

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN INTERNAL SECURITY FOR PEACE BUILDING IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA

Kevin Chinweikpe Wami, Ph.D

kevin.wami@ust.edu.ng,

Doreen Kobani, Ph.D

Dkobani.doreen@ust.edu.ng,

&

Prince Douglas

okeyoniso@gmail.com

Department of Adult Education and Community Development,
Faculty of Education
Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwo,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract

The study examined community engagement in internal security for peace building in Rivers State. To achieve the purpose of the study, three (3) objectives, three (3) research questions and three (3) hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted descriptive design. The area of the study was Rivers State. The population of the study was made up of 46 Local Government Area Community Development Committee Chairmen (CDCC) and Local Government Area Divisional Police Officers (DPO). The entire population of this study was taken as census without sampling due to the manageable size of the population. The instrument for data collection was a self-developed questionnaire titled "Community Engagement in Internal Security for Peace Building Questionnaire". The questionnaire was divided into two sections, A and B: Section A was used to gather demographic data of the respondents while section B elicited responses from respondents on the 15 questionnaire items drawn from the research questions of the study. The instrument was validated by two (2) experts from Faculty of Education, Rivers State University. A test of internal consistency using Cronbach Alpha method was used for the reliability of the instrument. Cumulative reliability coefficient of 0.82 was obtained. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation while the null hypotheses were tested using z-test statistics at 0.05 level of significance. The study among others revealed that community engagement in collaboration with community policing, security sensitization programmes and justice practice enhanced peace building in Rivers State to a high extent. Based on the findings, the study recommended among others that the community authorities/leaders should collaborate with external security agents like the police by reporting crimes to the nearest police station, initiating and training vigilante operatives for peace building.

Keywords: *Community Engagement, Internal Security, Peace Building.*

Introduction

In recent times, Rivers State has encountered enduring difficulties pertaining to internal

security and the maintenance of peace inside its territorial boundaries. Rivers State, situated in the Niger Delta region, has a historical backdrop characterised by instances of warfare, political violence, and criminal activities. These occurrences have had significant consequences for the state's progress and the welfare of its inhabitants (Humphreys & Weinstein, 2008). This study aims to provide insight into the significance of community participation as a strategic approach to address security concerns and promote peace in Rivers State.

Peace-building is a multifaceted and all-encompassing endeavour that seeks to prevent the occurrence, reoccurrence, or intensification of conflicts. Its primary objective is to provide the necessary circumstances for the establishment of enduring peace within societies that have been impacted by violence, warfare, or instability. The concept of conflict transformation comprises a diverse array of activities, tactics, and interventions that aim to address the underlying causes of conflict, foster reconciliation, and cultivate resilient and peaceful societies. (Lederach, 1997; United Nations, 2009).

The concept of community is inherently social, representing a complex network of interpersonal connections. Community development has been conceptualised and characterised by various authors, each emphasising unique elements and attributes. The definition of "it" varies depending on the geographical perspective and the specific field of specialisation, including a wide range of interests among other factors. According to Wami (2022), a community functions under specific parameters that are collectively established by its members, either through implicit understanding or explicit agreement. Every society establishes its own set of customs and behavioural

patterns, which can be either implicit or explicitly stated as norms. Community members are united by various factors, including but not limited to their geographical proximity, shared interests, same backgrounds and identities, as well as similar situations and experiences (Kobani & Alozie, 2019). According to Dokubo (2019), the concept of community can be understood from two perspectives: a collective of individuals residing in a specific geographic region due to shared bonds of unity, rootedness, closeness, ethnicity, birth, and kingship. The qualities encompassed by this concept include shared bonds, mutual interests, linguistic similarities, shared views and ideals, as well as hierarchical positioning. Furthermore, a community can be defined as a structured collective of individuals who have common interests, exemplified by formal entities such as cooperative societies and community-based organisations. These may include various associations such as clubs, age groups, youth organisations, and women organisations. According to Abiona (2009) in Anyanwu referred to the community as the most fundamental unit of democracy. This necessitates the implementation of checks and balances, which encompass security measures.

According to Oyebamiji and Adekola's definition as cited in Kobani and Alozie (2019), a community can be seen as a social structure that is geographically defined, where individuals coexist in a state of harmony, affection, and intimacy, while also sharing common social, economic, and cultural attributes. The notion was further elucidated as a population residing inside officially designated urban boundaries, characterised by shared social and economic attributes that facilitate the pursuit of collective objectives. However,

contemporary communities are formed regardless of physical location, exemplified by the presence of social media platforms 140 such as WhatsApp, Instagram, and Facebook (Kobani and Alozie, 2019).

The concept of engagement comprises a range of dimensions related to involvement, participation, and interaction across many situations. Active, meaningful, and deliberate interactions or connections between persons, groups, or entities are frequently linked to this phenomenon. Engagement is observed in several contexts, encompassing social, educational, organisational, and digital domains, and it assumes a crucial function in cultivating connections, enhancing productivity and attaining intended results (Kahn, 1990; Schaufell, Gonzales-Ronza & Bakker, 2002). Engagement is typically influenced by a framework consisting of guiding ideas, methods, and techniques, rather than being solely determined by a specific 'model'. The framework is founded upon concepts that uphold the entitlement of all individuals within the community to be duly informed, consulted, engaged, and empowered. Community engagement utilizes a variety of methods and strategies in order to achieve favourable outcomes. Additionally, it prioritises the cultivation and augmentation of trust as a crucial component in establishing enduring, sustainable involvement and efficient governance.

Community engagement refers to the collaborative efforts undertaken with groups of individuals that share a common geographic location, specific interests, or comparable circumstances, in order to collectively address concerns that impact the overall welfare of these individuals. The implementation of this initiative holds significant potential in facilitating environmental and behavioural

modifications that can effectively enhance the overall well-being of both the community and its individual constituents. Frequently, the process entails the establishment of partnerships and coalitions that facilitate the mobilisation of resources and exert influence on systems. Additionally, these partnerships and coalitions have a pivotal role in altering the dynamics among involved parties, acting as catalysts for the transformation of policies, programmes, and practices (CDC, 1997). Community engagement is a deliberate and purposeful approach aimed at collaborating with specific groups of individuals (such as security agencies) who may be linked by geographical proximity, shared interests, or affiliations, in order to discover and tackle issues that impact their overall welfare. The association between the concept of 'community' and 'engagement' serves to expand the range of inquiry, redirecting attention from the individual to the collective, thereby highlighting the need for inclusivity in order to acknowledge the various forms of diversity present within any given community.

Prior to the implementation of community policing, the Nigeria Police Force functioned under a typical British semi-military policing organization, which emphasized the concentration of authority. According to Kpae and Adishi (2017), the notion of centralisation of authority contradicts the philosophy of community policing, which prioritises the decentralisation of power. While community policing is a relatively recent development in Nigeria, it has already acquired significant traction in the Western world, particularly in the United States, since the late 1970s. The ideology places emphasis on the principles of collaboration, proactive policing, and the decentralisation of power. Community policing emphasises the

collaborative efforts between law enforcement agencies and the community, highlighting the potential for achieving outcomes that neither party can achieve independently (Kpae & Adishi, 2017). According to the findings of Wroblewski and Hess (2003), Community Policing can be defined as a comprehensive organisational philosophy and management strategy that fosters collaboration between the community, government entities, and law enforcement agencies. This approach emphasises proactive problem-solving techniques and active community involvement in order to effectively address the root causes of criminal activity and other community-related concerns. Additionally, it was observed that the fundamental principle of community policing revolves around the restoration of a collective approach to ensuring safety and security within a community. This approach entails the active involvement and assumption of responsibility by all members of the community, rather than solely relying on a limited group of individuals such as the local government administration or the safety forces. The aim is for everyone in the community to contribute towards the overall well-being and protection of the community as a whole. In response to the prevailing lack of public confidence in law enforcement, the former Inspector General of Police (IGP) T.O. Balogun implemented a series of initiatives in 2003 aimed at enhancing the rapport between the police and the citizenry. The author, Ibeanu (2007), reported that the individual in question implemented the Police Complaints Bureau and the Human Rights Desks across all state commands. Additionally, with assistance from the British government, they initiated a trial community policing programme in Enugu State.

Sensitisation, also known as heightened awareness, should not be conflated with comprehensive training. The primary objective of awareness presentations is to direct and concentrate attention towards a certain subject, such as security. The purpose of awareness presentations is to facilitate individuals in recognising and acknowledging security problems, and subsequently taking appropriate actions in response (Wilson and Hash, 2003). The concept of security refers to the measures and strategies implemented to protect individuals, organisations, and sensitisation programmes are frequently employed methods or frameworks that play a crucial role in consolidating policy, strategy, and implementation efforts, as well as disseminating these efforts to a particular organisation or groups such as communities. These programmes aim to enhance information systems in security by introducing new assets (System Security, 2013). Security is widely recognised as a distinct field or sub-discipline within the realm of international relations occupying a central position in the study of this discipline. Due to its dynamic nature and its significance in the realm of international politics, a considerable amount of time and scholarly endeavours have been devoted to the discipline of security, particularly in the post-Cold War era. The definition and scope of security, as well as the field of study known as "security studies," are contingent upon the referent object, i.e., the entity or entity to be protected (Collins, 2013). According to Baldwin (1995), in order to mitigate ambiguity, security can be stated in terms of two specifications by this reformulation. For whom is security being provided? This refers to the entity or someone that serves as the object of

reference, or the intended recipient of a sense of security. Is it the individual who bears the responsibility, and if so, is it a portion, a majority, or the all of them? Alternatively, may it be argued that the state, the international system, and other relevant factors have a significant role in this context?

b) Security for what specific set of values? Given that security is a relative concept, it necessitates a careful equilibrium with other fundamental principles, including but not limited to economic prosperity, individual freedom, national sovereignty and environmental preservation.

Nevertheless, Baldwin (1997) conceded that while these criteria are crucial to the understanding of security, they are insufficient in offering more explicit instructions for its pursuit. Therefore, it is imperative to provide further specifications encompassing the extent of security required, the specific dangers from which security is sought, the methods employed to achieve security, the associated costs, and the projected timeframe for implementation. Within the framework of this research, it is anticipated that communities will possess a comprehensive understanding of the aforementioned inquiries and be capable to furnishing corresponding responses. According to Mutimer (2013), the act of questioning the referent object of security necessitates questioning the nature and extent of security, as well as the field of security studies. Degaut (2015) asserted that individuals, communities, and nations are incapable of solely prioritising the safeguarding of their territorial boundaries against military risks or pursuing territorial expansion solely for the sake of enhancing security or economic advantages. The players in question also demonstrate a keen interest in safeguarding their deeply held

beliefs, the environment in which they reside, their unique way of life, and their individual identities.

According to the scholarly work of Wolfers as cited in Degaut (2015), the idea of security holds significant importance within the field of International Relations. However, it is worth noting that the perception of security can vary greatly among individuals and is inherently subjective in nature. During the period of the Cold War, the primary focus of security was centred on nation-states, strategic considerations, military capabilities, and the preservation of the existing political order (Williams, 2013). Due to the elevated incidence of criminal activities, it is of utmost importance for communities to actively participate in ensuring security by establishing and coordinating community policing initiatives, such as vigilante groups. This proactive approach is essential for fostering the advancement and well-being of the community.

Alen (2019) posited that social justices intricately linked to the concepts of justice and rights, specifically human rights. The objective is to identify the locations of inequality, the instances of discrimination, and the areas of disadvantage, with the aim of addressing these issues and promoting equitable treatment and justice for all those involved. This particular intervention pertains to the promotion of social transformation. The objective is to enact reforms aimed at establishing a more equitable society by eradicating disparities and injustices. At its most fundamental level, Social Justice Principles revolve around the concept of equity. Social justice ideas are integral to the practice of community development. The aforementioned principles embody fundamental ideals in the pursuit of effecting societal transformation via the

establishment and enhancement of communal structures and progress. The primary objective of community development practice is to attain social justice by collaborative engagement with communities or by providing assistance to the local community as it assumes a leadership role in effecting transformative change. Social justice is a concept that revolves around the objective of guaranteeing that every individual is granted and receives equitable and unbiased treatment. These principles encompass various elements, including equity, equality, access, participation, inclusion, and diversity. The presence of social justice is essential for the establishment of genuine and enduring community security in the context of community development (Allen, 2019).

The concept of social justice is intricate and diverse, encompassing the notion of impartially allocating resources, opportunities, and advantages in a society to guarantee the comprehensive engagement and flourishing of all individuals and groups. The subject matter pertains to the correction of historical and structural disparities, the advancement of equitable access to rights and opportunities, and the resolution of systemic biases and matters of justice (Rawls, 1971; Sen, 1999). Alen (2019) posited that social justice is intrinsically interconnected with justice and rights, specifically emphasising the significance of human rights. The objective is to identify the locations of inequality, the presence of discrimination, and instances of disadvantage, with the aim of addressing these issues and promoting equitable treatment and justice for all those involved. This particular intervention pertains to the promotion of social change. The objective is to enact reforms that foster a more equitable

society by addressing and eradicating disparities and injustices. To simplify things to its most fundamental level, the principles of social justice revolve around the concept of fairness. Social justice ideas are integral to the practice of community development. The aforementioned principles embody fundamental ideals within the realm of fostering societal transformation through the establishment and enhancement of communal structures. The primary objective of community development practice is to attain social justice by collaborative engagement with communities or by providing assistance to the local communities as it assumes a leadership role in effecting transformative change. Social justice is a concept that revolves around the objective of guaranteeing that every individual is granted and receives equitable and unbiased treatment. These principles could include a number of items such as, equity, equality, access, participation, inclusion and diversity. Without having social justice as a base, there can be no real and lasting community security for community development. (Alen, 2019).

Statement of the Problem

The endeavours made by governmental bodies and security organisations to mitigate the issue of insecurity remains persistent, hence indicating the necessity for a comprehensive and multidimensional strategy. Community engagement has emerged as a viable approach to tackle these difficulties, as it involves the active involvement of local people in the process of designing and implementing security measures. This approach acknowledges that the duty for security extends beyond state agencies and encompasses a shared obligation between the government and the community. Nevertheless, there is a lack of

comprehensive research on the scope and efficacy of community engagement in Rivers State. This phenomenon has a significant impact on the progress of community development and poses challenges to the operations of investors. The researchers, however, noted that the majority of enterprises refrain from establishing their operational sites in such places due to the elevated level of insecurity prevalent in these neighbourhoods. Against this contextual background, a comprehensive investigation was conducted on the subject of Community Engagement in Internal Security for Peace Building in Rivers State. 144

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine community engagement in internal security for peace building in Rivers State. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Find out the extent community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State.
2. Investigate the extent community engagement in security sensitisation programme enhance peace building in Rivers State.
3. Examine the extent community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent does community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State?
2. To what extent does community engagement in security sensitisation programme enhance peace building in Rivers State?

3. To what extent does community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State?

Hypotheses

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

- H₀₁. There is no significant difference in the mean responses of CDC chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State.
- H₀₂. There is no significant difference in the mean responses of CDC chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in security sensitisation programme enhance peace building in Rivers State.
- H₀₃. There is no significant difference in the mean responses of CDC chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Methodology

The research approach employed in this study was a descriptive survey, which involved a population consisting of 46 individuals serving as Local Government Area Community Development Committee Chairmen (CDCC) and Local Government Area Divisional Police Officers (DPOs). The overall number of individuals involved in this consists of 23 Chairmen of the Local Government Area Community Development Committee (CDCC) and 23 Divisional Police Officers (DPO), resulting in a combined count of 46. The study encompassed the complete population, which was surveyed in its entirety without employing sample techniques, as the

population size was deemed manageable. The data gathering instrument utilised in this study was a self-structured questionnaire. The survey will be partitioned into two distinct portions, namely Section A and Section B. Section A will be used to collect demographic information from the participants, while Section B will be dedicated to obtaining replies from the participants regarding the 15 questionnaire items derived from the research inquiries of the study. The instrument underwent validation by two professionals affiliated with the Faculty of Education at Rivers State University. The instrument's dependability

was assessed by employing Cronbach Alpha statistics, which provided a measure of internal consistency. The research inquiries were addressed by employing measures of central tendency, specifically the mean, and measures of dispersion, such as the standard deviation. The decision rule for the study questions was determined using a four-point Likert response rating scale, ranging from Very High Extent (VHE) to Very Low Extent (VLE). A mean value below 2.50 (<2.50) was classified as a low extent (LE), whereas an item with a mean value of 2.50 or above (≥ 2.50) was classified as a high extent (HE). The hypotheses were tested using a Z-test at a significance level of 0.05.

Table 1: Distribution of Population

S/N	Names of LGAs/Communities	Names of LGAs/Divisional Police Stations	No. of DPOs
1.	Abua/Odual – Abua Central	Abua Central Divisional Police Station	1
2.	Ahoada-East – Odiabidi	Odiabidi Divisional Police Station	1
3.	Ahoada-Wast – Engenni	Engenni Divisional Police Station	1
4.	Akukutoru – Abonnema	Abonnema Divisional Police Station	1
5.	Andoni - Asarama	Asarama Divisional Police Station	1
6.	Asari Toru – Buguma	Buguma Divisional Police Station	1
7.	Bonny- Finima	Finima Divisional Police Station	1
8.	Degema – Bokana	Bokana Divisional Police Station	1
9.	Eleme - Alesa	Alesa Divisional Police Station	1
10.	Emohua – Rumuche	Rumuche Divisional Police Station	1
11.	Etche – Okehi	Okehi Divisional Police Station	1
12.	Gokana – Bodo	Bodo Divisional Police Station	1
13.	Ikwerre – Ishiokpo	Ishiokpo Divisional Police Station	1
14.	Khana – Bori	Bori Divisional Police Station	1
15.	Obio/Akpor - Rumukpakani	Rumukpakani Divisional Police Station	1
16.	Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni – Omoku	Omoku Divisional Police Station	1
17.	Ogu – Bolo – Okobie	Okobie Divisional Police Station	1
18.	Okrika – Ogoloma	Ogoloma Divisional Police Station	1
19.	Omuma – Eberi	Eberi Divisional Police Station	1
20.	Opobo/Nkoro – Queenstown	Queenstown Divisional Police Station	1
21.	Oyibo – Afam	Afam Divisional Police Station	1
22.	Port Harcourt – Oroworukwo	Olu-obasanjo Divisional Police Station	1
23.	Tai – Nonwa	Nonwa Divisional Police Station	1
	Total		23

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Analysis of Data and Results

Research Question 1: To what extent does community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State?

Table 2: Mean Responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the Extent Community Engagement in Collaboration with Community Policing Enhance Peace Building in Rivers State

S/ N	Item	CDC Chairmen N=23			LGA DPOs N=23		
		\bar{X} RMK	SD		\bar{X} SD	RMK	
1.	Communities collaborate with community police by reporting crimes to the nearest police station.	2.5 2	0.86	HE	2.72	0.81	HE
2.	Communities collaborate with community police by initiating vigilante operation for peace building.	3.0 1	0.90	HE	2.61	0.89	HE
3.	Communities do not have community police unit as a strategy for peace building.	2.6 8	0.83	HE	2.53	1.22	HE
4.	Community members assist the police in investigating criminal activities for peace building.	2.4 1	0.82	LE	2.64	0.76	HE
5.	Community stakeholders and opinion leaders identify and point out criminals with biasness and sentiment.	2.5 1	0.83	HE	2.99	1.05	HE
	Grand mean	2.6 3		HE	2.70		HE

Source: Field Survey, 2023

The analyzed data on table 2 above for research question 1, revealed that all the items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 had mean scores 2.52, 3.01, 2.68, 2.41 and 2.51 with standard deviation 0.86, 0.90, 0.83, 0.82 and 0.83 for CDC Chairmen and 2.72, 2.61, 2.53, 2.64 and 2.99 with standard deviation 0.81, 0.89, 1.22, 0.76 and 1.05 for LGA DPOs. It revealed the extent community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State.

However, with grand mean scores of 2.63 and 2.70 for CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs in the 23 local government areas in Rivers State respectively, the answer to research question one reveals that community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State to a high extent.

Research Question 2: To what extent does community engagement in security sensitization programme enhance peace building in Rivers State?

Table 3: Mean Responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the Extent Community Engagement in Security Sensitization Programme Enhance Peace Building in Rivers State

S/ N	Item	CDC Chairmen N=23			LGA DPOs N=23		
		\bar{X} RMK	SD	HE	\bar{X} RMK	SD	HE
6.	Security summits are organized from time to time in communities for peace building.	2.71 147	1.37	HE	2.83	1.27	HE
7.	Communities and police train and equip youths to function as community vigilante.	2.63 3	1.32	HE	2.68	0.87	HE
8.	Community leaders are sensitized on security, conflict resolution, dialogue and right terms to use in settling disputes.	2.41 1	1.18	LE	2.61	0.83	HE
9.	Communities and police organize security programmes to sensitize members of communities on the negative effect of hard drugs for peace building.	2.34 4	1.28	LE	2.53	1.03	HE
10.	Police do not relate with community members to enhance mutual relationship for peace building.	2.82 2	0.93	HE	2.39	1.10	LE
Grand mean		2.58		HE	2.60		HE

Source: Field Survey 2023

The analyzed data from table 3 revealed that all the items 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 had mean scores 2.71, 2.63, 2.41, 2.34 and 2.82 with standard deviation 1.37, 1.32, 1.18, 1.28 and 0.93 for CDC Chairmen and 2.83, 2.68, 2.61, 2.53 and 2.39 with standard deviation 1.27, .87, 0.83, 1.03 and 1.10 for LGA DPOs and revealed the extent community engagement in security sensitization programme enhance

peace building in Rivers State. However, with grand mean scores of 2.58 and 2.60 for CDC Chairman and LGA DPOs in the 23 local government areas in Rivers State respectively, the answer to research question two reveals that community engagement in security sensitization programme enhance peace building in Rivers State to a high extent.

Research Question 3: To what extent does practice enhance peace building in Rivers community engagement in social justice State?

Table 4: Mean Responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the Extent Community Engagement in Social Justice Practice Enhance Peace Building in Rivers State

S/ N	Item	CDC Chairmen N=23			LGA DPOs N=23		
		\bar{X} RMK	SD	HE	\bar{X} SD	RMK	HE
11	Community leaders allow legal justice on everyone guilty of crime.	2.81	1.29	HE	2.59	0.78	HE
12	Justice is practiced for all and sundry in communities for peace building.	2.58	1.15	HE	2.48	0.63	LE
13	Community members often adhere to constitution and bye-laws for peace building.	2.63	0.69	HE	2.82	0.65	HE
14	Community members practice jungle justice and traditional justice as justice practice.	2.79	0.90	HE	2.91	0.87	HE
15	Communities adhere to court judgments in communal dispute for peace building.	2.51	1.06	HE	2.68	0.62	HE
Grand mean		2.66		HE	2.70		HE

Source: Field Survey 2023

Data on table 4 shows that all the items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 had mean scores of 2.81, 2.58, 2.63, 2.79 and 2.51 with standard deviation 1.29, 1.15, 0.69, 0.90 and 1.06 for CDC Chairmen and 2.59, 2.48, 2.82, 2.91 and 2.68 with standard deviation 0.78, 1.03, 0.65, 0.87 and 0.62 for LGA DPOs and reveals the extent community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State. However, with grand mean scores of 2.66 and 2.70 for CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs in the 23 local

government areas in Rivers State respectively, the answer to research question three reveals that community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State to a high extent.

Test of Hypotheses

Ho₁: There is no significant difference in the mean responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Table 5: Z-test Analysis of Difference in the Mean Responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the Extent Community Engagement in Collaboration with Community Policing Enhance Peace Building in Rivers State

Respondents	N	\bar{X}	SD	DF	LS	z-cal	z-critical	Decision
CDC Chairmen	23	2.63	0.85	44	0.05	0.56	±1.96	Accepted
LGA DPOs	23	2.70	0.95					

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Data on Table 5 above revealed z-test analysis of difference between the mean responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State. At 0.05 level of significance and 44 degree of freedom, the z-calculated value was 0.56 which was less than the z-critical value of ±1.96, therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted; which states that there is no

significant difference between the mean ratings of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Ho₂: There is no significant difference in the mean responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in security sensitization programme enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Table 6: Z-test Analysis of Difference in the Mean Responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the Extent Community Engagement in Security Sensitization Programme Enhance Peace Building in Rivers State

Respondents	N	\bar{X}	SD	DF	LS	z-cal	z-crit	Decision
CDC Chairmen	23	2.58	1.22	44	0.05	0.13	±1.96	Accepted
LGA DPOs	23	2.60	2.24					

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Data on Table 6 above shows a z-test analysis of difference between the mean ratings of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in security sensitization programme enhance peace building in Rivers State. At 0.05 level of significance and 44 degree of freedom, the z-calculated value was 0.13 which was less than the z-critical value of ±1.96, therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, which states that there is no significant

difference between the mean ratings of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in security sensitization programme enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Ho₃: There is no significant difference in the mean responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Table 7: Z-test Analysis of Difference in the Mean Ratings of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the Extent Community Engagement in Social Justice Practice Enhance Peace Building in Rivers State

Respondents	N	\bar{X}	S.D	DF	LS	z-cal	z-cri	Decision
CDC Chairmen	23	2.6 6	1.02	44	0.0 5	0.19	±1.96	Failed to Reject
LGA DPOs	23	2.7 0	0.71					

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Data on Table 7 above shows a z-test analysis of difference between the mean ratings of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State. At 0.05 level of significance and 44 degree of freedom, the z-calculated value was 0.19 which was less than the z-critical value of ±1.96, therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, which states that there is no significant difference between the mean ratings of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of the study on research question one clearly revealed that community engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State to a high extent with grand mean scores of 2.63 and 2.70 for CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs respectively. From the analyzed table, it was revealed that communities collaborate with community police by reporting crimes to the nearest police station, communities collaborate with community police by initiating vigilante operation for peace building among others. The corresponding hypothesis one on table 5 showed no significant difference between the mean responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community

engagement in collaboration with community policing enhance peace building in Rivers State with z-calculated value of 0.56 which was less than the z-critical value ±1.96. This finding is in agreement with Kpae and Adishi (2017) which showed that community policing stresses that by working together, the police and the community can accomplish what neither cannot accomplish alone.

The findings of the study on research question two clearly revealed that community engagement in security sensitization programmes enhanced peace building in Rivers State to a high extent with grand mean scores of 2.58 and 2.60 for CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs respectively. From the analyzed table, it was revealed that security summits are organized from time 151 time in communities for peace building, communities and police train and equip youths to function as community vigilante, community leaders are sensitized on security, conflict resolution, dialogue and right terms to use in settling disputes among others, the corresponding hypothesis two on table 6 showed no significant difference between the mean responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in security sensitization programmes enhance peace building in Rivers State with z-calculated value of 0.13 which was less than the

z-critical value ± 1.96 . This finding is in consonance with System Security (2013) which revealed that security sensitization programmes are common approaches or models necessary to centralize policy, strategy, implementation and also to distribute the implementation and strategy for a certain, specific organization or sets, groups like communities by improving the information systems in security through implementation of new assets.

The findings of the study on research question three clearly revealed that community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State to a high extent with grand mean scores of 2.66 and 2.70 for CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs respectively. From the analyzed table, it was revealed that community leaders do not allow justice on everyone guilty of crime, justice is practiced for all and sundry in communities for peace building, community members do not adhere to constitution and bye-laws for peace building among others. The corresponding hypothesis three on table 7 showed no significant difference in the mean responses of CDC Chairmen and LGA DPOs on the extent community engagement in social justice practice enhance peace building in Rivers State with z-calculated value of 0.19 which was less than the z-critical value of ± 1.96 . This finding corroborated with Alen (2019) who revealed that this type of intervention is about social change. Making change to create a fairer society where inequality and injustice is eliminated

Conclusion

Based on the findings, cases of insecurity are reported in most parts of the state in various media every week, this takes the form of communal clashes and cult related violence, kidnapping, illegal bunkering as observed in the 23 local government areas of Rivers

State. Communities do not collaborate with community policing, promote security sensitization programmes and social justice practice for peace building in Rivers State. Thus, it was concluded that community engagement in collaboration with community policing, security sensitization programmes and justice practice as a strategy will enhance peace building in Rivers State to a high extent.

Recommendations

1. The community authority/leaders should collaborate with external security agents like the police by reporting crimes to the nearest police station, initiating and training vigilante operative for peace building.
2. The community stakeholders/opinion leaders should promote security sensitization programmes, establish security units, organize security summits from time to time in communities, sensitize community leaders on security, conflict resolution, dialogue and right terms to use in settling disputes for peace building.
3. The community leaders should promote equity in justice practice. Community leaders should allow justice on everyone guilty of crime, justice practice should be for all and sundry in community, community members should adhere to constitution and bye-laws for peace building.

References

- Abiona, I.A. (2009). *Principles and Practice of Community Development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Alen Blackshaw (2019) *Community builder and corporate training:*

- herdingtogether.com/2019/03/07/social-justice-and-community-development/
- Baldwin, D. A. 'Security Studies and the End of the Cold War'. *World Politics*, 48(1), 117-141. Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, A. (2013) *Contemporary Security Studies*. 3rd ed., London, Oxford University Press.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1997). CDC Committee on Community Engagement. Principles of community engagement* (1st ed.). Atlanta (GA): CDC/ATSDR Committee on Community Engagement; 1997.
- Dokubo, D. (2019). *Management and Strategies of Community Development in Adult Education*. Benin City: BenC Technologies.
- Degaut, M. (2015). Out of the barracks: The role of the military in democratic revolutions. *Armed Forces & Society*, 41(4), 646-667. doi: 10.1177/0095327X14562649
- Ibeanu, O. (2007). Criminal justice reforms: Policing services delivery. In J.C. Otteh (Ed.), *Reforming for Justice*. Apapa: Access to Justice.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation on divided societies*. US Institute of Peace Press.
- 152 Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal* 33(4), 692-724.
- Kobani, D. & Alozie, K. (2019). *Essentials of Community Development in Nigeria*. Second edition. Owerri: Beauty Concepts.
- Kpae, G., & Adishi, E. (2017). *Community policing in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects*. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 3(3), 2545-5303.
- Mutimer, D. (2013) 'Critical Studies: A Schismatic History', in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies*, 3rd ed., London, Oxford University Press, 2013, p. 69.
- Mark Wilson and Joan Hash (2003), *Building an Information Technology Security Awareness and Training Program, Computer Security*, NIST Special Publication 800-50, October.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Schauffell, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzales-Ronza, V., Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: Two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- System Security. (2013). *Software and Systems Security*. Retrieved from <http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/softeng/security/>.
- United Nations, (2009). Report of the Secretary-General on Peace Building in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict. A/63/881-S/2009/304. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view-doc.asp?symbol=A/63/885-S/2009/304>.
- Wami, K. C. (2022). Influence of citizens' participation on community development in Bonny Local Government Area, Rivers State. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science L*
- Williams, P. (2013) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. (2 ed.), New York, Routledge.

Wolfers, Arnold. 'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol', *Political Science Quarterly*, 67(4), 3552-3575.
Wroblewski, H. M. and Hess K. M. (2003).

Introduction to Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. 7th Edition.
Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson.