



GRASSROOT LEADERSHIP AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF OKOLOBA COMMUNITY IN KOLUKUMA/OPOKUMA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF BAYELSA STATE

¹MACCARTHY, Macclean & ²NWANKWO, Evans Onuabuchi

^{1,2}Department of Political Science,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education
Rumuolumeni, P.M.B 5047,
Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

Email: buchievansn@gmail.com +2348036753025

Article history:	Abstract:
<p>Received: December 6th 2022 Accepted: January 6th 2023 Published: February 6th 2023</p>	<p>This paper generally examined the relationship between grassroots leadership and security management in the Okoloba community of Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State, Nigeria. The Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT) developed by Keene in the year 2000 was used. It made use of a descriptive survey research design, and a sample of 200 respondents was determined using the random sampling technique. Both primary and secondary/documentary data were used. A structured questionnaire titled, "grassroot leadership and security management (GLSM)" was used for primary data collection. The mean scores and standard deviation (SD) were used for data analyses while the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC) was used to test the hypothesis at .05 level of significance. The paper established a significant relationship between grass-roots leadership and security management. It found that the impacts of grassroots leadership on security management in Okoloba community are significantly positive. It further identified the challenges of leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba community to include indifferent attitude of police towards vigilantes, lack of personnel training, inadequate crime combating equipment, unwillingness of community members to provide relevant information on crimes to vigilante groups, lack of proper enlightenment of vigilante group activities to the community members, poor security information management, poor salary or stipends payments to the vigilante groups for their services, resistance to arrests or invitation from vigilante groups, disobedience to hierarchical order, and power tussle between Chiefs and vigilante groups. The paper concluded that effective security management can be guaranteed through improved and good leadership system at the grassroots levels. It recommended that in order to enhance the functioning of grass-roots leadership and improve security management, the traditional rulers should be relevant at the State and federal levels, and that the local governments must be encouraged to operate as the third tier of administration in Nigeria.</p>

Keywords: Grassroot, Community, Security, Management

1. INTRODUCTION

Grassroot leadership is pertinent to realizing any giant stride taken in pursuit of security in any community. It involves grassroots leaders engaging other community members and individuals in authority who can help bring improvements on security to communities. Grassroots leaders, generally speaking are in their leadership roles because of a passion for a cause or an issue, often driven by a desire to correct an injustice or inequity. Similar motivations have been found to drive the work of recognized leaders in formal educational roles (Davidson & Hughes, 2019). Kezar *et al.*, (2011) posited that non-political leadership is found in the non-state sector such as civil society constituents like Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). Example of these grassroots community organisations includes vigilante groups in Okoloba community of Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa

State. This type of organisations according to Anazado *et al.*, (2014), “take decisions based on local initiatives and help promote unity, team spirit and social relations as mechanism of conflict resolution and poverty related problems in the rural areas (p. 116).”

In Nigeria, the grassroots like Okoloba community have a lot of challenges confronting them, ranging from land struggles, electoral violence and gangs’ wars, poverty, unemployment, drug abuse, illiteracy, lack of portable water, good roads, and poor health care delivery system, and cultism involving young people who receive support from the political class, especially politicians who use them to carry out acts of violence during elections. The resultant effects include: breakdown of law and order, increased crimes in the form of robbery, rapes, kidnappings, political assassinations, and all other forms of criminal activities across the villages of Okoloba community. This is not unrelated to years of rural neglect due partly to the urban bias of government that prioritise major cities and urban centers to the detriment of the rural areas. Nevertheless, grassroots leadership has a crucial role to play in the realisations of the goals of security management both at the individual and collective levels. In the words of Greenberg (2000), “grassroots leaders are crucial in stabilizing and improving neighborhood quality (p. 21).” However, grassroots leaders wield little influence unless they have a broad base of trust. English and Ehrich (2012) argued that “grassroots leaders must build trust before any action is possible, whereas in formal organizations leaders may assume a position and then look to build trust (p. 89).” Regrettably however, grassroots leaders in Nigeria appeared to have been ignored in their local support base for many years, thereby robbing the security process of its total support base necessary for genuine security management. The issue of security management at the grassroots level gave rise to the need for vigilante groups in various communities and villages in Nigeria. This is consequent upon the total neglect of security in rural communities. Essentially, vigilante groups are established at the community to compliment the efforts of the Police in security management at the grassroots level.

So many research works have been done on leadership particularly political leadership and on security however, only few studies have been done on security in relation to grassroots leadership. Some of these works tend to lay more emphasis on the meaning of grassroots or community and security management. Most issues in these works equally centered on national or sub national security such as Nwogwugwu and Ayomola (2015) who focused on the whole Northern Nigeria and Greenberg (2000) who focused the generality of New Jersey, United States. Most of them also relied solely on secondary data and equally limited to a very large scope. Their methodologies were rather more historic, example; Okonkwo *et al.*, (2019). Uniquely, this present study is limited to a manageable geographical scope which is Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State and to the period of 2015-2019 to ensure an accurate analysis and reliable research outcome.

Research Questions

This research work is predicted on the following research questions.

- i. How has grassroots leadership impacted on security management in Okoloba community?
- ii. What are the challenges of leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba community?

Objectives of the Study

This paper generally examined the relationship between grassroots leadership and security management in Okoloba community of Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State, Nigeria. The specific objectives include to:

- i. ascertain how grassroots leadership has impacted on security management in Okoloba community.
- ii. identify the challenges of leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba community.

Research Hypothesis

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between grassroots leadership and security management.

II. CONCEPTUAL LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Grassroot Leadership

Leadership is probably the most written about the social phenomenon of all time. It is the most studied and least understood topic, and assumed to be a life’s phenomenon which is complex and mysterious (Almohaimeed, 2014). Since the early 20th century, leadership has constantly been redefined by a number of leadership theorists who based their definitions on different theoretical perspectives. As such, there is no specific or single definition for leadership thus making it a complex concept which lacks a universally accepted definition. Notwithstanding, some scholars have variously defined leadership. Leadership is the process of influencing followers (Yukl, 2006). It is a dynamic process whereby one man influences other to contribute voluntarily to the realisation and attainment of the objectives towards the common goal (Chowdhury, 2014). Aspiration, values of the group that is representing the essence of leadership is to help a group or an organisation to attain sustainable development and growth (Malik, *et al.*, 2016). Leaders help in achieving communal goals by creating an environment which influence peoples’ attitudes and motivation.

Grassroot leadership could be referred as community leadership. It tends to describe cases in which a member of a geographical area with specific influence or skill comes forward for a project’s benefit, with an emphasis on the relationships between people and tacit knowledge of the community (Martiskainen, 2017, Udensi *et al.*, 2012). The notion of community is important for the concept of community leadership (as well as community energy), and it can be defined by locality as well as interest (Martiskainen, 2017). Communities can be seen as complex systems which are not only defined by boundaries such as geographical location but are open to different participants despite their location (Onyx & Leonard, 2011). According to Sullivan (2007), “community leadership is different from the classical notion of leadership being “about ‘leaders’ asking, persuading and influencing followers (p. 142).” It is usually less hierarchical

(Onyx & Leonard, 2011) and often based on volunteer action (Zanbar & Itzhaky, 2013), involving the creation of social capital (Riley, 2012) and acting as a symbolism for change (Sullivan, 2007), as are also many grassroots innovations. Grassroot or community leaders are often informal and non-elected leaders (Béni-Gbaffou & Katsaura, 2014). Grassroot leadership is explained by the boundaries of the community within which it operates and community leadership can consist of one individual or a group of people. Grassroot leaders are individuals who mobilize a community toward a goal. They play vital roles in management and planning of the community. Some of the tasks of grassroot or community leaders include "decision making, community mobilisation, financial contribution, project legitimisation, planning the project, monitoring and evaluating the project, raising funds for the project, and organizing skilled and unskilled labor for the project (Ozor & Nwankwo, 2009, Udensi, *et al.*, 2012)." Notably also, they ensure the security of the community. Grassroots leadership is therefore a philosophy that empowers every individual to share the responsibility of achieving excellence (Keyser, 2016).

There are countless volunteer community activists throughout the world who marshal and organize individuals and groups to engage with representatives of agencies or entities that hold some degree of power over peoples' lives. There is the issue of protests for electricity distribution in Okoloba and Sabageria communities in 2017 led by their traditional leaders; Late Chief MacCpherson, M. W. of Okoloba and Sir Dr. Boukumo Orukari of Sabageria. The protests led to the installation of electricity in both communities. There is also SPDC and Ayibabiri oil field employment protest led by Chief Dimie Izoneritei that led to the creation employment for the people of the community. There is the example of the Kiama Declaration by the Ijaw Youth Council in 1999 led by Elder T. K. Ogoriba aimed at attracting development to the Niger Delta region by the Federal Government of Nigeria. This demand led to the establishment of the Niger Delta Development Commission in the year 2000. In their exhaustive case study of grassroots leadership, Willie *et al.*, (2008) concluded that while the characteristics of grassroots leaders can continuously change, there are some common characteristics that emerge such as emotional intelligence and a strong sense of empathy, conflict resolution through education and negotiation, among other features. Grassroots leaders, generally speaking, are in their leadership roles because of a passion for a cause or an issue, often driven by a desire to correct an injustice or inequity.

Security Management

Security management as a concept has been variously conceptualised by scholars and security experts. Some scholars in conceptualizing security placed emphasis on the absence of threats to peace, stability, national cohesion, political and socio-economic objectives of a country (Nwanegbo & Odigbo, 2013). To understand the concept of security management, it is therefore pertinent to first understand the concept of security. The realist school of thought viewed security as a two-issue character orientation: state and military. Security is viewed in the parochial military terms and concentrates on the different military strategies adopted to contain external threats to state security. According to Williams (2008), "security as an essential concept is commonly associated with the alleviation of threats to cherished values, especially the survival of individuals, groups or objects in the near future (p. 6)." Adebakin and Raimi (2012) however defined security as "activities that ensures protection of a country, persons, properties of the community against future threats, danger, mishaps and all other forms of perils (p. 8)."

Furthermore, Otto and Ukpere (2012, p. 67) and Adebakin, (2012, p. 9) asserted that security "means protection from hidden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life in homes, offices or communities." The above authors defined security as activities that ensure the protection of a country, persons, and properties of the community against future threats, danger, mishaps and all other forms of perils. Security must therefore be related to the presence of peace, safety, happiness and the protection of human and physical resources or the absence of crisis, threats to human injury among others. Security is considered as any mechanism deliberately fashioned to alleviate the most serious and immediate threats that prevent people from pursuing their cherished values (Chris, 2012). Orji (2012) posited that pivotal to the survival of any society is its law and order which are predicated on national security (p. 199). Thus, Nwankwo *et al.*, (2022a) described national security as "the absence of threats to core values, the prevention of public disorder, the preservation, protection, and guarantee of the safety of lives, properties, and wealth of the people, the protection of the nation's integrity, and the protection of the nation's territorial, aerial, and coastal boundaries against external aggression (p. 17)." It is the conscious efforts and deliberate measures of a sovereign nation to identify and prevent or avert perceived, potential or actual threats to the nation, and ensure the protection of her citizens and the territorial boundaries (Nwankwo *et al.*, 2022b).

Community security is not a 'bottom-up' approach, which only activates the grassroots level. Instead, it is a vehicle for wider cooperation, which seeks to harness joint capacities to address obstacles at all levels. It is an end-state whereby people feel protected and valued as members of society. This end-state is achieved when the processes behind community security are functioning, or rather, the mechanisms to ensure communities can articulate their security needs exist in conjunction with the local and institutional capacity and willingness to respond to them. Community security is a process focused on promoting a community driven approach to understanding and providing security. It has a clear focus on improving the relationships between and behaviours of communities, authorities and institutions. The process uses participatory assessments and planning and seeks to contribute to a full range of security and development improvements as decided by communities themselves. The process may lead to anything from better service delivery, to reduced social exclusion, enhanced relations between social groups, or strengthened democratic governance (UNDP, 2009). The key is that the problems addressed, the process behind it, and the results achieved, contribute to a more secured environment. From the foregoing explanations of security, security management involving

identifying the people, buildings, machines, systems and information accosted by the development, documentation, and implementation of policies and strategies for protecting them from threats.

Grassroot Leadership and Security Management: The Nexus

The primary purpose of grassroot leadership is to ensure peace, orderliness, and the security of lives of the people resident in the rural communities as well as their properties. Security is therefore focal to effective grassroot leadership. Security is a natural choice of subject, as the traditional leadership institutions evolved out of people's own attempts to ensure peace and security in their communities. For traditional rulers to participate meaningfully on matters of security in the country, there is the need for them to be re-positioned so as not to just serve as agents of conflict resolution but also as security managers which they were before. With the ever increasing security challenges facing the nation today, the integration of traditional rulers into a security network that will provide necessary stability is desirable. To effectively operate, the security agencies in Nigeria often have to relate with traditional rulers who play prominent roles at the grassroots. They are very well situated to assist security agents in neutralizing threats emanating from their domains or neighbouring communities. Grassroot leaders hold the key to the success or failure in security administration not just in their localities or communities but also in Nigeria generally. This is because, these leaders operate at the grassroots of the society and interact closely with people in their daily activities consequent upon which they are highly respected. Abdullahi (2005) noted that community based approach as opinion leaders' traditional authority are first stakeholders if they do not back opinion will face problem as they are closer always in contact with people.

There is no gain saying the fact that the grassroot leaders occupy a strategic position in security management in modern Nigerian society. This position was substantially recognized by different communities even before the period of colonisation. It is this importance that influenced the colonialists to adopt the indirect rule system. One of the singular characteristics of the traditional authority is the capacity to change, as the situations and conditions change. Amnon and Lee (2014) drawing from the experiences of extraordinary leaders in nonprofit community organisations, identified that there are patterns of successful grassroots leadership in task-oriented groups. Despite the onerous task, responsibilities and leadership and guiding roles that the grassroot rulers are expected to provide, it performed certain functions which helped to restore order and stability in Nigeria. These functions include among others, link with the grassroots, intermediating, mobilizing and sensitizing people on policies of the government. It is important to realize that, it is because of the considerable power and authority over its subordinates and subjects as well as maintenance of peace and order, security in its territory, coupled with divine and religious roles, that they enjoy degree of respect, loyalty and legitimacy within their territories. There are hierarchies of village elders, ward heads, village heads and district heads who can resolve disputes. Besides, these, grassroot leaders act as a linkage tool in the contemporary democratic political system. This is so because, the structure of traditional administrations is still favour by the people and could well serve them. They act as an intermediary between the government and the governed, by the fact that the institution receives orders from the government for transmission to their societies (Whyeda, 2018). They provide security surveillance and contribute to the decision-making structure. The above explanations indicate strong nexus between grassroot leadership and security management.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This paper employed the Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT) developed by Keene in the year 2000. The theory recognizes the dynamic interactions that take place within a society. It proposes that adaptability occurs in the everyday interactions of individuals responding to triggers in the environment. The theory is therefore relevant in analysing community leadership and the issue of security management in the community (Keene, 2000; Onyx and Leonard, 2011). The main thrust of the theory is that leadership should be seen not only as position and authority but also as an emergent, interactive dynamic (Uhl-Bien *et al.*, 2007). The theory according to Uhl-Bien *et al.*, (2007), "identifies three types of leadership: (1) administrative leadership is hierarchical and controlling; (2) enabling leadership encourages creative problem solving, learning and adaptability; and (3) adaptive leadership is a dynamic that empowers change (p. 299)." Uhl-Bien *et al.*, (2007) noted that adaptive leadership emerges from interactive changes and can be used especially for dealing with problems which require learning, new behaviours and innovation, all of which are also relevant processes to the development of grassroots innovations.

Relevantly, the theory helped in examining the relationship between grassroot leadership and security management in Okoloba community of Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State. Thus, it explains how grassroot leaders collaborate with the members of the community to ensure security management in the community. This therefore helped in ascertaining how grassroot leadership has impacted on security management in Okoloba community. Relatedly, Onyx and Leonard (2011) have used the Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT) in their analysis of five communities, and identified seven elements of successful community leadership: (1) leaders were embedded in the formal and informal networks of the community; (2) decision making was shared with the community; (3) leaders were operating in an open system, engaging with others; (4) leaders had a vision about the future of the community; (5) leaders had practical management skills; (6) leaders had planning in place for their potential successors; and (7) leaders had commitment, persistence and energy (pp. 503-505)."

IV. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH SETTING

This paper employed the descriptive survey research design which is considered appropriate to enable the researchers collect necessary data from the respondents using questionnaire items addressing the research questions. The

population for this study was drawn from the adult population of males and females, indigenes and residents of the study area which is estimated to fifteen thousand, seven hundred and sixty two persons (15,762). The paper made use of 200 respondents as the sample size determined using the random sampling technique. Both primary (quantitative) and secondary/documentary (qualitative) data were used in this study. A structured questionnaire titled, "grassroot leadership and security management (GLSM)" was used for data collection. The questionnaire was designed based on the four Likert-scale with options ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The data generated from the respondents were in line with the research questions of the study. The mean scores and standard deviation (SD) and the rank order (RO) were therefore be used to analyse the research questions while the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC) was used to test the hypothesis at .05 level of significance. To determine the acceptance and rejection level of each item in relation to the research questions, a decision rule based on the criterion mean score up to 2.50 and above were accepted while mean scores of 2.49 and below stand rejected. The computation of the mean and standard deviation was done with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22.10.

This study was carried out in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State, Nigeria. The community shares boundaries in the South with Sabageria Town, and in the North with Ayibabiri Town, all in Kolokuma Kingdom. It is bounded in the East by River Nun, and in the West by the Polaku River, Swamp, and vast forest bordering Polaku community, Yenegoa. Okoloba community is made up of five (5) villages which have sub or satellite villages. These villages are: Oladani (Ofonitoto-gbene, Okoro Boye-gbene, Ukieta-gbene satellite villages), Isedani (Oziza-ama bou-gbene, and Kobriko-gbene satellite villages), Abadani (Puipa-gbene, Duala-gbene, and Amadaba-gbene satellite villages), Burudani (Igbani-gbene, Ikiebo-gbene, Opubou-gbene, Masili-gbene, and Agadagbabou-gbene satellite villages), and Tamu-Isedani (Bumoun Bolou-gbene, and Nama-ama Zibumoun-gbene). The community has a well-structured and strong traditional leadership system. It has seven (7) major organs of leadership namely: The general assembly headed by the Amanamaowei, The Council of Chiefs headed by the Traditional Ruler, Elders Council headed by the oldest man in the council, Women Council headed by the Amanama-Arau, Youth Council headed by the Youth President, Security Outfits comprising of Commanders, and lastly, the Community Development Committee (CDC) headed by a Chairman. Okoloba indigenes are predominantly farmers basically fish farming.

V. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 1: Demography of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	105	52.5
	Female	95	47.5
	Total	200	100
Age of Respondents	21-30 years	120	60
	30-40 years	58	29
	41 years and above	22	11
	Total	200	100
Qualification	FSLC/O'Level	45	22.5
	NCE/ OND	60	30
	HND/Bachelors	75	37.5
	MSc/MEd/PhD	20	10
	Total	200	100
Participating Villages	Oladani	40	20
	Isedani	40	20
	Abadani	40	20
	Burudani	40	20
	Tamu-Isedani	40	20
	Total	200	100

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2022

The above table indicated that 105 of the respondents representing 52.5% were males while 95 respondents representing 47.5% were females. This showed that the number of males outnumbered their female counterpart. The table indicated that 120 of the respondents representing 60% were between the ages of 21-30 years, 58 of the respondents representing 29% were between the ages of 31-40, while 20 respondents representing 11% were between the ages of 41 years and above. On respondents' qualifications, the table indicated that 45 respondents representing (22.5%) of the population have FSLC/O'Level certificates, 60 respondents representing (30%) have NCE/OND certificates, 75 respondents representing (37.5%) have the HND/Bachelors certificates, while 20 respondents representing (10%) have the MSc/MEd/PhD certificates. It equally indicated the various distributions of the questionnaire to the five villages that make up the study area. Each of the villages such as: Oladani, Isedani, Abadani, Burudani, and Tamu-Isedani were administered forty (40) questionnaire templates totalling two hundred (200) questionnaire templates.

Research Question 1: Grassroot leadership has no significant impact on security management in Okoloba community.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on the ways through which grassroots leadership has impacted on security management in Okoloba Community

S/N	Items	SA	A	SD	D	Mean	Std	Remark
1	Sensitisation of community members on security tips	95	77	16	12	3.0	.74	Agreed
2	Security policy decision making	100	61	20	19	3.5	.51	Agreed
3	Making security surveillance and intelligence reports	96	76	10	18	2.6	1.1	Agreed
4	Overseeing community members' houses to know their occupants	82	66	18	34	2.8	.85	Agreed
5	Interrogating new faces in the community	95	77	12	16	2.5	1.1	Agreed
6	Ensuring orderliness and peace	100	61	19	20	2.8	1.1	Agreed
7	Provision of security gadgets	96	76	18	10	3.3	.91	Agreed
8	Improvement of salaries of vigilante groups	84	68	25	33	2.8	1.0	Agreed
9	Provision of security posts	122	58	10	28	2.9	.88	Agreed
10	Security awareness creation	95	68	20	17	2.6	1.2	Agreed
Grand Mean						2.88	0.94	Agreed

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2022

Table 10 showed the various ways through which grassroots leadership has impacted on security management in Okoloba community. With the grand mean of 2.88 and standard deviation of 0.94, the null hypothesis is rejected, thus, the table showed that grassroots leadership has significantly impacted security management in Okoloba community through the following ways: sensitisation of community members on security tips (Mean=3.0, Std.=0.74), security policy decision making (Mean=3.5, Std.=0.51), making security surveillance and intelligence reports (Mean=2.6, Std.=1.1), overseeing community members' houses to know their occupants (Mean=2.8, Std.=0.85), interrogating new faces in the community (Mean=2.5, Std.=1.1), ensuring orderliness and peace (Mean=2.8, Std.= 1.1), provision of security gadgets (Mean=3.3, Std.= 0.91), improvement of salaries of vigilante groups (Mean=2.8, Std.=1.0), provision of security posts (Mean= 2.9, Std.= 0.88), and security awareness creation (Mean=2.6, Std.= 1.2).

Research Question 2: There are no significant challenges confronting the leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba community.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics on the challenges of leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba Community

S/N	Items	SA	A	SD	D	Mean	Std	Remark
11	Indifferent attitude of Police towards vigilantism	83	68	25	33	2.73	1.04	Agreed
12	Lack of personnel training	122	58	10	28	2.96	.718	Agreed
13	Inadequate crime combating equipment	95	68	20	17	3.06	1.23	Agreed
14	Unwillingness of community members to provide relevant information on crimes to vigilante groups	112	66	16	6	2.73	1.14	Agreed
15	Lack of proper enlightenment of vigilante group activities to the community members	84	60	26	30	2.70	1.12	Agreed
16	Poor security information management	86	66	20	28	3.30	.836	Agreed
17	Poor salary or stipends payments to the vigilante groups for their services	95	78	12	15	3.03	1.22	Agreed
18	Resistance to arrests or invitation from vigilante groups	102	72	14	12	2.60	1.52	Agreed
19	Disobedience to hierarchical order	96	81	8	15	2.56	1.50	Agreed
20	Power tussle between Chiefs and vigilante groups	82	66	18	34	3.26	.827	Agreed
Grand Mean						2.89	1.12	Agreed

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2022

Table 3 showed the challenges of leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba community. With the grand mean of 2.89 and standard deviation of 1.12, the study proved that there are several challenges of leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba community which include: indifferent attitude of Police towards vigilantism (Mean = 2.73, Std. = 1.04), lack of personnel training (Mean = 2.96, Std. = 0.718), inadequate crime combating equipment (Mean = 3.06, Std. = 1.23), unwillingness of community members to provide relevant information on crimes to vigilante groups (Mean = 2.73, Std. = 1.14), lack of proper enlightenment of vigilante group activities to the community members (Mean = 2.70, Std. = 1.12), poor security information management (Mean = 3.30, Std. = 0.84), poor salary or stipends

payments to the vigilante groups for their services (Mean = 3.03, Std. = 1.22), resistance to arrests or invitation from vigilante groups (Mean = 2.60, Std. = 1.52), disobedience to hierarchical order (Mean = 2.56, Std. = 1.50), and power tussle between Chiefs and vigilante groups (Mean = 3.26, Std. = 0.827).

Test of Hypothesis

HO₁: There is no significant relationship between grassroots leadership and security management.

Table 4: Summary of regression on the relationship between grassroots leadership and security management

A. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.535 ^a	.287	.263	.71861

a. Predictors: (Constant), Grassroot Leadership

The table showed that the coefficient of relationship between grassroots leadership and security management is 0.535 while the R-squared value is 0.263 indicating that grassroots leadership relate positively with security management in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State. The table also showed that grassroots leadership account for only 26.3% (0.263x100) relationship with security management in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State. Meaning that, the remaining 73.3% of security management in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State is explained by other variables not included in the model.

B. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.254	.917		3.550	.001
	Grassroot Leadership	.497	.143	.535	3.472	.006

a. Dependent Variable: Security Management

The regression equation $y = 3.254 + 0.497x$ indicates that an improvement in grassroots leadership will lead to an effective security management in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State. Also, in the column label t under the grassroots leadership (3.472) confirmed the significance of F-statistics with $Sig < 0.06$.

C. ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	4.035	3	1.345	1.371	.272
Residual	27.465	28	.981		
Total	31.500	31			

a. Dependent Variable: Security Management

b. Predictors: (Constant), Grassroot Leadership

The F-statistic on table C above shows that there is a significant relationship between grassroots leadership and security management in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State, $F_1, 1.371, p > .05$. Therefore, null hypothesis one was rejected at 0.05 level of significance.

VI. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The discussion of study findings will be based on the subheads which are presented below.

Relationship between Grassroot Leadership and Security Management in Okoloba

The study findings on this subject matter are based on the data generated from table 6 on percentage and the correlation table 9 above of the respondents' responses on the relationship between grassroots leadership and security management. The general finding with the coefficient of 0.535 and the R-squared value of 0.263 indicating that grassroots leadership relate positively with security management in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State. The regression equation $y = 3.254 + 0.497x$ indicated that an improvement in grassroots leadership will lead to an effective security management in Okoloba community. Also, in the column label t under the grassroots leadership (3.472) confirmed the significance of F-statistics with $Sig < 0.06$. The F-statistic on table C therefore proved that there is a significant relationship between grassroots leadership and security management in Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State, $F_1, 1.371, p > 0.05$. Therefore, null hypothesis one was rejected at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is a significant relationship between grassroots leadership and security management.

Impacts of Grassroot Leadership on Security Management in Okoloba Community

The study findings on the subject matter with grand mean of 2.88 and standard deviation of 0.94 proved that grassroots leadership has significantly impacted security management in Okoloba community. This was based on the following ways: sensitisation of community members on security tips, security policy decision making, making security surveillance

and intelligence reports, overseeing community members' houses to know their occupants, interrogating new faces in the community, ensuring orderliness and peace, provision of security gadgets, improvement of salaries of vigilante groups, provision security posts, and security awareness creation. This proved that grassroots leadership has significantly impacted security management in Okoloba community. This finding agrees with Orji (2012), who identified that the traditional rulers' play specified roles in security maintenance in such areas as, "security of village, ward, district and emirate vigilante committees; security surveillance reports pass to relevant authorities; head of security, safety and protection enlightenment campaigns; sensitising/conscientising individuals (what citizens need to know i.e. do and don'ts on security tips in form of vigilance, and surveillance); policy decision making; making security surveillance and intelligence reports; and Watchdogs in numbering all houses to know their occupants and their general conduct (p. 402)." Martiskainen (2017) found that community leadership can aid the development of grassroots innovations, which operate in niches and require nurturing.

Challenges of Leadership in the Fight against Crimes in Okoloba Community

The study finding on the subject matter with the grand mean of 2.89 and standard deviation of 1.12 showed that there are several challenges of leadership in the fight against crimes in Okoloba community. These include: indifferent attitude of police towards vigilantism, lack of personnel training, inadequate crime combating equipment, unwillingness of community members to provide relevant information on crimes to vigilante groups, lack of proper enlightenment of vigilante group activities to the community members, poor security information management, poor salary or stipends payments to the vigilante groups for their services, resistance to arrests or invitation from vigilante groups, disobedience to hierarchical order, and power tussle between Chiefs and vigilante groups. This finding corroborate with Mustapha *et al.*, (2016) who concluded that inadequate support from government, lack of support from members of the public, poor welfare package/ incentive for policemen and the hostile relationship between the police and the informal policing machinery were among the challenges of community policing in Nigeria. It also lends support to Okonkwo *et al.*, (2019) who investigated traditional rulers and community in Nigeria: challenges and prospects. They argued that continued non-involvement and the loss of traditional rulers constitutional roles with the attendant upheaval in the Nigeria is fueled by weak enforcement of legislations and laws by relevant government agencies.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Security of lives and properties of the communal people is first, the primary responsibility of the State, and secondly the grassroots leaders. The Police and the vigilante groups are therefore mandated by the State with regard to the former, and the community leaders for the later, to maintain law and orderliness in the communities, and to secure the lives of the people. Today, most communities in Nigeria and in this case Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State is confronted by insecurities such as sea piracy, armed robbery, kidnapping, rape, cultism, land struggles, gang groups activities, among others. This paper therefore examined the grassroots leadership and security management with focus on Okoloba community in Kolukuma/Opokuma Local Government Area of Bayelsa State. Based on the data analyses, the study concluded that effective security management can be guaranteed through improved and good leadership system at the grassroots levels. The paper recommended thus:

- i. To enhance the functioning of the grassroots leadership and improve security management, the traditional rulers should be relevant at the State and federal levels, and that the local governments must be encouraged to operate as the third tier of administration in Nigeria. This would improve grassroots leadership and effective security management at the community level.
- ii. To boost the morale of vigilante groups in providing adequate security in Okoloba community, they should be adequately catered for, through improved salary and general welfare packages provided by the grassroots leaders and volunteer philanthropic bodies.
- iii. Adequate and advanced security apparatus and personnel training should be provided for the vigilante groups by the grassroots leaders with the support of the local government chairmen. This would boost their performance in security management.
- iv. There is need for positive perception of police about vigilantism. This can be achieved through a regular community security management orientation organised for the police by the State Police Headquarters before deployment. Thus, it would enhance the effective collaboration and working of the vigilante groups.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullahi, S. A. (2005). Youth deviance and traditional authority in Kano Metropolitan: Some issues in chieftaincy and security in Nigeria 40th Anniversary of the Emirship of HRH; Alhaji (Dr.), Ado Bayero.
2. Adebakin, M.A., & Raimi, L. (2012). National security challenges and sustainable economic development: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1-30.
3. Almohaimed, S. (2014). *Leadership development for young people*. The University of Edinburgh.
4. Amnon, B. & Lee, S. (2014). Grassroots leadership in task-oriented groups: Learning from successful leaders. *Social Work with Groups*, 28(2), 77-96.
5. Anazado, O. R., Igbokwe-Ibeto, C. J., Osawe, C. O. & Nkah, B. C. (2014). Grassroot leadership and sustainable development in Nigeria: Periscoping the impediments and exploring the imperatives. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 16(6), 114-125.

6. B nit-Gbaffou, C. & Katsaura, O. (2014). Community leadership and the construction of political legitimacy: Unpacking Bourdieu's Political capital in post-apartheid Johannesburg. *International Journal of Urban Regional Research*, 38, 1807-1832.
7. Chowdhury, G. R. (2014). A study on the impact of leadership styles on employee and commitment. *Doctoral Dissertation, Padmashree Dr. D. Y. Patil University*.
8. Chris, I. N. (2012). Security challenges and economy of the Nigerian State (2007-2011). *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(6), 244-258.
9. Davidson, F. D. & Hughes, T. R. (2019). Grassroots leadership models: A conceptual history of thought and practice. *ResearchGate*.
10. Davidson, F. D., & Hughes, T. R. (2019). Exemplary superintendents' experiences with trust. *Education Leadership Review*, 20(1), 51-68.
11. English, F. W., & Ehrich, L. C. (2012). What can grassroots leadership teach us about school leadership? *Administrative Culture*, XIII (2), 85-108.
12. Greenberg, M. (2000). Grassroots leadership, personality, and urban neighborhood environments: A case study in New Jersey. *Human Ecology Review*, 7(2), 21-29.
13. Hargreaves, T., Hielscher, S., Seyfang, G. & Smith, A. (2013). Grassroots innovations in community energy: the role of intermediaries in niche development. *Global Environ. Change*, 23, 868-880.
14. Keene, A. (2000). Complexity theory: The changing role of leadership. *Industrial Commercial. Training*, 32, 15-18.
15. Keyser, J. (July 26, 2016). Grassroots leadership. *Common Sense Leadership*. <http://www.commonseleadership.com/grassroots-leadership/>
16. Kezar, A., Bertram Gallant, T., & Lester, J. (2011). Everyday people making a difference on college campuses: The tempered grassroots leadership tactics of faculty and staff. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(2), 129-151.
17. Malik, S. Z., Salem, M., & Naeem, R. (2016). Effect of leadership styles on organisational citizenship behaviour in employees of telecom sector in Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 54, 385-406.
18. Martiskainen, M. (2017). The role of community leadership in the development of grassroots innovations. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 22, 78-89.
19. Mustapha, D. H., Zakariyya, M. S. & Usman, S. S. (2016). A review on achievements and challenges of community policing in Nigeria. *Wudil Journal of Humanities (WJH)*, 1, 271-281.
20. Nwanegbo, C. J., & Odigbo, J. (2013). Security and national development in Nigeria: The threat of Boko Haram. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (4), 285-291.
21. Nwankwo, E. O., Cymeh, J. K., Oji, D. O. & Echeonwu, M. S. (2022). The trajectory of border management and national security in Nigeria: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Development and Public Policy*, 2(9), 14-27.
22. Nwankwo, E. O., Echeonwu, M. S., Haruna, M. O., & Chukwu, K. E. (2022). Borderlands policy and national security in Nigeria: An exploratory study of the 2019 border closure. *American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research*, 3(12), 261-270.
23. Nwogwugwu, N. & Ayomola, O. O. (2015). Political leadership and security management in Nigeria: A study of boko haram insurgency in Northern Nigeria. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 20(5), VII, 47-52.
24. Nwogwugwu, N. & Odedina, A. M. (2018). Policy framework for community and state policing in combating rising security challenges in Nigeria. *International Relations and Diplomacy*, 6(6), 334-345.
25. Okonkwo, C. I., Onuigbo, R. A. & Eme, O. I. (2019). Traditional rulers and community security in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research*, 7(2), 145-159.
26. Onyx, J., & Leonard, J. R. (2011). Complex systems leadership in emergent community projects. *Community Development Journal*, 46, 493-510.
27. Orji, K. E. (2012). National security and sustainable development in Nigeria: Challenges from the Niger Delta. *African Research Review*, 6 (1), 198-201.
28. Otto, G., & Ukpere, U.I. (2012). National security and development in Nigeria. *African Journal Business Management*, 6(23), 6765-6770.
29. Ozor, N., & Nwankwo, N. (2009). The role of local leaders in community development policy. *The Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 12.
30. Riley, K. (2012). Walking the leadership tightrope: building community cohesiveness and social capital in schools in highly disadvantaged urban communities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39, 1-21.
31. Sullivan, H., (2007). Interpreting 'community leadership' in English local government. *Policy Politics*, 35, 141-161.
32. Udensi, L.O., Udoh, O.S., Daasi, G.L.K. & Igbara, F.N. (2012). Community leadership and the challenges of community development in Nigeria: The case of Boki local government area, Cross River State. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 1 (3), 912-923.
33. Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R. & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity Leadership Theory: shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *Leadership Quarter*, 18, 298-318.

34. UNDP (2009) Community security and social cohesion. Retrieved from: www.undp.org/content/dam/thailand/docs/CommSecandSocialCohesion.pdf p.17.
35. Whyeda, G. M. (2018). Who stole the town hall? The end of local government as we know. An article publication on tandfononline.com
36. William, P. D. (2008). *Security studies: An introduction*. Routledge Publication.
37. Willie, C. V., Ridini, S. P., & Willard, D. A. (2008). *Grassroots social action: Lessons in people power movements*. Rowman & Littlefield press, p. 7.
38. Yukl, G. A. (2006). *Leadership in organizations (6th ed.)*. Pearson Education, Inc.
39. Zanbar, L. & Itzhaky, H., (2013). Community activists' competence: the contributing factors. *Journal Community Psychology*, 41, 249-263.