

SEFFECT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COLLABORATION ON SECURITY
MANAGEMENT IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Abiodun Emmanuel OLUKOTUN¹ & Bolanle Waliu SHIYANBADE²

¹Department of Public Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria
olukotunabiodun17@gmail.com ORCID ID: 0009-0007-5228-9028

²Department of Public Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria
bwshiyانبade@oauife.edu.ng ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4770-5484

ABSTRACT

Evidences from empirical studies have shown the escalating complexity of security threats in Nigeria, ranging from organized crime to communal clashes, has necessitated a shift from isolated security operations to more integrated approaches, despite the constitutional centralisation of security powers at the federal level, sub-national, regional and state. This paper examined the effect of intergovernmental collaboration on security management in Oyo State, Nigeria. The paper adopts a descriptive survey design, utilising both primary data and secondary data. Primary data were collected through questionnaire and structured interview from personnel of the Nigeria Police (127), Civil Defence (87), Amotekun Corps (84), and members of Community Development Associations (87), totalling a sample size of 385 drawn from a study population. Findings revealed that intergovernmental collaboration had a limited effect on security management in the State. While joint security operations involving state and federal agencies improved patrol effectiveness (mean = 2.68) and enhanced rapid response capability (mean = 2.96), these gains were not substantial enough to significantly influence overall security outcomes. Despite these efforts the existence of collaborative mechanisms such as statutory support to federal law enforcement agencies (mean = 2.92) and regular meetings of state-local government joint security committees (mean = 2.94). The study concluded that intergovernmental collaboration has a minimal effect on security management in Oyo State, Nigeria. The study recommends establishing joint intergovernmental security structures, unified communication protocols, a centralized intelligence database, and a clear legal framework to strengthen coordination among security agencies.

Keywords: Federalism, Intergovernmental Collaboration, Security Management, Resource Sharing, Oyo State

INTRODUCTION

Effective intergovernmental collaboration is necessary to address complex challenges including resource management, infrastructure development, security, and service delivery that transcend jurisdictional boundaries. Oyo State, one of Nigeria's largest states, is crucial to the development and improvement of the nation's intergovernmental dynamics (Yagboyaju & Akinola, 2019; Shiyabade et al., 2025). According to Nnabuihe et al., (2023) Nigerian federal governments and those of its constituent states, including Oyo, are facing a major crisis with regard to security management. Rising risks such as terrorism, armed conflicts, organised crime, and natural catastrophes have highlighted the need for robust security protocols and effective coordination among various government departments and levels (Owoeye et al., 2021). Due to the interconnectedness of today's issues, international collaboration and security management study has become increasingly popular worldwide. Fighting transnational risks including cybercrime, terrorism, and environmental issues requires cooperation and coordination between international organisations and governments (Suchi & Wika, 2021). Effective intergovernmental collaboration enables nations to exchange ideas, assets, and best practices, facilitating more effective resolution of various problems (Ikeanyibe et al., 2021).

Empirical evidence highlights that the effect of intergovernmental collaboration on security management is often constrained by operational and institutional challenges. Ojo and Akinola (2020) noted that weak collaboration frameworks frequently result in fragmented security operations and inconsistencies in policy implementation, thereby reducing the overall effectiveness of security management. Awe and Shiyabade, (2026) also emphasized that collaboration between government institutions and community stakeholders is critical, as its absence weakens intelligence gathering and grassroots-level security responses. In the context of localized security issues, Olaniyan and Asuelime (2022) demonstrated that coordinated intergovernmental efforts can improve responses to conflicts such as farmer-herder crises, suggesting that collaboration has the potential to positively influence security outcomes when effectively implemented. However, Ajayi (2023) pointed out that political interference, inadequate

funding, and weak institutional capacity often undermine these collaborative efforts, thereby limiting their impact.

These further indicates that the effectiveness of intergovernmental collaboration in security management depends on several key factors. Clear legal and institutional frameworks help define roles and reduce duplication of responsibilities, thereby enhancing coordinated action (Ekanade, 2013). Effective communication systems and information-sharing platforms improve intelligence exchange and rapid response capabilities (Saka, 2024), while capacity building and equitable resource allocation strengthen operational efficiency among security agencies (Olomola, 2015). Additionally, political will and leadership commitment play a crucial role in ensuring that collaborative mechanisms function effectively, as political interference can significantly weaken coordination (Egwim, 2020). Trust among agencies and active community engagement also enhance the effectiveness of collaboration by improving cooperation and intelligence gathering (Agbude & Afolabi, 2022; Paul et al., 2023).

Oyo State's security management and intergovernmental Collaboration are influenced by a number of issues. Oyo State's infrastructure and services are under stress due to the state's rapid urbanisation and population increase. To solve these challenges, intergovernmental collaboration is essential for resource allocation and coordination (Obisanya et al., 2021). Encouraging investments, boosting the economy, and promoting sustainable development depend on environmental security and stability because Oyo State is a key economic hub that accounts for a sizable amount of the country's GDP (Otaiku, 2022; Lamidi et al., 2023). With its wealth of historical and cultural heritage, including historic cities, landmarks, and tourist attractions, Oyo State emphasise the need of maintaining security and preserving these places to promote tourism and the state's cultural identity.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

This section reviewed previous studies relevant to intergovernmental collaboration and security management. To better understand this subject matter, the study clarified some concepts, such as intergovernmental collaboration, security management, resource sharing and capacity building.

Intergovernmental Collaboration

The exchanges among governmental tiers within a country-state, which combine discussions and cooperation activities, are defined as intergovernmental collaboration (Krane & Wright, 2018). The intergovernmental framework encompasses simultaneous horizontal relationships between identical governments together with hierarchical vertical relationships between state/regional and federal and local governmental departments. This concept is important for systems that distribute authority and responsibilities between multiple governments at various levels (Adedeji, 2021; Shiyanbade et al., 2026).

Defining intergovernmental collaboration becomes difficult due to its diverse theoretical dimensions. The legal foundation constitutes constitutional provisions and legislative instruments which established roles and coverage areas and authorised powers for different government levels (Sawani, 2023). Intergovernmental collaboration, however, encompasses complex political, administrative, and financial aspects in addition to simple legal agreements. According to theories of collaborative governance and intergovernmental management, one can gain knowledge about intergovernmental collaboration's methods and apprehensions alongside its behavioral patterns (Adedeji, 2021, Awe & Shiyanbade, 2026).

The practice of intergovernmental collaboration contains multiple varied components. Policies are developed along with resource distribution and financial planning, and regulatory development follows service delivery methodologies (Eleje, 2020). The collaboration between different government levels includes both effort coordination and information exchange, and conflict resolution procedures (Vabulas & Snidal, 2021). These dimensions of power allocation and political beliefs, together with economic matters and sociocultural settings, prove influential for their development.

A small collection of essential principles coupled with operational procedures creates success for intergovernmental partnerships. Because successful intergovernmental collaboration requires constitutional boundary adherence, along with role and duty clarification and transparency along with accountability and joint decision making supported by conflict resolution mechanisms (Fischer et al., 2023). Intergovernmental councils, together with committees and forums, establish mechanisms that assist governmental levels in their communication and negotiation practices

(Behnke, 2019). Financial stability depends on intergovernmental operations through equalisation payments and conditional grants, and revenue-sharing formulas (Fischer et al., 2023).

Intergovernmental collaboration exists as a dynamic, continuous process which demands permanent cooperative changes among various governmental levels. The effectiveness of governance depends strongly on the requirement of proper cooperation between governments for national unity purposes and handling issues that span multiple jurisdictions

Intergovernmental Relations

Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) refer to the complex set of interactions, collaborations, and negotiations that occur between different levels of government—federal, state, and local—within a political system. These relationships are fundamental to the functioning of federal systems of governance and serve as a mechanism for coordination and cooperation across various government jurisdictions. In the context of security management, intergovernmental relations are particularly vital, as security is a multifaceted domain that cuts across borders, institutions, and government levels.

The foundation of intergovernmental relations lies in the recognition that no single tier of government possesses the resources, capacity, or authority to address all public policy issues independently. This is especially true for security matters, which require synchronized responses, shared intelligence, joint operations, and unified policies. In a federal system like Nigeria or the United States, security threats such as terrorism, armed banditry, insurgency, cybercrime, and communal conflicts cannot be adequately addressed without collaborative efforts among federal, state, and local governments. This collaboration forms the crux of intergovernmental relations as a strategic tool for effective governance and public administration (Akindele & Olaopa, 2002).

The conceptual development of IGR is deeply rooted in the theories of federalism and cooperative governance. Wright (1988) categorized intergovernmental relations into three models: coordinate-authority, inclusive-authority, and overlapping-authority. Each of these models reflects different levels and forms of interaction between governmental units. The overlapping-authority model is particularly relevant to security management, as it acknowledges the shared responsibilities among different levels of government. In this model, no single level has absolute control over a policy area, and effective governance depends on cooperation and negotiation.

Security management, as a public function, cannot be confined to one level of government. For example, in Nigeria, while the federal government controls the military and major security agencies such as the Nigeria Police Force and the Department of State Services, state governments often establish complementary agencies such as the Amotekun Corps in the South-West or the Hisbah Corps in parts of the North. Local governments, although constitutionally weak in security roles, serve as critical sources of intelligence and community mobilization. Thus, the need for robust IGR mechanisms becomes evident in order to ensure that efforts at all levels are aligned and mutually reinforcing (Ogunna, 1996).

Moreover, IGR serves as a framework through which conflicts among different governmental tiers can be resolved. In security management, disagreements over jurisdiction, resource allocation, or operational control are common. An effective intergovernmental structure provides the platforms—such as intergovernmental councils, joint task forces, and policy forums—for dialogue, conflict resolution, and consensus-building. For instance, the Nigeria Governors' Forum (NGF) and the National Economic Council (NEC) serve as platforms where federal and state actors deliberate on security and other critical national issues (Fatile & Adejuwon, 2010).

The effectiveness of intergovernmental relations in security management depends significantly on the clarity of roles, mutual trust, and legal frameworks. A poorly defined relationship among different levels of government often leads to policy duplication, inefficiencies, and inter-agency rivalry. In contrast, clearly delineated roles and collaborative mechanisms promote synergy and effectiveness. According to Olowu and Wunsch (2004), the lack of effective intergovernmental collaboration in many African countries has led to fragmented responses to security threats, allowing non-state actors to exploit the governance vacuum.

Fiscal federalism also plays a role in intergovernmental relations and by extension in security management. The allocation of financial resources determines the capacity of sub-national governments to contribute meaningfully to security initiatives. A situation where the federal government controls the bulk of national revenue, as in Nigeria, limits the ability of state and local governments to fund their security needs, thereby creating a dependency syndrome. Consequently, states may find themselves at the mercy of the federal government for security interventions, which

may not be timely or adequate. This fiscal imbalance undermines the spirit of intergovernmental collaboration and could escalate security vulnerabilities (Ekpo & Ndebbio, 1998).

The role of informal relations and political dynamics in shaping intergovernmental collaboration for security cannot be overemphasized. While formal institutions and legal frameworks provide the structure for IGR, informal networks and political alignment often determine its functionality. For instance, a state governor from the ruling party may enjoy better cooperation with federal security agencies compared to one from an opposition party. This politicization of intergovernmental relations introduces bias and may compromise the objectivity and effectiveness of security interventions (Suberu, 2001).

In the global context, the importance of intergovernmental relations in security management is further underscored by the increasing interdependence of modern societies. Issues such as human trafficking, drug smuggling, terrorism, and cybercrime transcend national boundaries and require not just intergovernmental but also intergovernmental and intersectoral cooperation. Countries like the United States have institutionalized IGR through homeland security councils, multi-agency task forces, and coordinated intelligence sharing systems. These mechanisms enable real-time information flow and coordinated responses, which are essential in preempting and combating security threats (Kettl, 2003).

Nevertheless, there are notable challenges facing IGR in security management, particularly in developing countries. These include bureaucratic red tape, lack of technical capacity at sub-national levels, inadequate funding, and poor data management systems. Additionally, there is often a lack of political will to institutionalize collaborative practices, leading to ad hoc and reactive security measures. Addressing these challenges requires comprehensive reforms, capacity-building programs, and the establishment of institutional frameworks that facilitate continuous and structured engagement among the various levels of government (Ezeani, 2004, Lamidi et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the evolution of intergovernmental relations in the digital age has opened new frontiers for security management. The use of digital platforms for surveillance, information sharing, and early warning systems enhances intergovernmental collaboration. However, it also requires significant investment in technology, training, and cybersecurity infrastructure.

Governments must therefore prioritize digital transformation as part of their IGR strategy for security (Akindele & Olaopa, 2002; Awe & Shiyanbade, 2026).

Thus, intergovernmental relations provide the structural and institutional backbone for collaborative governance in the area of security management. Through coordinated planning, joint implementation, and resource sharing, different levels of government can effectively address security challenges that no single tier can manage alone. However, the success of such collaboration depends on mutual trust, legal clarity, political will, and adequate resourcing. Strengthening intergovernmental relations should therefore be a top priority for countries seeking to improve their internal security architecture in an increasingly complex and interconnected world.

Security Management

Security management delivers comprehensive protection and resilience arrangements for diverse risks that safeguard human beings alongside their communities and nations, and their organisations. Security management comprised diverse actions and procedures that work to stop and limit security hazards and respond to emergencies (Gberinyer et al., 2022). Security management encompassed both physical and cyber security domains, together with threats created by terrorism and violent attacks, along with natural disasters, environmental threats, technological failures and crime hazards (Boustras & Waring, 2020). Risk assessment together with policy creation, resource allocation and infrastructure development along with training and capacity building and emergency preparedness, and incident response mechanisms comprised only a few of the many necessary integration points (Tagarev & Ratchev, 2020).

Security management integrates multiple interconnected parts for its operation. The essence of security management demands a robust system for risk management that focuses on detecting, assessing and ordering potential threats alongside vulnerabilities. Moving forward to implement appropriate security protocols as well as executing of procedures and policies aimed towards minimising all recognized risks. Physical security systems in Chithaluru and Prakash (2020) include the security of personnel alongside surveillance tools and entrance limitations. The present digital age demands equal importance on cybersecurity elements, which include firewalls and encryption technology, and incident response planning.

Oluwatobi (2019) observed that weak coordination and poor cooperation among different tiers of government significantly constrain effective security operations in Nigeria. This observation provides a useful basis for examining the effect of intergovernmental collaboration on security management in Oyo State. Empirical studies suggest that while collaboration among federal, state, and local governments is intended to enhance security outcomes, its actual impact remains mixed. For instance, Ojo et al. (2019) found that inadequate intergovernmental oversight contributed to corruption within the military, thereby weakening the effectiveness of security responses. In a similar vein, Shiyanbade et al. (2016) argued that the financial dependence of local governments on higher tiers reduces their operational capacity, limiting the overall effectiveness of collaborative security efforts. These findings imply that intergovernmental collaboration may not automatically translate into improved security outcomes without structural efficiency.

Security management needs qualified human resources from security guards to emergency responders and subject matter experts to function effectively, according to Damasevicius et al., (2023). Security management requires complete cooperation between stakeholders and their communities to implement a well-integrated approach. Despite its challenges, security management remains difficult to achieve, yet efficient. intergovernmental collaboration with security management faces restrictions from limited resources as well as dual authorities and conflicting priorities which exist between different governmental levels. Public security defends against a multitude of obstacles that develop from rapid threat changes, including cyber-attacks and international criminal networks, because public security demands continuous innovative adaptations. Security management methods need to develop direct solutions against current security challenges.

The development of strong intergovernmental partnerships requires open communication systems and combined decision-making structures, together with pooled financial assets (Javaid & Petrov, 2023). The combination of technology and data analytics enabled more effective performance of risk assessment functions while improving threat detection capabilities and incident response strategies. The protection against new security threats requires security personnel and stakeholders to participate in continuous training programs and capacity development initiatives. To achieve optimal security management, security professionals need to

maintain a critical balance between guarding public safety and safeguarding the rights of individuals, including civil liberties (Amoo et al., 2024; Shiyanbade et al., 2026).

Security management practices that want to be effective need to build three fundamental elements: accountability alongside transparency, followed by public trust. For Oyo State to effectively address its complex security problems, it needs a well-functioning government that cooperates with secure administration systems. Various governmental departments should team up with police organisations and community stakeholders to accomplish this goal effectively. Citizens' safety necessitates resource sharing combined with specialized vulnerability-targeted security strategies, which need capacity development for the state's protection requirements.

Dimension of Intergovernmental Collaboration

Intergovernmental collaboration, or IGR for short, are the complex network of collaboration connections, and interactions that run between the various governmental tiers in a political system. The complex nature of governance in contemporary societies is reflected in this diverse collaboration. Vertical Dimension describes how various levels of government, including the federal, state/provincial, and local ones, interact with one another. The mechanisms for coordination, cooperation, and conflict resolution are all included, as is the allocation of authority, responsibility, and resources among these levels. When power is shared between the federal government and sub-national governments, the vertical dimension becomes especially important (Adedeji, 2021).

The Horizontal Dimension: is concerned with the collaboration and exchanges that occur between governments that are at the same level as one another, such as local governments in a state or province or states or provinces within a federation. On matters of common interest or concern, it entails cooperation, coordination, and the management of interdependencies across jurisdictions, the finances, resource distribution, and revenue-sharing programs that control the transfer of funds amongst various governmental tiers are all included in the fiscal dimension. The distribution of fiscal responsibilities and resources, grants, tax sharing, and intergovernmental transfers are some of the topics covered. According to Gberinyer et al., (2022) The Policy Dimension: is concerned with how policies are developed, carried out, and coordinated at various governmental levels. The topics it covers include integrating policies, resolving policy conflicts

and overlaps, and harmonizing policies. In areas where different governmental levels have concurrent or shared jurisdiction, the policy dimension is especially significant.

Administrative Dimension: The administrative dimension addresses the day-to-day functioning of intergovernmental collaboration, encompassing the systems, procedures, and frameworks for intergovernmental cooperation, dialogue, and decision-making. It entails the creation of committees, councils, and other administrative structures at the intergovernmental level in order to promote cooperation, communication, and problem-solving (Adedeji, 2021)

Legal and Constitutional Dimension: This dimension includes the legal and constitutional frameworks that specify the authorities, obligations, and intergovernmental collaboration. It involves interpreting and putting into practice laws, court decisions, and constitutional provisions that influence intergovernmental collaboration.

Political Dimension: The political aspect acknowledges that intergovernmental collaboration is fundamentally political. Frequently impacted by political ideologies, interests, and party affiliations, it includes the dynamics of power-sharing, bargaining, negotiation, and the resolution of political conflicts or tensions among various levels of government. These characteristics, which represent the complexity of contemporary governance structures, are not mutually exclusive but rather entwined and interdependent. In order to promote cooperation, coordination, and the efficient management of interdependencies amongst various levels of government, effective intergovernmental collaboration require a comprehensive approach that takes into account and balances these various dimensions (Adedeji, 2021).

Resource Sharing and Capacity Building

Security management, together with intergovernmental collaboration (IGR) relies essentially on resource distribution as well as capacity development activities. Present-day complex security conditions require government entities to work cooperatively through sharing their mutual resources across different levels of authority since security threats naturally extend beyond jurisdictional limitations (Giedraityte, 2022). Security management within IGR heavily relies on resource sharing as its essential element. The efficient combination and distribution of monetary funding, together with human personnel and physical assets, must happen between different public entities to properly handle shared security matters (Shadare, 2022). The method

makes it clear that any governmental tier lacks all necessary tools to handle intricate security issues (Orhero, 2020).

Resource sharing operates as financial collaboration through mutual funding initiatives and grant programs that governments establish (Varghese & Panigrahi, 2023). The federal government finances state and local authorities to enhance their emergency preparedness system and counter terrorism and cybersecurity capabilities through financial support. String programs or cooperative efforts within their jurisdictions receive financial support from state and local governments (Kawi, 2021). Human resource sharing enables effective staff member allocation by moving qualified personnel between different government levels (Ubah & Ibrahim, 2021). The deployment of temporary emergency responders and intelligence analysts, together with law enforcement officers, occurs to assist with high-priority security operations and crises beyond local resource capacity (Toltica, 2023).

Material resources such as infrastructure, technology and equipment receive equal importance when it comes to their distribution and sharing among organisations. State and local agencies enhance security operations by employing federal databases and communication networks, and surveillance systems, according to Awotayo et al., (2023). Federal agencies benefit from state and local partner expertise and resources when they need to investigate incidents or carry out investigations (David, 2024). Resource sharing requires building capacity as it boosts the security abilities of separate government departments, which eventually enhances their combined operational capabilities. The process involves knowledge and best practice extractions between government levels to build preventive capacities that enable adequate threat recognition and response at both organisational and individual levels.

Uniform staff participation in joint training exercises with participants at different levels of the government serves as a typical capacity-building initiative (John, 2024). Partnerships between different agencies develop universal security guidelines as well as enhance the communication function and generate mutual agreement about security requirements. The concept of capacity building incorporates intelligence sharing with analytical abilities and situational awareness, as stated by Naseer et al., (2024). Security management receives thorough coordination

through information-sharing networks and fusion centers that let security professionals exchange threat assessments and vulnerability analysis along with actionable intelligence (Nguyen, 2021).

Establishing guidelines together with their distribution becomes an essential aspect of capacity building, according to (Poppe et al., 2021). Strategic security frameworks develop through gathering expertise from different government levels, which ensures jurisdiction-wide security programs maintain unity and consistency (Bello, 2023). Both resource optimization, IGR and security management capacity development, generate maximum resource utilisation and strengthen interagency teamwork (Ogbu et al., 2023). The collaborative strategy enhances country, state, and local security postures through enhanced resilience capabilities while decreasing security weaknesses (Aleyomi & Nwagwu, 2023).

Significant barriers exist to resource sharing and capacity building due to departmental competition for organisational ends, as well as legal barriers and distinct objectives of agencies (Cohen & Cohen, 2023). Achieving national and public safety outcomes that are greater than any one agency or jurisdiction will require strong leadership, clarity in governing frameworks, and a collective willingness to take the necessary actions (Paleri, 2022).

Overall, empirical studies indicate that intergovernmental collaboration has the potential to improve security management by facilitating the pooling of resources, expertise, and authority across different levels of government (Adanma & Ogunbiyi, 2024; Kosmider, 2021). It enhances coordination in law enforcement, emergency response, and intelligence sharing (Elkady et al., 2022; Li et al., 2024), while also supporting regional cooperation in addressing cross-border or inter-jurisdictional threats (Benavides, 2023). However, its effect on security management, particularly in contexts such as Oyo State, is often limited by institutional weaknesses, poor policy coordination, and inadequate resource allocation (Digitemie & Ekemezie, 2024; Kivimaa, 2022; Habib, 2023; Ikeayinebe et al., 2023; Willman, 2020). This suggests that although intergovernmental collaboration is a critical component of security governance, its effectiveness in improving security outcomes remains constrained, thereby necessitating further context-specific investigation in Oyo State.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored on the Collaborative Governance Theory advanced by Ansell and Gash (2008) in their seminar work titled “*Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice*”. The theory proceeds from the premise that complex public problems frequently exceed the capacity of any single institution or tier of government acting in isolation, and that their resolution therefore depends upon structured interaction, joint decision-making, trust, commitment, information sharing, resource pooling, and coordinated action among interdependent actors. Central to the theory is the assumption that governmental institutions and other relevant stakeholders possess distinct yet complementary resources, expertise, information, and capacities, such that their collaboration enhances collective problem-solving.

The theory further holds that the effectiveness of collaboration is conditioned by the quality of institutional arrangements, facilitative leadership, trust among participating actors, and the extent to which those actors are genuinely engaged in deliberation and decision-making. These propositions are especially pertinent to security management, whose challenges are complex and routinely transcend institutional and administrative boundaries. In Oyo State, where responsibility for security is distributed across multiple governmental and security institutions with potentially complementary mandates and capacities, effective security management cannot rest on the independent activities of individual agencies alone; rather, it demands functional relationships through which relevant actors communicate, share intelligence and resources, coordinate activities, and formulate collective responses to security threats (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

The assumptions of Collaborative Governance Theory align directly with the analytical thrust of this study, in which intergovernmental collaboration constitutes the explanatory variable and security management represents the outcome of interest. The theory furnishes a coherent basis for interrogating whether the quality and extent of collaboration among governmental and security actors contribute to improved security management in Oyo State, positing that effective information sharing, joint planning and decision-making, resource sharing, coordinated operations, trust, institutional support, and facilitative leadership collectively strengthen the capacity to manage security challenges.

Equally, the theory acknowledges that collaboration may be constrained by institutional rivalry, weak trust, poor communication, inadequate resources, ambiguous responsibilities, and ineffective coordination mechanisms. It therefore does not presume that the mere presence of multiple security institutions automatically yields effective outcomes; instead, it directs analytical attention to how these institutions interact and whether their collaborative processes translate into tangible security results. The adoption of this framework is thus justified on the ground that it offers a systematic lens for explaining how interdependence, institutional arrangements, stakeholder participation, and collaborative processes shape the effectiveness of intergovernmental security management in Oyo State

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design complemented with an ex-post facto approach, allowing the researcher to examine existing conditions without manipulating the independent variables. The study was conducted in Oyo State, Southwestern Nigeria, covering selected urban areas across four Local Government Areas-Ogbomoso North, Oyo West, and Ibadan South-West drawn from the three senatorial districts to ensure equal representation. The study targeted population comprised of 1,459 personnel drawn from key security and community-based institutions, including the Nigeria Police Force (862), Civil Defence (513), Amotekun Corps (275), and Community Development Associations (191), particularly those involved in inter-agency collaboration and security-related functions. The sample size of 385 respondents was determined using the Taro Yamane formula, after which a multi-stage sampling procedure was employed. This involved stratified sampling based on senatorial districts and simple random sampling for the selection of communities and respondents, ensuring adequate representation across the study area.

Data for the study were obtained through primary and secondary sources. The primary data were questionnaire and interview, while secondary data were sourced from textbooks, journals, reports, and other relevant documents. Interviews were conducted with key officials, including Divisional Police Officers, NSCDC heads, Amotekun commanders, and community representatives, to provide deeper insights into intergovernmental collaboration and security management. Also, the study formulates research hypothesis which is H_0 : intergovernmental

collaboration has no significant effect on security management, while the H_1 : intergovernmental collaboration has significant effect on security management. Data collected were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical tools, such as percentages, mean, standard deviation, and regression analysis, to establish relationships and draw conclusions on the effect of intergovernmental collaboration on security management in Oyo State.

DATA ANALYSIS

The section elaborated on an in-depth analysis of security data pertaining to Oyo State intergovernmental partnerships. The statistical evaluation regarding sampled respondent distribution for stated variables appears in the table below

Many individuals who took part in the study deemed the combined funding of security infrastructure between federal and state agencies, to be ineffective at boosting deployment operations. Among the surveyed group, 23.8% showed strong disagreement with low security infrastructure deployment, while 48.0% more added to the total of 71.8% who shared this view. Security funding has received approval from 32 respondents (11.6%) who agreed and 28 respondents (10.1%) who strongly agreed that it improved infrastructure. A small percentage, 18(6.5%), remained undecided. The general sentiment is negative as provisioning of joint security funds shows insufficient effectiveness for sustaining infrastructure development according to the 1.36 mean value ($SD = 1.24$).

Most survey participants noted that development of quick response capabilities gains strength through better coordination among different governing bodies. The majority of police officers, 100(36.1%) combined with 117(42.2%), altogether comprised 217(78.3%) who noticed enhanced rapid response capabilities. Nevertheless, skepticism dominated the responses with 22 respondents (7.9%) strongly against and 24 respondents (8.7%), though disagreement existed, and 14 participants (5.1%) felt undecided. Results show a positive perception about coordination efforts where 2.96 ($SD = 1.24$) captures respondents' opinions although they differ slightly.

The data established that intelligence-gathering networks experienced enhancements

because of combined state and federal cooperation. An agreement was reached by 208 subjects making up 75.0% of the sample because 50.5% of them agreed and 24.5% strongly agreed to this enhancement. Out of all responses 53(19.1%) maintained the strongest opposition followed by 13(4.7%) who disagreed. A small proportion, 3 (1.1%), remained undecided. A majority of respondents held favorable opinions towards intelligence-sharing mechanisms according to the mean score 2.57 (SD = 1.41).

Research indicated that most survey participants viewed operation collaborations between state and federal agencies as effective for police patrols. Most participants indicated their agreement with improved patrols due to joint security operations between state and federal agencies with 230(83.1%) respondents supporting the same view. However, 15(5.4%) strongly disagreed, and 28(10.1%) disagreed. A minimal 4(1.4%) remained undecided. Survey participant agreement about joint patrol effectiveness reaches a high level with a mean of 2.68 (SD = 0.92).

Research indicated that emergency responders believe federal-state coordination has had a negative influence on response times. Emergency response times showed no indication of improvement according to 178(64.3%) of the interviewed subjects who either strongly disagreed or disagreed about response time improvements. The majority of 56 respondents (20.7%) did not perceive emergency response improvement through cooperation. The remaining 71 participants (26.2%) were neutral on this issue during the survey. General dissatisfaction existed regarding response coordination according to results that showed a 1.53 (1.30) average rating.

The connection between state-local governments had a positive impact on strengthening community policing practices. A significant percentage totaling 155 respondents (55.9%), considered the utilisation of collaboration as effective based on their agreement and strong agreement. A total of 47 participants or 17.0% strongly disagreed with the notion. These findings revealed moderate concerns regarding the matter. An additional 22(7.9%) remained undecided. The score of 2.26 (SD = 1.43) shows that the population usually supports

community policing but exhibits blended feelings about it.

Most survey participants expressed positive views about how intergovernmental security committees contribute to better strategic planning, since 80 (28.9%) respondents agreed, while another 97 (35.0%) strongly agreed, which amounted to 177 (63.9%) of the total respondents supporting strategic growth. A majority of 50 participants (18.1%) strongly disagreed with the impact of intergovernmental security committees, along with 34 (12.3%) who disagreed but an additional 16 (5.8%) stood undecided. The survey data revealed a positive general approval of strategic planning effectiveness though the scores from participants were slightly divided.

The output of the data indicated that security operations between the federal and state government was perceived as generally effective in increasing crime prevention. Specifically, 110 (39.7%) of the respondents indicated agreement, and 70 (25.3%) indicated strong agreement, demonstrating that joint operation efforts at the intervention level were found to be positive in their contribution. 48 (17.3%) strongly disagreed, 29 (10.5%) and disputed the effectiveness of that effort, and 20 (7.2%) indicated uncertainty regarding the joint operation partnership efforts. The mean of 2.45 (SD = 1.42) is indicative of overall approval of intergovernmental efforts at the operational/implementation level in relation to crime response

Table 1: Effects of Intergovernmental Collaboration on Security (N = 277)

Item	Response	F	%	$\bar{x}$	Σ
Joint federal-state security funding has improved security infrastructure deployment	Strongly Disagree	66	23.8	1.36	1.24
	Disagree	133	48.0		
	Undecided	18	6.5		
	Agree	32	11.6		
	Strongly Agree	28	10.1		
Coordination between state and federal security agencies has enhanced rapid response capability	Strongly Disagree	22	7.9	2.96	1.24
	Disagree	24	8.7		
	Undecided	14	5.1		

	Agree	100	36.1		
	Strongly Agree	117	46.2		
	Strongly Disagree	53	19.1	2.57	1.41
State-federal collaboration has	Disagree	13	4.7		
improved intelligence gathering	Undecided	3	1.1		
networks	Agree	140	50.5		
	Strongly Agree	68	24.5		
Joint security operations between	Strongly Disagree	15	5.4	2.68	0.92
state and federal agencies have	Disagree	28	10.1		
increased patrol effectiveness	Undecided	4	1.4		
	Agree	216	78.0		
	Strongly Agree	14	5.1		
Federal-state security coordination	Strongly Disagree	54	19.5	1.53	1.30
has improved emergency response	Disagree	124	44.8		
times	Undecided	41	14.8		
	Agree	14	5.1		
	Strongly Agree	44	15.9		
	Strongly Disagree	47	17.0	2.26	1.43
State-local government security	Disagree	53	19.1		
collaboration has strengthened	Undecided	22	7.9		
community policing	Agree	92	33.2		
	Strongly Agree	63	22.7		
	Strongly Disagree	50	18.1	2.50	1.51
Intergovernmental security	Disagree	34	12.3		
committees have improved	Undecided	16	5.8		
strategic planning	Agree	80	28.9		
	Strongly Agree	97	35.0		

	Strongly Disagree	48	17.3		
Joint federal-state security	Disagree	29	10.5	.45	.42
operations have enhanced crime	Undecided	20	7.2		
prevention protocols	Agree	110	39.7		
	Strongly Agree	70	25.3		

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Hypothesis Testing

There is no significant effect of intergovernmental collaboration on security management in the study area

Table 2: Linear Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient	t-stat	P-value
Constant	33.455	25.861	.000
Civil Registration and Vital Statistics	-0.757	-11.939	.000
Adjusted R Squared		0.339	
F-stat		142.534	
Sig		.000 ^b	

a. Dependent Variable: Security Management (SM)

Source: Field Survey, 2025

This segment presented statistical verification about security management effectiveness potential from intergovernmental partnership initiatives. The research tested the assumption that no relationship exists between intergovernmental and security management. A linear regression analysis using SPSS 26 informed about the effects which independent variable (intergovernmental collaboration) produced on dependent variable (security management). The independent variable of intergovernmental collaboration was formatted using the calculable aspects of seven categorical measurements for collaborative mechanisms in the SPSS. Security management was defined

through seven individual items in the research design. The research used a 95% level of statistical significance.

An increase of one unit in intergovernmental relation collaboration leads to a -7.57% negative impact on security management throughout according to Table 2 with $t = -11.94$ and $\beta = -0.757$. The intensity of the challenges demonstrated their negative impact on intergovernmental security cooperation which indicates that the present method of collaboration failed to unite effectively leading to decreased security management performance. The model enabled significant prediction between the independent variables and the dependent variables according to $F(1, 275) = 142.534$ which showed statistical significance

at $p < 0.05$. The state government provides support to federal agencies, but without proper administrative and financial backing, these efforts struggle to be effective. At the local level, security groups seem to work closely with the state government, but some respondents question whether this coordination is as strong as it appears (Digitemie & Ekemezie, 2024). There are also concerns about how security funds meant for joint operations are handled, with many believing that mismanagement and poor allocation hinder efficiency.

Notably, joint operations have improved patrol effectiveness, ensured broader coverage of crime-prone areas and increased deterrence. However, emergency response times remain a significant concern, suggesting gaps in logistical support, resource allocation, or bureaucratic bottlenecks that hinder swift mobilization during crises. Addressing these shortcomings may require additional investments in dispatch technology, streamlined communication channels, and a review of operational protocols.

Community policing has seen notable reinforcement through state-local cooperation, particularly in fostering trust between law enforcement agencies and residents. This collaboration has led to enhanced intelligence gathering at the grassroots level, facilitating preemptive crime detection. However, full implementation remains elusive, as highlighted by the majority of respondents. This suggests that while policy frameworks may support community policing, practical challenges such as inadequate training, lack of sustained funding, and resistance from traditional law enforcement structures continue to impede its full integration into the broader security architecture.

The role of intergovernmental committees in strategic planning was recognized by respondents, with many acknowledging their contributions to high-level policy coordination. However, opinions on their effectiveness remain divided. Some view these committees as crucial platforms for fostering dialogue and alignment between different levels of government, while others criticize them for bureaucratic inefficiencies, slow decision-making, and a lack of tangible outcomes. To maximize their impact, there may be a need to refine their mandates, improve accountability mechanisms, and ensure that their recommendations translate into actionable policies.

Despite these challenges, state-federal partnerships are widely regarded as pivotal for crime prevention, underscoring the potential of collaborative efforts in addressing security threats. These partnerships can leverage federal resources, expertise, and intelligence networks while incorporating state and local insights for a more nuanced, community-responsive approach to security. Strengthening such partnerships may involve policy reforms that delineate clear roles and responsibilities, as well as mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of joint security initiatives over time.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the dynamics of intergovernmental collaboration in the management of security in Oyo State, revealing both the strengths and challenges inherent in the current framework. It is evident that effective security governance requires the coordinated efforts of federal, state, and local governments, as well as relevant security agencies. While Oyo State has made significant strides in fostering cooperation through joint task forces and information-sharing mechanisms, issues such as overlapping responsibilities, political interference, and resource limitations continue to hinder optimal performance.

To strengthen security management, there is a need for clearer institutional roles, improved funding, capacity-building, and sustained political will across all levels of government. Enhanced collaboration, based on mutual trust and shared objectives, remains central to addressing the complex security challenges facing the state. Ultimately, the success of intergovernmental

collaboration in Oyo State will depend on consistent policy implementation, legal reform, and the active involvement of local communities in the security architecture.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings of the study, the following actionable policy are proposed to enhance security management in Oyo State:

- i. the state government should create new reform or if any, existing or Joint Security Operations Task Force that adequately represent federal, state, and local security formations to improve collaborative intelligence-sharing for effective security management;
- ii. the state should develop foundational-based centralised security database accessible to security agencies across all levels of government to improve intelligence-based decision-making in security management;
- iii. there is need for the establishment of State-Federal Security Council to meet regularly for review of security policies, jurisdictional conflicts, and ensure compliance with security mandates, this will bridge the friction that often happen when security issues require both the state and the federal governments;
- iv. a comprehensive legal framework on intergovernmental security matters should be enacted to specify the roles and responsibilities of each government level, reducing conflicts of over-lapping of jurisdiction and resource allocation;
- v. the local government security committees should be strengthened by providing clear mandates and needed resources scale-up their role in security management so that accountability in spending for joint security initiatives will be achieved;
- vi. the government should build a digitally informed workflow system for collaborative security communication reducing delays in decision-making and response in order to design resolution mechanisms for conflict of interest that might occur as a result of jurisdictional overlap in intergovernmental arrangement for security management; and
- vii. there need to strengthen community policing initiatives to integrate local security efforts into broader state and federal security strategies.

REFERENCE

- Adedeji, A. (2021). Intergovernmental collaboration and the birthing of Collaborative Governance in Nigeria. *Contemporary Journal of Politics and Administration*, 1(2). 20-36.
- Akindele, S. T., & Olaopa, O. R. (2002). The theory and practice of inter-governmental relations in Nigeria: An overview. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 6(5), 117–125.
- Aleyomi, M. B. & Nwagwu, R. C. (2023). Strategic model for Nigeria's security and socioeconomic development. *African identities*, 21(1), 66-86.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Awe, A. P. & Shiyanbade, B. W. (2026). Effectiveness of community policing in the management of farmers-herders conflict in Oyo South Senatorial District, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 13(1), 158-174.
- Damaševičius, R., Bacanin, N., & Misra, S. (2023). From sensors to safety: Internet of Emergency Services (IoES) for emergency response and disaster management. *Journal of Sensor and Actuator Networks*, 12(3), 41.
- Digitemie, W. N., & Ekemezie, I. O. (2024). Assessing the role of climate finance in supporting developing nations: a comprehensive review. *Finance & Accounting Research Journal*, 6(3), 408-420.
- Ekpo, A. H., & Ndebbio, J. E. U. (1998). Fiscal operations in a depressed economy: Nigeria, 1960–1990. *AERC Research Paper 67*. African Economic Research Consortium.
- Eleje, J. N. (2020). Intergovernmental fiscal collaboration and effective Local Government. Sustainable Urbanisation in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance & Law*.
- Ezeani, E. O. (2004). *Local government administration*. Zik-Chuks Publishers.
- Fatile, J. O., & Adejuwon, K. D. (2010). Inter-governmental relations in a federal state: The Nigerian experience. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 2(7), 123–132.
- Fischer, M., Hollway, J. Jager, N. W., & Montfort, S. (2023). Design paths of federal intergovernmental cooperation. *Policy Studies Journal*, 51(4), 773-792.
- Gberinyer, J. T. Okoro, I. & Adishi, E. (2022). An evaluation of relevance of criminal intelligence management and implications for security and public safety in Benue State, Nigeria. *Journal of Advocacy and Legal Services*, 4(1), 91-122.

- Ikeanyibe, O., Olise, C., Abdulrouf, I., & Emeh, I. (2020). Interagency collaboration and the management of counter-insurgency campaigns against Boko Haram in Nigeria. *Security Journal*, 33, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-020-00237-3>
- Javaid, S. & Petrov, E. (2023). Interregional cooperation and connectivity. Lessons from transnational initiatives. *Journal of Regional Connectivity and Development*, 2(2), 248-259.
- John, M. M. (2024). Training civil society in nonviolent action: evidence from South Sudan. In the Elgar Companion to War, *Conflict and Peacebuilding in Africa* (pp. 120-138).
- Kawi, A. L. (2021). Impact of state/local government joint account on the performance of selected local government councils in Borno State. *International Academy Journal of Management, Marketing and Entrepreneurial Studies*, 8(2), 39-69.
- Kettl, D. F. (2003). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for twenty-first century America*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Krane, D., & Wright, D. S. (2018). Intergovernmental collaboration. *In defining public administration* (pp. 83-101).
- Lamidi, K. O., Ojakorotu, V. & Shiyabade, B. W. (2023). Community members' perspectives on the farmer-herder crisis: a case study of Ibarapa north local government area of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Acta Criminologica: African Journal of Criminology & Victimology*, 36(2), 50-66.
- Nnabuihe, O. E. Ashindorbe, K., & Odobo, S. O. (2023). Politics of security sector reform. violence and the emergence of regional security outfits in Nigeria. *African Studies Quarterly journal* 21(4). 3-20.
- Obisanya, A. R., Hassan, K. I., & Musa, P. O. (2021). Local Government and service delivery in Nigeria: A Study of Nsukka Local Government Area, (2007-2015). *IAA Journal Arts and Humanities*, 6(1), 48-64.
- Ogunna, A. E. C. (1996). *Handbook on local government in Nigeria*. Versatile Publishers.
- Okenyodo, O. (2016). *Governance, accountability, and security in Nigeria*. United Kingdom
- Olowu, D., & Wunsch, J. S. (2004). *Local governance in Africa: The challenges of democratic decentralization*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Orohero, A. E. (2020). Human security: the key to enduring national security in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, 470-484.

- Owoeye, D. I. Nduba, O. J. & Ezeanya, V. E. (2021). Nigerian Government responses to the menace of Boko Haram and Nigeria's status in the global Security rankings (2009-2019). *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research*, 60-72.
- Paki, F. A. E., & Rufus, A. (2023). The proliferation of armed vigilante groups in Nigeria: Tacit or official endorsement. *Journal of Global Social*
- Paleri, P. (2022). National Security: Definitions and Manifestations. In revisiting national Security: *prospecting Governance for human well-being* (pp. 109-153).
- Sawani, Y. M. (2023). Libya's Public Administration. Burdens of the past and challenges of transition in *Public Administration in the Middle East and North Africa* (pp. 134-174) *Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.58934/jgss.v4i15.204>
- Shadare, G. A. (2022). The governance of Nigeria's social protection. The Burdens of Developmental Welfarism. *Societies Journal*, 12(1), 20-38.
- Shiyanbade, B. W., Igbokwe, P. I., & Taiwo, M. O. (2025). Farmers–Herders Conflict in Nigeria: A Threat to Peacebuilding in Igangan and Igboora Areas of Oyo State, Southwestern Nigeria. In A. I. Adeniran et al., (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of (In)security and Transnational Crime in Africa* (85-99), Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Shiyanbade, B. W., Williams, O. M., Olukotun, A. E., & Ogundemurin, A. O. (2026). Community Policing and Crime Prevention in Lagos State, Nigeria. *AKSU Journal of Administration and Corporate Governance*, 6(1), 136-150.
- Suberu, R. T. (2001). *Federalism and ethnic conflict in Nigeria*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Suchi, P. M. & Wika, P. N. (2021). Cybercrime and Terrorism financing Nigeria's potential vulnerabilities and policy options. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social science*, 7(6), 20-37.
- Tagarev, T. & Ratchev, V. (2020). A taxonomy of crisis management functions. *Sustainability journal of social sciences*, 12(12), 5-23.
- Vabulas, F. & Snidal, D. (2021). Cooperation under autonomy building and analysing the informal Intergovernmental organisations data set. *Journal of Peace Research*, 58 (4), 859-869.
- Wright, D. S. (1988). *Understanding Intergovernmental*. States Institute of Peace.
- Yagboyaju, D. A., & Akinola, A. O. (2019). Nigerian state and the crisis of governance: A critical exposition. *Sage Open*, 9(3), 2158244019865810.