E-ISSN: 1116 - 2619 P-ISSN: 3026-8524
MPRI-JHLAR | INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES, LITERATURE AND ART RESEARCH
VOL. 11 NO. 6 – JANUARY, 2026

SECURITY AGENCIES COLLABORATION IN CURTAILING THE MENACE OF BANDITRY IN KATSINA STATE 2015 - 2024

MUKHTAR USMAN LIMAN
Department of Social Sciences, College of Administrative Stdies and Social Sciences, Kaduna Polytechnic, Kaduna.
Corresponding Author: abbausman87@yahoo.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70382/mejhlar.v11i6.094

Abstract

Inter-agency collaboration is a propitious and timely architecture to conflict management and security provisioning in contemporary Nigeria, considering the incessant violent conflicts and consequent entrenched insecurity. Considering the topsy-turvy security situation in Nigeria, one would expect minimal rivalry and maximum Collaborations among the organizations statutorily saddled with the responsibility of managing conflict and containing insecurity. However, dysfunctional rivalry has characterized the security agencies. In fact, the rivalry has burgeoned into outrageous proportions and dimensions. This study seeks to find out the causes of these rivalries and clashes; what has been done to address these incessant conflicts and the way out of these challenges The total population for the study is 3,003 staff from Katsina state Local Government workers. The study made use of secondary data from national tabloids, books, internet sources, among others. The researcher shall use questionnaires as the instrument for data collection. Descriptive Survey research design shall use for this study. The data to be collected shall be presented in tables and analyzed using simple percentages and frequencies.

Keywords: Security, Security Agencies, Collaboration, Banditry, Katsina State.

Introduction

Security provisioning and conflict management are, no doubt, pivotal to the survival and success of any polity in the world. In other words, security provisioning is a fundamental responsibility of any government. Section 14 (2b) of the 1999

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. S. T. Addo [GHANA]

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended) states that, "the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government." In other words, ensuring physical and human safety and welfare of Nigerians are fundamental to the survival any country. Security provisioning is the fundamental obligation of any state in the word that seeks to engender and promote sustainable development. Mechanisms for ensuring that there is peace in a polity are many. But acuteness, sustainability and the resources (finance and personnel) determine which method to employ. Whichever method a country decides to employ, Collaborations is required among the security agencies.

Collaboration or synergy is a vital mechanism for managing conflicts and containing insecurity. This is because each of the security agencies has a unique capability and operational skills that can complement the other. For ease of analysis and comprehension, James (2000) and Ahmed (2007) have identified the military component (armed forces), law enforcement agencies and secret intelligent agencies as the three broad component elements of national or instruments of internal security in Nigeria. This type of inter-agency Collaborations to solving internal security problems was also envisaged by Gbanite (2001). As he argues, Nigeria requires commitment from security personnel and financial mobilization to strengthen all the security agencies. Gbanite (2001) envisages that, the National Security Agency (NSA) must have clear and achievable objectives on how to keep this country safe. The objectives as envisaged by NSA must be articulated to the National Intelligence Agency (NIA), State Security Service (SSS), Nigeria Police Force (NPF), and Nigeria Immigration Service (NIS), Nigeria Customs Service (NCS), National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA), and Ministry of Interior. The Defence Intelligence Agency (DIA) should coordinate the efforts of the Directorate of Military Intelligence (DMI), Directorate of Naval Intelligence Agency (DNIA), and the Directorate of Air force Intelligence (DAI). Any and all information gathered that may be considered a threat to the stability of our country, be it from outside or within the country, must be shared with NSA for passage to the proper agency authorized to checkmate such insurgency.

Statement of the Problem

Considering the roles of these security agencies, it would be right to state that, if these constitutional roles are well played especially in mutual Collaborations with one another as envisaged by the society, violent conflict in the society will be minimal (Odoma, 2012:398). Despite the emphasis on the burgeoning need for inter-agency Collaborations, nothing appears to have changed in the distrust and non-Collaborations among the agencies. The situation appears to worry even the top echelon of the services, but the institutional roadblocks appear to be above their capacities (*Nigerian Tribune*, 2013).

One of the problems facing inter agencies collaboration in curtailing banditry in Katsina State is the rivalry among the security agencies, several clashes have hibernated between the Nigerian Police and the NSCDC and the Military. The operation of some of these agencies seems to veer into the activities of the other without formal agreement on collaboration. Ahmed (2007) has argued that inter-agency rivalries or clashes occur because of the feeling of superiority by one organization over and above the other creates a sense of envy and jealousy which can blossom into violent rage at any time;

Also there is indiscipline arising from a false sense of superiority, ignorance, poor education and training, undermines *esprit de corps* among the security agencies. The agencies like Army believe that they are superior to Police, the Police also believe that they are superior to Nigeria Security and Civil Defense Corp, that spirit of superiority is affecting coordination there by affecting exchange of intelligent information. Unhealthy rank comparisons between or among agencies often result in quarrels and fights

Another issue is lack of inter-service communication, which is required to ensure prompt command and control hampers the quick relay of information among the services, especially when clashes are in the formative stages

In another development, ineffective command and control borne out of weak leadership engenders indiscipline at all levels. Thus, the personnel do as they please, unchecked, because of the luxury of unbridled freedom is creating problem in inter agencies collaboration. Similarly, duplicating of functions without clear delimitation of constitutionally assigned operational areas of competency and undue interference in the statutory responsibilities of other agencies often resulted in clashes, especially when areas of Collaborations and role intersection are not properly harmonized.

Unnecessary and inordinate use of force by security personnel at the slightest provocation, is another potent cause of inter-agency conflict and inability of the system to create appropriate sanctions for erring personnel after the clashes; instead prepares the grounds for further rivalry and clashes. Nevertheless this rivalry among the security agencies has resulted to clashes, loss of lives and properties in Katsina state is mainly a consequence of cumulative insecurity in the state. Though, there are many researches on role of police and other security agencies, no research has ventured into the inter agency collaboration, that is why this study is filling the existing gap.

This attitude has exposed the society to various conflict and violent crimes in contemporary Nigeria. Anywhere there is lack of Collaborations and collaboration, success is undermined in so many respects. Constant rivalry among the security agencies in Nigeria has made insurgency and crime fighting ineffective. It is, therefore, not surprising as observed by top security officers at an inter-agency Peace-Building Conference organized by the Nigerian Security and Civil Defence Corps (NSCDC) in Abuja

that lack of collaboration among the country's security agencies was one of the factors responsible for the growth and success of Boko Haram terrorist attacks (Sunny, 2013).

Research questions

1. What are the security challenges that necessitated interagency collaboration in Katsina State?
2. What are the factors militating against inter-agencies collaboration in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State?
3. What are the efforts made to resolve dispute among various inter-agencies in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State?
4. What are the effects of inter-agencies collaboration in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State?
5. What are the best approaches of promoting inter-agencies collaboration in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State?

Research objective

1. To explore security challenges that necessitated interagency collaboration in Katsina State.
2. To analyse factors militating against inter-agencies collaboration in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State.
3. To examine the efforts made to resolve dispute among various inter-agencies in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State.
4. To explore the effects of inter-agencies collaboration in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State.
5. To highlight the best approaches of promoting inter-agencies collaboration in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State.

Hypotheses of the study

1. That Inter-Agency Collaborations does not significantly improve on Nigeria Security level.
2. That Security Challenges does not Necessitate Inter-Agency Collaborations in Nigeria.
3. That Building Capacity and Facilitating Inter-Agency Collaborations does not enhance Conflict Management and Security Provisioning.

Scope of the Study

The research attempts to review the Effects of Security Agencies Collaboration in curtailing Banditry in Katsina State 2015 - 2024. This is due to the fact that since the

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. S. T. Addo [GHANA]

inception of the fourth republic there has been incessant increase in the level of crime and criminal activities ranging from armed-robbery, Boko-Haram, Kidnapping to the worst which is banditry.

Inter-Agency Collaborations

It was the imperative nature of inter-agency Collaborations that spurred Rosenbaum (nd.) to stress that, Collaborations is expected to increase organizational accountability; reduce fragmentation and duplication of service; build interagency linkages; permanently alter the way agencies do business by giving more attention to strategic planning, data driven decision making, prevention, and inter-agency Collaborations. In the light of the above, exploring interdependences among the agencies saddled with the responsibility of managing conflicts and providing security has definitely become imperative. According to Weiss (1987), inter-agency Collaborations exists when two or more organizations that share a problem area agree to deal with the issue by establishing a link via formal contract that provides for resources and for the adjusting of internal and/or external procedures to adequately support the new arrangements. Even in well-designed political systems, the responsibilities of authorities will overlap, which means that a certain amount of Collaborations must exist (Hudson, Hardy Henwood & Wistow, 1995).

Hence, as Frazier (2014) states, development and implementation of public policy often requires multilateral Collaborations that blurs or eliminates traditional boundaries or jurisdictions. However, as Frazier (2014) further argues, diverging organizational goals and operational routines can make policy implementation difficult and, therefore, a more formal Collaborations process is required. Inter-agency Collaborations becomes imperative when a single agency such as the police cannot adequately address a constitutional responsibility such as security provisioning or conflict containment. Thus, agencies such as State Security Service (SSS), National Intelligent Agency (NIA), Nigerian Security and Civil Defence Corps (NSCDS), and National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) must seek to promote Collaborations in order to achieve successful security policy implementation. This, therefore, requires a review of the existing national security policy and the very architecture of the Nigerian military-security establishment; a new security architecture that constructs all military and paramilitary agencies as equal partners-in-security (Nigerian Tribune, 2013).

Conflict Management

Conflict management is the process of reducing or mitigating the negative and destructive capacity of conflict through a number of measures and by working with and through the parties involved in that conflict (Best, 2006). This term is sometimes used synonymously with conflict regulation. It covers the entire area of handling conflicts

positively at different stages, including those efforts made to prevent conflicts, by being proactive. It encompasses conflict limitation, containment and mitigation.as John Burton explains, this may include "conflict prevention" (Burton, 1990), a term he uses to connote containment of conflict through steps introduced to promote conditions in which collaborative and valued relationships control the behaviour of conflict parties. The term conflict management is, perhaps, an admission of the reality that conflict is inevitable, but that not all conflicts can always be resolved; therefore, what practitioners can do to is manage and regulate them (Best, 2006).

Concept of security

However, the concept of security is a multifaceted one that covers every sphere of human endeavours. This is why people talk about social security, economic security, psychological security, job security, among others. Each type of security is directed towards a certain type of threat. Security does not have a universally accepted definition as various scholars have defined it in various ways depending on their intellectual or ideological orientation. For example Akpuru (1999) sees security as absence of threat or fear in a social system. Akinyele (2001) looks at security from the socio-economic perspective and defines it as "the prevention of property damage, injury and loss of lives caused by military means as well as limitation of such damage, casualty and death in the event of war". In his part Buzan sees security as the ability of a state and societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity (Buzan, 1991).

> Security has been defined from state-centric, militaristic and strategic calculations. It has been seen as the sum total of the vital national interest of the state. A vital national interest is one for which a nation is willing to resort to force or war (Onuaha 2007). Concepts of national security will vary from state to state in direct proportion to their individual states willingness to risk conflict or war at any given time (Hartmann 1983:13).

The definitions above are too narrow, viewing security only from the conventional point of view. The second definition sees security as having not to do with war alone. There are non-military threats such as famine, poverty, ecological disasters, which are more devastating than military threat. Based on this, Ebo argued that "the traditional approach to security has had an overwhelmingly military bias which arguably limits the scope of the concept. There has therefore been the emergence of an alternative view, whose essence is that, properly understood, 'security is development" (Ebo 1997:32). As in the words of Robert McNamara

> Security means development. Security is not military hardware, though it may include it; security is not traditional military activity, though it may encompass it. Security is development, and without development, there can be no security (cited in Ebo 1997:32).

Some western scholars who theorized on defence anchored their argument on physical or conventional security. By this, they postulated that once the military is well trained and equipped the country's defence is secured. In the views of scholars like Asobie, such territorial defence paradigm is highly inadequate for security analysis. He said national security goes beyond military security. Challenges created by non-military threats like unemployment, food insecurity, diseases and underdevelopment posses more security threats to nations in third world which Nigeria belong to than military threats. Thus, he argued:

> This is an orthodox conception of the national defence problem. It is a conception which ignores the basic question why an enemy would want to attack and seize another state's territory. It is not the territory, geographical area but the material and human resources in it that other states desire. If a state is already exploiting the human and material resources in a territory, without formal conquest and military occupation so much the better (Asobie 1988: 33)

National Security

Security can be defined as 'the sum total of actions and measures, including legislative and operational procedures. These procedures are adopted to ensure peace, stability and the general well being of a nation and its citizens' (Shinkaiye, quoted in Mbachu, 2009:21). In strategic studies, security has an objective and subjective meaning. Security measures the absence of threat to life, liberty, property and core values. Security measures the absence of fear, anxiety, liberty, property and core values. Thus, when taken together, security means or represents the absence of threats and fear in a socio-political system.
According to Lippmann(1943), a nation is secured to the extent that it is not in a position to lose core values, life property and liberty and if it wishes to deter aggression or win war when unavoidable. Security therefore is always the primary concern of every country as it bears on the fundamental needs of individuals and groups, as well as the survival of the nation as a viable entity. Security can be defined as 'the protection of a nation from all types of external aggression, espionage, hostile reconnaissance, sabotage' (McNamara, 1990). This definition however, views national security in the classical concept in terms of the survival of the state and protection from external aggression through the use of the military. Developments in the international system and the emergence of the concept of

"positive peace" have made the concept of national security to be no longer synonymous with sufficient military strength to defend the nation and its interests.

Hence, the more realistic and comprehensive approach to national security now includes economic strength, internal cohesion and technological ability. Good governance and a strong sense of national security can be defined as 'the protection and preservation of the territory, sovereignty and stability of a country from threats. It entails the freedom to pursue its core values. When collecting intelligence, the United States Intelligence Services collect every information relating to military, economic, political, scientific and technological. This includes other aspects of foreign developments that pose actual or potential threats to US national interest. According to McNamara that:

> Any society that seeks to achieve adequate military security against the background of food shortages, population explosion, low level of productivity and income, low technological development, inadequate and inefficient public utilities and chronic problems of unemployment has a false sense of security. Security is not military force though it may involve it. Security is not military hardware, though it may include it, security is development and without development, there can be no security (2008:1).

Security Provisioning

Until the end of the Cold War, the concept of security had traditionally focused on the preservation of autonomy and the integrity of national borders through the powers of military capability, an externally focused "might is right" approach (Tshitereke, 2009). But the traditional military conception of security has been criticized and reconstructed to meet contemporary imperatives because it does not account for or explain the emerging non-military sources of threat to security at the individual, societal, state, regional and global levels (Francis, 2006:23). This debate has led to the redefinition of security and the broadening of the conception of security to embrace non-military dimensions such as environment, migration, ethno-religious and nationalist identities, poverty and human insecurity and disease. According to Barney et al (1991), "National security, properly understood includes not only military security against foreign invasion, but also food security, economic security, environmental security, domestic order, educational security, old age security and national disaster security." As Obasanjo (2000) gives a template of security in respect of Nigeria, "the primary objective of national security shall be to strengthen the Federal Republic of Nigeria, to advance her interest and objectives, to contain instability, combat crime, eliminate corruption, enhance genuine development, progress and growth, and improve the welfare and wellbeing and quality of life of every citizen." Ochoche (2013) stresses that security is a first order value for a people and a

country. These contributions depict that the entire gamut of human needs is central to national security. The new focus thus recognizes the need for national security to address other threats that infringe on the wellbeing of the people. In the words of Matazu (2013), security has to do with self-preservation and it implies a stable and relatively predictable environment in which an individual or group may pursue its ends or objectives without disruption, harm, danger and without fear or disturbance or injury.

Security Challenges Necessitating Inter-Agency Collaborations in Nigeria

The most likely circumstances in which inter-agency collaboration is considered imperative span over quite a large spectrum. According to Shiyanbade (2000:459), such areas include communal clashes, general unrest, religious clashes, student unrest, natural disasters, and accidents. Others are political/electoral violence, insurgency, security problems along borders, among others. As Matazu (2013) and Mejabi (2012) corroborate, Nigeria internal security is threatened by heinous crimes, perpetrated with impunity across the country, consisting, among others, unbridled kidnapping and hostage-taking, violent crimes, robberies, insurgency, political and civil disorder. In recent times, the clashes between the farmers and Fulani herdsmen has bourgeoned into outrageous dimensions. Herdsmen seeking grazing pastures for their animals are constantly in bloody conflict with their host communities (Ekhomu, 2013). Religious clashes are crises resulting from sectarian intolerance, misunderstanding or crass illiteracy. Nigeria has been wracked by periodic violent clashes between ethnic and religious groups since the 1990s. The reasons behind these clashes have varied from local political disputes to conflicts between fundamentalist Muslims and Christians or moderate Muslims. In many cases, local civic or religious leaders have manipulated these conflicts for political gain. The Maitatsine riots of the 1980s, the multiple ethno-religious clashes of 2000s (Shiyanbade, 2000; Ekhomu, 2013) and of recent, the Shiite and Boko Haram, are some of the instances. Natural disasters these such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, fire disasters, floods, landslides and other natural geological or environmental processes calls for the military, National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), Nigerian Security and Civil Defence Corps (NSCDC), the Nigerian Police Force, Fire Service to cooperate in order to assist in controlling the crowd, evacuating endangered persons, protecting private property and public installation, or in delivering humanitarian assistance to victims (Shiyanbade, 2000). Insecurity along the borders is another insecurity challenge that requires inter-agency Collaborations. The main security challenges here include smuggling, piracy, alien influx, insurgency, commando raid/air bombardment, subversive penetration and military incursion. The list, however, represents the various ways in which Nigeria's border security has been, or could be, undermined (Imobighe, 2000:455). This insecurity requires a functional synergy among the security agencies such as the military,

Customs Service, Immigration Service, the Nigerian Police Force, DSS, NIA, among others. Increased inflow of Small and Light Weapons (SALWs) has been associated with periods of elections as political elites, political parties and even governments encourage or acquiesce to the importation, acquisition, distribution and use of arms for electoral and political purposes (Ikelegbe, 2014). Post-election violence has occurred severally in Nigeria. The election conducted in 2011, for instance, recorded the most excruciating post-election violence than years that preceded it. Despite these security challenges, inter-agency rivalry is still rife in Nigeria. What then are some of its causes?

Factors Militating Against Inter-Agency Collaborations in Nigeria

Despite this urgency and imperative for inter-agency Collaborations, rivalry among the security agencies has been recorded. For instance, the Nigerian Police has severally clashed with the NSCDC and the Military. The operation of some of these agencies seems to veer into the activities of the other without formal agreement on collaboration. Ahmed (2007:2006) has argued that inter-agency rivalries or clashes occur because of the following:

1. The feeling of superiority by one organization over and above the other creates a sense of envy and jealousy which can blossom into violent rage at any time;
2. Indiscipline, arising from a false sense of superiority, ignorance, poor education and training, undermines *esprit de corps* among the security agencies;
3. Pecuniary interest arising from poor remuneration; when security personnel are not well paid, any opportunity to make extra income may pitch one group against the other;
4. Unhealthy rank comparisons between or among agencies often result in quarrels and fights;
5. Lack of inter-service communication, which is required to ensure prompt command and control hampers the quick relay of information among the services, especially when clashes are in the formative stages;
6. Ineffective command and control borne out of weak leadership engenders indiscipline at all levels. Thus, the personnel do as they please, unchecked, because of the luxury of unbridled freedom;
7. Duplicating of functions without clear delimitation of constitutionally assigned operational areas of competency and undue interference in the statutory responsibilities of other agencies result to clashes, especially when areas of Collaborations and role intersection are not properly harmonized;
8. Unnecessary and inordinate use of force by security personnel at the slightest provocation, is another potent cause of inter-agency conflict;

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. S. T. Addo [GHANA]

9. Inability of the system to create appropriate sanctions for erring personnel after the clashes; instead prepares the grounds for further rivalry and clashes;
10. Inadequate barracks accommodation which compels military and other security personnel to live among the civilian populace and commute in public transportation means.

Though this rivalry among the security agencies has resulted to clashes, several successes have been recorded in the sphere of Collaborations.

Theoretical Framework

The Janet Weiss (1987) Process Model of Collaborations is used in this study to determine what factors promote enhanced inter-agency Collaborations. The model fundamentally explains that local agencies must undergo a three-step process driven by external influences, systematic or random, to be encouraged to engage in the level of Collaborations necessary to achieve the maximum implementation of an initiative. This inter-agency Collaborations, as Rosenbaum (n.d.) argues in support, has so many benefits, including the following:

1. Inter-agency Collaborations is better suited than individual security agencies to identify and accurately define the target problems of greatest concern in a given community; they are more likely to include diverse perspectives on conflict and insecurity causation;
2. Inter-agency Collaborations is ideally more result-oriented to developing creative targeted interventions because they include a diverse group of individuals representing a diverse group of organizations with different philosophies of interventions;
3. Multiple interventions are more effective than single interventions; they hold the potential of increasing the total quality and/or better quality of the treatment; and
4. Applying similar reasoning, multiple agencies are more effective than a single agency. Representing different organizational cultures and services cooperating members bring more new ideas and resources to the problem-solving arena.

The three-step process, according to Weiss (1987), include: (a) perceived problem must be shared across agencies; (b) resources must be available to handle problem cooperatively; and (c) institutional capacity has to be established to mount Collaborations. So, goal congruence is an essential factor in encouraging inter-agency Collaborations. It is important to investigate the similarity of agency goals, as exchange interactions between agencies are less likely to occur if agency goals are in high conflict. Meyers et al (2001) provide operational definition of goal congruence and explain the

importance of operative goals. As they explain, goal congruence is the extent of agreement between (or among) the official or formal policy goals of political officials and the operative goals of the organizations or networks charged with delivering that policy. As Meyers et al (2001) further explain, it is the operative goals that tell us what the organization is actually trying to do, regardless of what official goals say are the aim. They go beyond the life of a particular interaction and become the standards by which the organization's actions are judged and around which decisions are made. They provide an important indicator of policy as delivered because they identify the preferences and choices of those who control organizational resources (Meyer et al, 2001).

Implementation studies have confirmed that goal congruence is important in cooperative process. As Lundin (2007) states, "a shared interest can be a powerful facilitator of Collaborations, whereas diverging objectives may decrease Collaborations." Das (2005) indicates that mutual commitment (common obligations or goals) "offers a way of enhancing the robustness of Collaborations and diminishing the attractiveness of defection." Also, in Tett et al (2003), it was established that in order to reduce the risk of Collaborations failure in delivery of services, it is critical to be clear about the purpose of Collaborations and to enable the operators to work together to develop a common sense of purpose that they were committed to implementing.

The second step of Weiss' Process Model of Collaborations involves agencies identifying resources to support the cooperative process (Frazier, 2014). As Weiss (1987) argues, if no initiative, energy, money, or adequate staff became available explicitly for cooperative activities, the process grinds to a halt. These myriad of resources or factors have emerged from the literature as the most relevant mechanisms necessary for agencies to progress to the third step of Weiss' process model of Collaborations (Dyer & Singh, 1998; Serrano, 2000; Daft, 2007).

Talking about the third step of Weiss' Process Model of Collaborations, Chaskin (2001) provides an appropriate operational definition of capacity. He explains that, "community capacity is the interaction of human capital, organizational resources, and social capital existing within a given community that can be leveraged to solve collective problems and improve or maintain the wellbeing of a given community. It may operate through informal social processes and or/organized efforts" (Chaskin, 2001). Institutional capacity is fundamentally dependent upon the influence of external influences driving it (e.g., legal mandates, unexpected societal demands and monetary resources) and the degree/amount of diversity in delivery mechanisms e.g., technology, communication information systems, clear procedures, operational terminology, and professionalism) existing between possible partners (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001; Skelcher, Smith & Mathur, 2004; Carmeli & Tishler, 2004). As Weiss (1987) describes, this depends on the nature of the activity that could range from a trivial matter of reliance of existing

mechanisms to a major undertaking of building new infrastructure. The commencement and sustainability of cooperative programme could be effective only if a legal and workable way support it.

Conclusion

The existence of social peace is a sine qua non for socio-economic development in any society. The lofty dream of Nigeria joining the league of 20 most developed nations in the coming ten years will be difficult to realize under a climate of social insecurity. This paper tried here to X-ray this problem, its manifestations, ramifications and impacts on security collaborations in particular and the security of the nation in general.

Recommendations

i. Periodic research must be initiated by the government to track issues that are likely to balloon into conflicts among security agencies and nip such in their buds.
ii. Integrated stake-holders meetings should be held from time to time at both national, states, local governments and community levels to sieve the feelings and opinions of the populace. These harvests of opinions will then be factored by policy makers into their social and security plans for the nation.
iii. Entrenchment of good, transparent and service-oriented governments at all tiers of governance in Nigeria.
iv. Religious bodies and traditional and socio-cultural institutions in the transformation agenda in order to stem the tide of political, ethnic and communal conflicts, and usher in the much needed peace.

References

Abdullahi, L. T. (2014). The Geoegraphical of Politics: A Case for the Political Redistricting of Adamawa State, Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IOSR), Volume 19, Issue I, Ver II*, pp 12 - 24 e -ISSN ; 2279 - 0837.

Abolurin, A. (2010). *Democratization, Conflict Management and the Amnesty Question in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Archers.

Adeniyi, O. (2012). "Terrorism and Inter-Agency Coordination in Nigeria." *Daily Post*, December 1st.

Ahmed, L. (2007). Inter-Agency Relationships. In S.E. Arase and I.P.O. Iwuofor (eds.), *Policing Nigeria in the 21st Century*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.

Aliyu, U. (2021). *Statistical Methods for Biometric and Medical Research.* Kaduna, Nigeria: Kaduna Spider Press Limited, Kaduna Nigeria.

Arase, S.E. & Iwuofor, I.P.O. (2007). From Smith to Balogun, Ehindero… In S.E. Arase and I.P.O. Iwuofor (eds.), *Policing Nigeria in the 21st Century*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Best, S.G. (2006). "The Methods of Conflict Resolution and Transformation." In S.G. Best. (Ed.), *Introduction to Peace and Conflict studies in West Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, 93-115.

Bill Summary and Status, 111th Congress (2009-2010), H.R. 2207, CRS Summary, http://

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. S. T. Addo [GHANA]

Carmeli, A., & Tishler, A. (2004). The Relationships between Intangible Organizational Elements and Organizational Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 1257-

Chaskin, R.J. (2001). Building Community Capacity: A Definitional Framework and Case Studies from a Comprehensive Community Initiative. *Urban Affairs Review*, *36*(3), 295.

Chiluwa, I. (2011). Media Representation of Nigeria's Joint Military Task Force in the Niger Delta Crisis. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(9), 197-2008.

Collier, P. &Hoeffler, A. (1998). " On The Economic Consequences of Civil

Coventry Cathedral (2009). The Potential for Peace and Reconciliation in the Niger Delta. www.conventrycathedral.org.uk

Daft, R.L. (2007). *Organizational Theory and Design*, 9th Edition. Cengagebrain.com. Mason, Ohio: Thompson –Southwestern.

Das, T.K. (2005). Deceitful Behaviours of Alliance Partners: Potential and Prevention. Management Decisions, *43*(5), 706-720.

Diez, T. S. (2006). The European Union and border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Intergration. *International Organization*, 60 (3) : 563 - 593.

DuBrin, A. J. (2009). *Essentials of Management (7th ed.)*. Thomson: South - Western.

Dunmoye, R. A. (2020). State, governance and insecurity in Nigeria: Issues, perspectives and challenges

Dyer, J.H. & Singh, H. (1998). The Relational View: Cooperative Strategy and Sources of Inter-Organizational Competitive Advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(4), 660690.

Ekhomu, O. (2013). National Security: Intelligence and Community Partnership Approach – Private Security Perspective. In S.E. Arase (Ed.), *National Security: Intelligence and Community Partnership Approach*. Abuja: LawLords Publication, 211-233.

Elbadawi, I. A. (1992). *Civil Wars and Poverty: The Role of External Interventions, Political Rights and Economic Growth.* The World Bank, Washington DC Encyclopedia Americana: 100th Anniversary Library Edition, Vol. 22 Danbury, Connecticut: Golier Inc.

Essien, F. (2012). "Management of Security Threats in Nigeria: An Integrative Approach". In I.O. Albert, W.A. Eselebor and N.D. Danjibo (eds.), *Peace, Security and Development in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Peace and Conflict Studies Programme.

Foster-Fishman, P.G., Berkowitz, S., Lounsbury, D., Jacobson, S, & Allen, N. (2001). Building Collaborative Capacity in Community Coalitions: A Review and Integrative Framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *29*(2), 241-261.

Frazier, R.M. (2014). "A Canon for Collaborations: A Review of Interagency Collaborations Literature". *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *4*(1), 1-22.

Garuba, D.S. (2010). Trans-Border Economic Crimes: Illegal Oil Bunkering and Economic Reforms in Nigeria. *Pllicy Brief Series*, 15, 1-15.

Gbanite,M. (2001).national security and intelligence in Nigeria under democracy : The Way Forward. This Next News, P.4

Goni, F. (2014). Ending Security Inter-Agency Rivalry. *Vanguard*, February, 3rd.

IDASA (2007). *National Campaign on the Reduction of Electoral Violence: An Evaluation*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers (Nig) Ltd.

Ikelegbe, A. (2014). Trends and Dynamics of Small Arms and Light Weapons Proliferation and Armed Violence in the South-South, Nigeria. A Paper presented at a Three-Day National Stakeholders'Cons1ultat1ive Forum on SALW, organized by the Presidential Committee on Small and Light Weapons (PRESCOM), Abuja.

James, I. (2000). The Road to Independence. In H.I. Ajaegbu, B.J. St. Matthew, O.E. Uya (eds.), *Nigeria: A People United; A Future Assured*.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. S. T. Addo [GHANA]

Jega, A.M. (2012). The Electoral Process and Security Sector Synergy. A Paper Delivered by Professor Attahiru M. Jega, OFR, Hon. Chairman, Independent National Electoral Commission, to EIMC 6 Participants of Institute for Security Studies (ISS), Abuja on August 21, 2012

Justino, P. (2004). 'Redistribution, Inequality, and Political Conflict' PRUS Working Paper No 18, Department of Economics, University of Sussex, UK.

Lippmann, W. (1943), *US Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic,* Little, Brown and Co.

Lundin, M. (2007). Explaining Collaborations: How Resource Interdependence, Goal Congruence, and Trust affect Joint Actions in Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. JPART, 17, 651-672.

Maier, K; (2003): *7his House has Fa//en; Nigeria* in *Crisis.*Penguin Publishers. Orenuga, O. (1996): *Fundamentals of Family Living,* Ayodeji Educational Publishers Lagos.

Matazu, A.S.R. (2013). Internal Security: the Imperative of Intelligence and Community Partnership. In S.E. Arase (Ed.), *National Security: Intelligence and Community Partnership Approach*. Abuja: LawLords Publication, 45-54

McNamara, R. S. (1968). *The Essence of Security.* London: Hodder and Stouhton.

McNamara, R.S. (1990), *The Essence of Security,* New York: Harper and Row.

Mejabi, H.O. (2012). Domestic Terrorism in the Niger Delta: A Case Study of Hostage-Taking and Kidnapping in Abia State. In I.O. Albert, W.A. Eselebor and N.D. Danjibo (eds.), *Peace, Security and Development in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Peace and Conflict Studies Programme.

Meyers, M.K., Riccucci, N.M., & Lurie, I. (2000). Achieving Goal Congruence in complex Environments: The Case of Welfare Reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. II(2), 165-201.

Mijah, B.E. (1998). ''Sustainable development, Security and the physical environment in Nigeria''. Journal of the faculty of art and social sciences, Nigerian defence academy, volume 1, September pp35-53.

Moses, U.T (2009). Security Challenges Affecting Democracy In Nigeria: An alternative view. Journal of center for development and research advocacy. 4th floor. Hamza Zayyad house, Muhammadu Buhari Way, Kaduna, Nigeria.

Moyfitt; G (1996) 7. News watch Magazine:

Ngunan, T. (2013). Multi-Agency Approaches to Conflict Management in Nigeria. In *The Journal of the Society for Peace Studies and Practice*, *1*(2),36-48.

Ochoche, S.A. (2013). *Issues in Nigerian Security: Perceptions and Priorities of Nigeria*. Abuja: The African Institute for Security and Development Studies. Monograph, 1.

Odo, L. U. (2015). Democracy and good governance in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects, . *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*, 15(3), 1-9.

Ogundiya. (2010). Democracy and good governance: Nigeria's dilemma. . *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 4(6), 201 - 208.

Okafor, C. (2015). "Boat Owners drag Defence Ministry to Court Over ₦3b Debt." *The Guardian*, www.ngrguardiannews.com*Metro Extra*, Thursday, March 26, p.VII.

Olubode, C. (2011). Keynote Speech. In Responding to the Emerging Trends of Terrorism in Nigeria, Conference Proceeding organized by CLEEN Foundation. Monograph Series, No. 16.

Reddick, C.G. (2010). Homeland Security Preparedness and City Governments. In R.L. Kemp (ed.), *Homeland Security: Best Practices for Local Government*. Second Edition. USA: ICMA Press.

Robert, M. (1989). Roberts Merton's Contributions to the Sociology of Deviance. *Sociological Inquiry*, pp 453 - 466.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (n.d). Evaluating Multi-Agency Anti-Crime Partnerships: Theory, Design and Measurement Issues. University of Illinois at Chicago. *Crime Prevention Studies*, 14, 171-225.

Rothstein, B. (2014). *Human well-being and the lost relevance of political science. European University Institute: Max Weber Lecture No.* European University Institute: Max Weber Lecture No 2014/03

Serramo, R. (2003). What Makes Inter-Agency Coordination works? Insight from the Literature and two Case Studies. Inter-American Development Bank.

Shiyanbade, G.A. (2000). The Military In Democracy. In H.I. Ajaegbu, B.J. St. Matthew, O.E. Uya (eds.), *Nigeria: A People United; A Future Assured*, 1, 459-466.

Skelcher, C., Smith, M., & Mathur, N. (2005). The Public Governance of Collaborative Spaces: Discourse, Design and Democracy. Working Paper for ESRC Seminar on Public Accountability in the New Institutional Environment. University. University of West England and the Institute of Local Government Studies, University of Birmingham.

Smith, M. F. (1983). *Sampling Considerations In Evaluating Cooperative Extention Programs.* Florida: University of Florida.

Sunny, O. (2013). Insurgency: Taming Inter-Agency Rivalry. *Sunday Trust*, 29th September.

Tett, L., Crowther, J., & Ham, P. (2003). Collaborative Partnerships in Community Education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *18*(1), 37-57.

The Nigerian Tribune (2013). Inter-Agency Collaboration and Security Challenges. Friday, October 18th.

Thomas, K. W. (1974). *The Thomas-Kilman conflict mode instrument.* Mountain View: CA : CPP, Inc.

Tshitereke, C. (2009). "There Shall be Houses, Security and Comfort." *ISS Paper 196*, August. Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.

Vanguard, 11th January 2012, "Federal Government Approves New Operational Status for JTF.

Weiss, J.A. (1987). Pathways to Collaborations among Public Agencies. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *7*(1), 94-117. www.thomas.gov.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. S. T. Addo [GHANA]