management committee = 20 | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|------|----------|---|------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | Decision | \bar{X} | SD | Decision |
| 20 | Lack of funds hinders the implementation of some of the strategies. | 3.40 | 0.68 | Agree | 3.40 | 0.88 | Agree |
| 21 | There is poor maintenance of technological security devices. | 2.90 | 0.97 | Agree | 3.05 | 0.94 | Agree |
| 22 | Lack of adequate security personnel affects the implementation of the security strategies. | 3.30 | 0.73 | Agree | 3.00 | 0.97 | Agree |
| 23 | Absence of perimeter fence around the school environment affects the security strategies. | 3.05 | 0.95 | Agree | 2.90 | 1.17 | Agree |
| 24 | Absence of scanners and appropriate devices affects implementation of security strategies. | 3.15 | 0.88 | Agree | 2.90 | 0.92 | Agree |
| Grand Mean | | 3.16 | 0.84 | Agree | 3.05 | 0.98 | Agree |

Data in Table 4 shows the mean ratings of principals and head of school security management committee on the impediments to the use of different measures to safeguard school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis. Generally, both groups agreed that all the items are factors affecting the different measures. Based on the grand mean rating of 3.16 and 3.05 for principal and head of school security management committee respectively, are above the decision level of 2.50

Hypothesis I

There is no difference between the response of the principal and the head of the school security management committee on the different strategies used to safe guard school resources in crises prone area of Makurdi metropolis.

Table 5: t-test analysis of the mean ratings of principals and head of school security committee on the strategies used to protect school resources.

| Variable | N | Mean | SD | df | α | t-cal. | t-crit. | Decision |
|--|----|------|------|----|----------|--------|---------|-----------------|
| principal | 20 | 2.99 | 0.82 | | | | | |
| | | | | 38 | 0.05 | 1.10 | 1.96 | Not Significant |
| Head of school security management committee | 20 | 2.94 | 0.95 | | | | | |

Data in table 5 shows that the calculated t-value of 1.10 at 38 degree of freedom and at 0.05 level of significance is less than the critical value of 1.96. Indicating that there is significance difference in the response of the principal and the head of school security management committee, on methods used to safeguard school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant different between the response of the principals and the head of the school security management committee on the challenges affecting measures used to protect school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.

Table 6: t-test analysis of the mean ratings of principals and heads of school security management committee on the challenges affecting measures used to safeguard school resources in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.

| Variable | N | Mean | SD | Df | Α | t-cal. | t-crit. | Decision |
|--|----|------|------|----|------|--------|---------|-----------------|
| principal | 20 | 3.16 | 0.84 | | | | | |
| | | | | 38 | 0.05 | 0.38 | 1.96 | Not Significant |
| Head of school security management committee | 20 | 3.05 | 0.98 | | | | | |

Data in table 5 shows at the calculated t-value of 0.38 at 38 degree of freedom and at 0.05 level of significance is less than the critical value of 1.96. This shows that there is no significance difference in the response of the principals and the head of school security management committee on challenges affecting the measures used to protect school resources, in crisis prone area of Makurdi metropolis.

Discussion of the Results

From the data in Table 1, it can be seen that the majority of schools have a committee for school security and management. Members of the neighborhood where the school is located, parents, teachers, and students make up its membership, accordingly. Information on the threat is obtained, evaluated, and shared with the appropriate authorities through the committee. The committee is essential for acquiring threat information. In accordance with the Federal Ministry of Education's National Policy on Safety, Security, and Violence-Free Schools of 2021, the committee was established.

Information in Table 2 makes it abundantly evident that school employees and students are typically briefed and informed about threats to school resources. The school community is instructed on what is expected of them in terms of protecting their lives and school property in an emergency. This concurs with the recommendations made by Manafa and Ohamobi (2020) and Ikediugwu and Onworah (2020) to increase safety measures in schools through sensitization.

The various safeguards used by school administrations in crisis-prone areas to protect school personnel and infrastructures are listed in Table 3. These include the installation of burglary bars on windows and doors, engraving school names on school property, using fences to restrict access to the school environment, properly regulating movement in and out of the school gate, and deploying armed security patrols when necessary. Table 4's findings showed that obstacles to using various security measures included a lack of funding, poor maintenance of technology security equipment, a lack of armed security officers, the absence of perimeter walls in some schools, and other physical devices like scanners. This suggests that schools facing these difficulties will experience resource losses during times of crisis. Mafana and Ohamobi emphasized the value of funding and school fencing (2020). The method taken by the majority of schools can be summed up as the following: obtaining information on threats to the school, raising awareness among the school community, and providing protective measures.

Conclusion

Through the usage of the school security management committee, schools in crisis-prone areas of the Makurdi metropolis collect information on security threats to school resources. The school community is briefed on threats to the school and the precautions community members should take to safeguard themselves and school property in an emergency. The school administration has put in place a variety of safeguards to protect school assets, including a fence around the school buildings, a path of escape in case of emergency, armed security guards, and restrictions on who is allowed to enter and exit the school grounds. However, a lack of funding, poor maintenance of security equipment, and insufficient equipment's. However, the majority of schools in Makurdi metropolis' crisis-prone neighborhoods have adopted tactics that, so far, have helped safeguard school assets, armed security personnel make it difficult to put some of these measures into place.

Recommendations

It was advised that; based on the study's findings;

I. When running a school, security should be given first attention.

II. School administrators should provide sufficient finances for the installation and upkeep of security equipment and infrastructure.

III. The government is responsible for ensuring the safety of people and property both within and outside of schools.

References

1. Adams, O.T, Adedeji, M.S, Majekodunmi, O. A, Kehind, B.R, & Adams, T.A. (2021) *The effects of insecurity on school system (secondary schools) in Nigeria in: Global Insecurities: challenges and the ways forward: science and education development institute, Nigeria. Akure, Ondostate, Nigeria. PP 126-136.*
2. Asiabaka, P. I. (2008). *The need for effective facility management in schools in Nigeria. New York science Journal. www.sciencepub.org: 1 (2): 10-21.*
3. *Human Right Watch Report (2021) more – school children – abducted – Nigeria* www.hrw.org
more - schoolchildren - abducted – Nigeria.
4. Ikediugwu, N.P & Onuorah, H. C. (2020) *School Security Management Procedures Applied by Principals for effective Administration of public secondary schools in Anambra State. Global Scientific Journal 8, (6), 870-882. www.globalscientificjournal.com.*
5. Lehr, C.A (2004). *Positive school climate; Information for education. National Association of school psychologists. Retrieved on 26.07.2015 from www.nasponline.org– climate – hopds.*
6. Manafa, I. F. & Obikeze, J. N. (2019). *Security Challenges and Managerial Skills needed to Enhance security in Colleges of education in South East, Nigeria. International Journal of Social Science Research, 2 (4) 34-43*
7. Manafa, I. F. & Ohamobi, I.N. (2020) *Evaluation of security management practices in Public Secondary schools in Anambra state. Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy studies, (8), 78-85.*
8. Omemu, F. (2020). *Human Resources management and effective administration in public secondary schools in Bayelsa State. Human Resource Management and Effective Administration in Public Secondary Schools in Bayelsa state, 5 (2), 19-25.*
9. Rogers, C & Schoeman, J. (2010). *Security Practice III: SEP 3701, Units 1-5, Pretoria: University of South Africa.*
10. Uko, S. E. (2015). *Principalship and effective management of facilities in secondary schools in Cross river state, Nigeria. International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection, 3 (1), 64-76.*
11. Vellani, H.K. (2019). *Strategic security Management: A risk assessment guide for decision makers. Second Edition. United Kingdom. Taylor and Francis.*

Corresponding E-mail Address: ogwuinikpi@yahoo.com, enefusamuel2012@yahoo.com or enefusamue17@gmail.com