

PRINCIPALS' APPLICATION OF SECURITY MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN CROSS RIVER STATE

Charles Ekpung Akata, PhD¹ & Dr. Duezeh, Emmanuel Afamefuna, PhD, FCPA2

¹Empirical Studies and Communication Development [A Research Center]

Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria, Email: charlesakata1975@gmail.com

²Department of Public Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka Anambra State
Nigeria, Email: duemmak@yahoo.com

Article Information	ABSTRACT
Received: 13th August, 2024 Accepted: 23rd September, 2024 Published: 6th November 2024 KEYWORDS: Funding, Management, Public Secondary Schools Publisher: Empirical Studies and Communication - (A Research Center) Website: www.cescd.com.ng Journal URL: https://ijois.com/index.php/ijoisjournal	<i>This study examined impact of principals' application of security management practices for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State Nigeria. Two objectives were formulated for the purpose of this study. Also, two research questions were raised and answered while four null hypotheses were generated and tested at 0.05 significance level. Literatures were reviewed according to the variables in the objectives of the study. Descriptive survey design research was employed in the analysis. The population of the study was the 293 principals of the 293 public secondary schools in Cross River State. No sampling was done as the entire population was manageable enough to be used. Data for the study were collected through a self-structured questionnaire titled "Principals Security Management Practices Questionnaire (PSMPQ)". Pilot study was conducted in four schools and the Cronbach Alpha was used to determine a reliability coefficient index of 0.73. The data collected were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and t- test. The mean value was used to answer the research questions while the standard deviation was used to ascertain the homogeneity or otherwise of respondents' ratings. Based on the findings of the study, the following it was recommended that Secondary school principals should be encouraged to maintain the application of security management procedures in their schools so as to curb cult and criminal activities. The State government through the State Ministry of Education should ensure the provision of physical security management infrastructures and tools for secondary school safety.</i>

Introduction

The need to provide a safe school for teachers, students and all stakeholders in the school system cannot be overemphasized. This is because of the importance of the school as an agent of education and reformation. According to Burton (2018), a school can generally be seen as a means to develop and strengthen individuals with pro-social attitudes and as a place where individuals are prepared for the part they are going to play in society. In the same vein, Van-Jaarsveld (2019) defined schools as the institutions where individuals go to learn, develop and get an education in order to prepare them for their futures. In Nigeria, formal schooling is carried out in three levels namely; basic (which includes primary schools and junior secondary1-3), senior secondary and tertiary levels of education.

Secondary school education is the phase of education students receive after primary school and before the tertiary education. Apart from serving as the link between primary and tertiary education, it provides opportunity for a child to acquire additional knowledge, skills and traits beyond the primary level. Yusuf (2019) opined that the aim of secondary education is to develop in a child better literacy, numeracy and communication skills. In other words, the broad goals of secondary education aimed at preparing people for useful living in the society and for higher education have made it imperative that it should, among others, supply trained manpower in the applied science, technology and commerce at sub-professional levels. However, it appears that the insecurity and unsafe school environment is a problem to achieving the above aims of secondary education.

Lack of respect for the authority of teachers and others in disciplinary acts threatens the teachers and the rights of other students and generally affects the quality of secondary school education in Nigeria (Ike, 2015). This is because teachers are disrespected and abused by both the parents and students in the school and in some cases the principal do not provide protection for their teachers. Increasingly, students are victimized in schools by fellow students, teachers, cultists and kidnappers. This is further enunciated by the plethora of school violence in some parts of Cross River State. However, security threats in secondary schools include bullying, cultism, exploitation of students by teaching staff and kidnapping. These threats portend a big challenge to the development of secondary education in Nigeria (Ike, 2019). Furthermore, issues concerning school safety and security are not limited to violence in the school. Ajayi (2017) explained that there are other security threatening issues that secondary schools face. Ajayi noted that the past decades have witnessed numerous tragic events in all part of the world.

Security is defined as the degree of protection against danger, damage, loss and crime. In the views of Van Jaarsveld (2019), security is a form of protection where a separation is created between the assets and the threat. Thus, security is the precaution taken to safeguard an environment from impending danger or injury. On the other hand, school security is the establishment and maintenance of protective measures that ensure a state of inviolability from hostile act or influences (Mentiki, 2018). This is to say that security measures are to be reinforced to keep students, teachers, other workers and the environment free from harm and danger. Creating and maintaining secure environment needs clear understanding and management by all students, teachers and non-teaching staff. School security management practice is a combination of strategies and procedures required to co-ordinate the diverse activities of the institution in order to achieve safety (Van Jaarsveld, 2019). Hence, security management can be defined as the plan for the protection that is given to the stakeholders (learners, educators and managers) within the school from crime and accidents by means of well-drawn policies which should be well managed (Trump, 2018). In the context of this

study, school security management involves measures and procedures put in place to ensure the safety of lives and facilities.

Procedures are vital part of security system in any institution. It sets guidelines and provides direction as to how situations should be effectively managed and handled (Rogers & Schoeman, 2019). The policy clearly states what the authorities of the various members of the school community as well as their limitations or restrictions are. Policies are the goals and objectives the school is set to achieve and, therefore, assist with the decision-making. Procedures are the “guidelines” that inform everybody how the objectives in the policy should be carried out and provide instructions on the conduct of security activities. Procedures also involve the development and implementation of efficient measures to deal with those security/risk problems. In support, Rogers and Schoeman (2019) stated that a security risk analysis is conducted to identify vulnerable assets and security weaknesses. It is a process used to calculate the probability (likelihood) of security risks actually occurring and the impact that these risks would have should they occur. When security procedures are in place, it then provides a platform on which physical security measures are put in place to curb security threats in these schools.

Physical security management practices are implemented in schools to ensure the safety of lives and property. When physical security practices are correctly and effectively implemented by a school principal, maximum protection will be guaranteed. Physical security measures can be divided into three categories consisting of the outside perimeter measures, inner middle perimeter measures and the internal measures (Kole & Lombaard, 2018). The outside perimeter measures are found outside of the school building normally the perimeter (first line of defense) of the premises such as signs, fences and other barriers (barricades), lighting, alarms and patrols. The inner middle ring (inside) are the security measures used within the boundaries of the facility and can include fences and other barriers (walls), alarms, lighting (often with motion detecting capabilities), Close Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras, warning signs, doors, locks, burglar proofing on windows, security staff and access control systems. Lastly, the internal physical security measures are found within buildings and include alarms, CCTV cameras, turnstiles, windows and door bars, locks, safes, vaults, protective lighting and other barriers such as security gate across a passage (Lombaard & Kole, 2018). These physical security tools are very essential to maintaining security in the school.

Furthermore, Haruna (2018) posited that where the school climate is not positive, there will be many threats which will adversely affect the academic work of the school. Amanchukwu (2018) opined that demographic factors such as locations of schools and gender of the principal can give rise to many threats to the school community. According to Nyakundi (2018), school location impinges on school safety; schools located at the heart of the cities are more prone to violence than schools in isolated areas. According to Nyakundi, the reason for this is that the endemic crimes and crises in the cities will always spill into the schools. In another vein, Mastisa (2019) suggested that principals in urban schools will be faced with greater security threats than those in the rural area. This agreed with Khoury, Astor and Zena (2015) who observed that the location of a school can give rise to many threats to the school community.

Overall, gender plays important role in the way principals administer and manage security in their schools (Mastisa, 2019). Gender analysis recognizes that the realities of men's and women's lives are different, and that equal opportunities do not necessarily mean equal results. Oyoyo (2018) opined that gender can influence principals' decision-making capacity with regards to school management. However, these views have not been empirically proven

to be the case among secondary school principals in Cross River State and thus require to be investigated.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite the importance of school safety, there seems to be an upsurge of violence arising quite rapidly in schools. It seems that a new wave of mayhem in society has not spared the secondary schools. It is expected that secondary school principals and members of the school management should be at alert all the time to prevent occurrence of acts of hooliganism to avoid blames for professional negligence. In some schools, students resort to senseless destruction, burning, maiming, raping or even killing those they think are harsh on them (Ojo, 2016 & Usman, 2016). Ojo reported that some students go to school with jack knives, battle axes and even locally made guns to threaten and bully fellow students. These problems not only endanger students and teachers but they also prevent teachers from concentrating on teaching and students from concentrating on learning.

There has also been an increased influx of cult groups into secondary schools in Nigeria including Cross River State resulting to high security threats. This unfortunate situation has increased the call for adoption of security management measures which may curb the menace of insecurity and make secondary schools safe for teaching and learning. Security management practices like school security management procedures, and physical security management practices have been proffered as effective in curbing school security threats. However, the level of adoption of these security management practices by secondary school principals' in Cross River State is not clearly known. Thus, what are the practices applied by principals in Cross River State to protect members of the school community from security threats?

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to determine the extent of principals' application of security management practices for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State. Specifically, the study determined:

1. The extent of principals' application of school security management procedures for effective administration of public secondary schools in Cross River State
2. The extent of principals' application of physical security management for effective administration of public secondary schools in Cross River State

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent do principals apply school security management procedures for effective administration of public secondary schools in Cross River State?
2. To what extent do principals apply physical security management practices for effective administration of public secondary schools in Cross River State?

1.5 Hypotheses

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

1. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals of rural and urban secondary schools in Cross River State on the extent they apply school security management procedures for effective school administration.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female principals of secondary schools in Cross River State on the extent they apply school security management procedures for effective school administration.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals of rural and urban secondary schools in Cross River State on the extent they apply physical security management practices for effective school administration.
4. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female principals of secondary schools in Cross River State on the extent they apply physical security management practices for effective school administration.

1.6 Significance and Scope of the Study

The result of this study would be of benefit to principals, secondary school staff and students, parents and guardians, the Ministry of Education, future researchers, authors and publishers. Through the findings of this study, the above-mentioned individuals will be aware of their roles to ensure that the link between security and opportunity for academic success is known to the community through the Parent Teachers Association meetings, School Based Management Committee meetings and during graduation and prize giving day celebrations among others.

The study determined the extent of principals' application of security management practices for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State. The content scope is delimited to school security management procedures, physical security management practices, human security management practices and technological security management practices. The opinion of public secondary school principals was used as source for data collection. This is because the principals are the chief executive officers in charge of the daily administration of secondary schools. Moderating variables are delimited to location and gender.

2. Literature Review

A principal can be defined as the head of an educational institution. According to Udalla (2012), a principal can be viewed as the chief executive officer of the school and the key person in ensuring that the students receive quality school experiences. In the same vein, Abdulrasheed and Bello (2015) defined a Principal as a leader is also the liaison officer that mediates between the school and the society. Obi in Udalla (2012) defined the principal as an administrator who is in charge of overseeing the affairs of the student, staff, community-school relationship, instructional practices, and school finance as well as school plant. A principal is the chief executive officer of the school, chief accounting officer of the school, and head of the school in charge of daily administration of the school.

Security is the state of being free from danger or threats; freedom from doubt, anxiety or fear. Security in the school system is the process used to attain tolerable levels of risk in the school environment and safety refers to a long- lasting security programme that is well administered. Ike (2015) viewed security as something that gives or assures safety. According to Rogers (2019), security can broadly be defined as a means of providing effective levels of protection against pure risk. It is a process used to create a relatively crime free area. The aim of security

is to assess the vulnerability to risk and thereafter to employ techniques and measures in order to reduce that vulnerability to reasonable level. Security will therefore assist in creating a stable, fairly predictable environment in which individuals may move freely with reduced or without any disturbance or injury (Kole & Lambaard, 2018).

However, management is a vital function of school administration. The school principal has to plan, organize, direct, control and evaluate the staff and the material resources to achieve the objective of the school (Obegbulem, 2015). Ike (2015) defines management as the social or international process involving a sequence of coordinated events such as planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling in order to use available resources to achieve desired outcome in the fastest and most efficient way. School security management practices involve the mobilization and utilization of material resources to attain educational goals. School management is the identification of the school objectives, mobilizing the teachers, or academic staff, students and material resources such as funds, equipment and facilities in the school to achieve the goal of teaching and learning (Ike, 2015). It is the process of creating a supportive environment by deciding in advance on how to secure the school, how to do it and who is to do it. This includes maintaining, comparing and correcting towards achieving the school goal (Odufowowu, 2015). Public secondary schools are managed by a principal and vice principal. The principal as the manager is responsible for the general oversight of hiring of staff, students and building. The school principal has various management functions.

Thus, security management can be defined as measures taken by an organization or government to prevent espionage, sabotage, or attack. Security management can also be defined as measures adopted by a business or home owner to prevent crime, assault, and to prevent an escape (Picarell, 2018). Van Jaarsveld (2019) defined security management are a fundamental element that should be implemented in all schools in order to prevent and reduce school violence as much as possible. According to Rogers (2019), security management can broadly be defined as a means of providing effective levels of protection against pure risks. Security management is a process used to create a relatively crime-free area (Rogers, 2009). Dimsey (2018) viewed school security management as the process of creating conducive and proper internal environment in the school. According to Trump (2010), security management practices are strategies and procedures required to co-ordinate the diverse activities of the institution in order to achieve safety. Security management practices are a valuable and helpful resource to be used in the school environment in order to achieve safety in school.

Furthermore, in order to ensure a safe school, school security management procedures need to be in place at school. School security management procedures are a vital part of security system in any institution. It sets guidelines and provides direction as to how situations should be effectively managed and handled (Rogers & Schoeman, 2010). The policy clearly states what the authority of the various people are and what the limitations or restrictions of those individuals are at schools. Policies are the goals and objectives that the organization wants to achieve and therefore assist with the decision-making (Rogers & Schoeman, 2010). School safety policies and procedures are set in place to make schools safe and to have a course of action to take in the event of unsafe situations (Trump, 2010). Students, staff, as well as parents, should understand the policies and procedures that are meant to help schools maintain safety. Schools should therefore enact policies to ensure safe, protective and inclusive learning environments (Maritim, 2014). Thus, many schools use the principle of zero tolerance in their security safety disciplinary policies (Van Jaarsveld, 2011). These policies deal with problems relating to school safety and discipline and state that no violence, crime or any other unauthorized activities will be tolerated. Those who violate the policy will be punished.

Physical security management practices are that part of security that one is able to see. It is implemented as a security measure in order to ensure the safety of staff and property. When physical security measures are implemented in the correct and effective manner, it will ensure maximum protection. Van Jaarsveld (2019) stated that physical security only forms a part of a total integrated security system and should not be used on its own. According to Lombaard and Kole (2018), the purposes of physical security management practices are meant to:

- Deter an intruder from entering the premises. In other words to discourage them from entering and cause them to abandon (discard) their efforts to enter;
- Detect the attempted entry or presence if an intruder succeeds in penetrating (i.e. getting through) the physical security management barrier or measure in place;
- Limit the harm that can be done if an intruder manages to gain entry without being detected; and
- Detain the intruder by using silent alarm or alerting a security patrol (to respond).

There is a wide range of physical security practices that can be put into practice. They can be divided into three categories or so-called rings of security, consisting of the outside perimeter measures, inner middle perimeter measures and the internal measures (Lombaard & Kole, 2018). The outside perimeter measures are those measures that can be found outside of the school building normally the perimeter (first line of defense) of the premises such as signs, fences and other barriers (barricades), lighting, alarms and patrols (both humans on their own or accompanied by dogs) (Kole & Lombaard, 2018). The inner middle ring (inside) measures are the security measures used within the boundaries of the facility and can include fences and other barriers (walls), alarms, lighting (often with motion detecting capabilities), CCTV external cameras, warning signs, doors, locks, burglar proofing on windows, security staff and access control systems (Kole & Lombaard, 2018). Lastly there are the internal physical security measures which are the ones that can be found within buildings such as alarms, CCTV cameras, turnstiles, windows and door bars, locks, safes, vaults, protective lighting and other barriers (e.g. security gate across a passage).

In another vein, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) is the process whereby security is designed into the buildings. CPTED focuses on the physical opportunity that an offender will have to victimize damage and/or harm people, a building or its contents (Campbell, 2017). In this system, the safety and security of a built environment is improved by making use of natural methods, using the environment. When a building is being designed, the architect needs to identify what is being protected (people, information and/or property) and needs to also determine the types and levels of risks and threats. Only then will he/she be able to provide for safety, security and protection features in the design of a building or other built environment. According to Atlas (2018), CPTED can have a direct impact on reducing external (outside) threats by using natural access control, surveillance, territoriality boundary definition, management, and maintenance strategies. Natural access control can be achieved for instance by designing walkways, stairs or car park entrances to channel vehicles or people to one main entrance, or avoiding dark dead-end passages, or unlit areas in the design of a school complex, i.e. correct placement of overhead lighting. The internal threats on the other hand can be addressed through policies and procedures strategies and management methods rather than physical design (Atlas, 2018).

The physical environment of a school definitely has an effect on human behaviour. Certain elements in a physical environment assist with the safety of scholars, educators and objects at

schools (Lee & Talib, 2010). CPTED focuses on behaviour that is desired, therefore, the aim of CPTED is to reduce that desire to commit an offence and to make use of natural environmental elements to reduce crime and improve safety (Lee & Talib, 2010). It is ideal for all new schools to be designed with CPTED in mind. However, many of the schools that were designed in the past were not designed with this in mind. Yet, CPTED can still aid as a guide to safety practices in schools. The key elements of CPTED include:

- Natural surveillance: being able to keep an eye on the entire environment without taking special measures to do so;
- Natural access control: has the purpose of denying access to crime targets as well as to create a perception of risks to possible offenders (Atlas, 2018); and
- Territoriality: establish authority and control over the environment as well as creating a sense of belonging.

Furthermore, Lombaard and Koe (2018) stated that features within the school's physical environment can influence the chances of a crime(s) occurring. The physical environment may be used as a point of departure, aimed at encouraging school safety and security. If a school is well maintained and has a safe and secure physical environment, it would be more difficult for threatening incidents to occur. Offenders prefer to commit crimes that comprise of the lowest risks, require the least effort and offer the highest benefit (Campbell, 2017). Therefore, if the physical environment of a school is well secured and has the necessary security measures in place, crimes are less likely to occur. The security concept, "target hardening" can be used to describe this. Target hardening considerably reduces, deters or prevents crime against individuals or institutions (Hill & Hill in Van Jaarsveld, 2011). Moreover, a "hard target" is said to be a difficult target. Some target hardening strategies include the following:

- ☐ A clean, attractive school
- ☐ Analysis of crime patterns
- ☐ Staff needs to feel safe and secure
- ☐ Restricted access to the school
- ☐ Restrictions on scholar attire and possessions (Hill & Hill in Van Jaarsveld, 2019).

Clean, attractive schools: Clean, attractive schools tend to create a sense of pride to the scholars, educators, parents and the community. This produces attitudes and behaviour that are beneficial to the school as a whole, thus discouraging undesirable behaviour (Fozia & Sabir, 2016). If a school has broken windows, litter and/or deteriorating buildings, then it creates the idea that, this kind of behaviour and image is acceptable. More individuals will then leave litter lying around and graffiti will also be more likely to occur unrestricted or unsanctioned (Van Jaarsveld, 2019). The school will also then be perceived as being vulnerable, making crime on its premises that more likely to occur. It is therefore crucial that schools pay attention to their physical environment, and that security measures should be put in place in the school environment and its surrounding environs as a point of departure for safety and security within the schools.

Analysis of crime patterns: It is important for school principals to continually gather, analyse and evaluate all kinds of information. Such information may include attendance rates,

suspension and expulsion patterns, tardiness, graduation rates and crime patterns (includes incident management of acts not necessarily deemed criminal but do involve elements of violence or conflict). Schools should have a security plan in place of which an important aspect should be the collection and recording in a register, which can take the form of database incident management programme software lending itself to trend, modus operandi and spatial analysis of violent incidents. The database records should include the following:

- The date and time of the incident;
- The type of incident;
- Where (place) the incident took place (i.e. in the classroom or on the playground);
- Who was involved (i.e. staff, scholars, parents);
- A description of the incident (what happened and who witnessed it); and
- Actions taken (what did the school do).

An analysis of when and where criminal behaviour takes place on school grounds can provide and shape the response, measure or preventative action taken in order to reduce and/or eliminate the crime or violent act (Kole & Lombaard, 2018). In order for a school to analyze information, data must first be collected. There are various software packages that are available for use as well as different technologies that can capture data.

Information regarding the entry and exit of vehicles should be recorded and filed. Staff and scholars should also be given parking stickers for their cars or parking cards on which all the necessary information and identification and contact details appear. All the information about the car and owner should be filed for possible use later on if an incident occurs (Van Jaarsveld, 2019). Photographs and video surveillance (CCTV) material can also assist in providing valuable information. These can serve as evidence if an incident is captured as and when it occurs. This information may also later be used in court proceedings or by the principal to take further action against the perpetrator of the incident or violence. The location of where the violence occurred on the school grounds needs to be identified, and then attention can be focused on those areas (where repeat incidents occur, i.e. identification of problem areas ("hot spots")) in order to reduce or put an end to the violence. This can be achieved with proper crime pattern analysis (Trump, 2019).

Safety and security needs of staff members: If staff members feel safe and secure in the school environment then they will be able to teach the scholars to the best of their ability. Educators need to be reminded regularly about the safety and security procedures applicable in their school and need to be trained on crime/violence prevention behaviour and self-defense strategies (Kole & Lombaard, 2018). It is important for educators to be trained in the identification of behaviour that can be indicators of potential trouble-causing scholars or recognize any antisocial behaviour within scholars. Some antisocial behaviour and risk factors may include aggression, hostility, lying, stealing, inability to listen to authoritative figures, refuses to follow rules and a lack of self-control. This might assist with curbing the incidence of crime and/or violence that may occur as a result of the antisocial behaviour, particularly if nothing was done to help that scholar to deal with or cope with their behaviour. If educators are able to observe minor problems within a scholar and deal with them immediately, this might prevent a more serious crime/incident from occurring at a later stage.

Restricted access to schools: Entrance-and-exit access points to a school need to be minimized to reduce the chances of strangers entering the school grounds freely. Ideally there should only be one entrance/exit point to a school or a maximum of two access points. Alternately access points are only opened and entry supervised for limited periods during a day, for the rest they remain locked. This will make it easier for security guards to keep watch over who enters the school premises. Once the school has started, the gate should be locked and all latecomers and strangers will need to sign in to enter and will then be escorted to the principal's office by the security guard (Cowan, Pollitt, Rossen & Vaillancourt, 2019).

It is essential that access points and the windows are clear of any obstructions such as big shrubs, trees or signs. This is to enable personnel and security officers to be able to observe and see the movement of any persons on the school grounds or around the access points. It will also prevent strangers hiding away in big shrubs. Increased lighting can be used to highlight those blind spots and deserted areas, thereby also enhancing safety and security (Cowan, Pollitt, Rossen & Vaillancourt, 2019). All movement on the school premises needs to be controlled. At any time during the day the school needs to know who is on the school grounds (Rogers, 2019).

Restrictions on scholar attire and possessions: The restriction on clothing items may assist with identifying strangers on the premises. Expensive label clothing and jewelry have also been banned as it can increase theft (steal to have the same clothes as peers) and absenteeism as some scholars may feel they will not fit in if they do not own such expensive brand label items (Cowan, Pollitt, Rossen & Vaillancourt, 2019).

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the Chaos Theory.

2.2.1 Chaos Theory

Chaos Theory was propounded by Douglas Kiel in 1993. According to the theory, chaos is one possible result of the dynamics of nonlinear systems. Kiel explained that there are three fundamental methods for controlling chaos.

One of the methods is to alter the parameters of the system. Altering the parameter means limiting the degrees of freedom on the extent of the behaviour available to a system. A second method involves perturbations or disturbances during chaotic episodes to change behaviour back to more predictable and smoother functioning. The third method aims at altering the orbit of a chaotic system to a more desirable orbit on its attractor. This approach uses continuous tracking and seeks to identify changes in the system behaviour that occur over time. Public managers (including principals) work within an environment of considerable constraints. Budget constraints dictate levels of agency services and response. Many school administrators, despite being aware of the need for safety equipment in their schools are not able to provide these requirements because of financial constraints.

In this study, the school is a nonlinear system where issues of safety are characterized by uncertainty, unpredictability and thus the need for safety measures and preparedness for such eventualities. Chaos widens the spectrum of opinion and forces the organization to seek new points of view. The many incidents of insecurity in schools have increased the need for the adoption of security management practices that should be implemented in schools to enhance safety. In relation to this study, certain measures need to be put in place, so as to alter the behavior of learners and limit their freedom thus enhance stability in the school. The

measures that may be put in place include fencing of the school compound, inspection of students' lockers and wearing of school uniforms among others.

The relevance of this theory to the present study is that it emphasizes the need for workplace rules such as policies and work processes on safety. Safety policies are very important because they help to give direction on what should be done to mitigate and respond to a crisis in schools. Principals should know that any effective strategy must consider all relevant stakeholders impacted by the strategic plan. However, the chaos theory did not cover the influence of principals' personal characteristics and choice on their ability to adopt the security management practices in their schools. This necessitated the use of the rational choice theory as a theoretical support for the study.

2.3 Empirical Studies

Nyakundi (2012) assessed the implementation of safety standards and guidelines in public secondary schools in Marani District, Kisii County, Kenya. The objectives of the study were to establish the safety situation, outline the main causes of disasters, examine the constraints in the implementation of safety measures and explore major strategies put in place to prevent occurrence of disasters in public secondary schools in Marani District, Kenya. Five research questions guided the study. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The population was 28 public secondary schools in Marani District. Stratified, purposive and simple random sampling techniques were used to compose the sample of 49 teachers used for the study. Data was collected using questionnaire. Validity of the instrument was determined by conducting pilot study before the actual study. Reliability of the instrument was determined by use of test-retest method. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics like frequencies and percentages and the findings presented in charts, tables and graphs. Thematic analysis was used to analyse qualitative data. The major findings of the study were that the Ministry of Education (MOE) safety standards and guidelines had not been fully implemented majorly due to inadequate funds and supervision. The relationship between this study and the present study is that they both determined security practices in secondary schools with respect to school safety policies and procedures using the same design. However, both studies differ in certain aspects, while the reviewed study used teachers as the population of the study, the present study used principals who are more conversant with security issues as population of the study. Furthermore, while Nyakundi (2012) ascertained the validity of the instrument for data collection through pilot testing, the present study ascertained the validity of the instrument for data collection through experts. The reviewed study also used test-retest to determine the reliability of the instrument while the present study utilized Cronbach Alpha. In the analysis, Nyakundi used percentages to analyze data while the present study used mean and standard deviation. Also, the reviewed study did not use hypotheses while the present study formulated and tested hypotheses. The use of pilot testing in the reviewed study is abnormal and cannot be a source of instrument validity, also teachers are not more disposed to respond to questions on implementation of safety standards to guide lives than principals; the use of test-retest in determining the reliability of the instrument can only give internal stability to the instrument and not internal consistency.

Fozia and Sabir (2016) carried out a study to analyse different safety and security measures in both public and private schools at secondary level in Islamabad, Pakistan. Four research objectives guided the study. The study adopted the descriptive survey design. The population of the study comprised all the 100 heads of schools (50 from private and 50 from public schools) with 56 males and 44 females. Checklist for Comparative Analysis of Safety and Security Measures at Secondary level was used to collect the data. Data were analysed with means, percentage and independent sample t-test. The findings revealed that safety and

security measures such as flooring and lighting, number of furniture according to the number of users and stable portable equipment i.e. Television and Computers, and good practice of computers among students were used as security measures in both private and public school. Findings also revealed that both male and female heads as well as public and private schools heads had no significant mean differences regarding safety and security measures in use at secondary schools in Islamabad, Pakistan. The study is related to the present study because they both determined security management practices of principals of secondary schools. However, the reviewed study utilized Checklist for Comparative Analysis of Safety and Security Measures at Secondary level to collect the data, while the present study used structured questionnaire as instrument for data collection. The reviewed study comparatively analyzed different safety and security measures in both public and private schools at secondary level in Islamabad, while the present study determined the extent of principals' application of security management practices for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria.

Xaba (2006) conducted a study on the basic safety and security of school physical environment in the United States of America. The purpose of the study was to find out how the basic safety of the school environment affects the learners and the educators in the schools. Three research questions guided the study and two hypotheses were tested. The design of the study was descriptive survey. Simple random sampling technique was used to sample 69 teachers from secondary schools and 69 teachers from primary schools. The instruments for data collection were questionnaires. Mean and Standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the study revealed that most of the schools were collapsed and have cracked walls which form death traps to students and educators. It was also revealed that most schools have no safety policy plan and no internal services of the school facilities. The study is related to the present study because they both studied security practices in school. However, they differ in some areas, while the reviewed study determined basic safety and security of school physical environment in both primary and secondary schools; the present study determined the extent of principals' application of security management practices for effective administration of secondary schools. The reviewed study was carried out in the United States of America, while the present study was carried out in Cross River State, Nigeria.

3. Research Methodology

The research employed a descriptive survey design to investigate principals' application of security management practices in the administration of secondary schools in Cross River State. The study targeted all 293 public secondary school principals across the state's three education zones, as per data from the State Secondary Education Board. Given the manageable population size, no sampling was needed. Data were gathered using a custom-designed questionnaire titled "Principals Security Management Practices Questionnaire (PSMPQ)," which was validated by three experts in educational administration and measurement. The questionnaire consisted of two sections: Section A covered respondents' demographic details, while Section B, organized into two clusters, included 31 items on security practices rated on a 5-point Likert scale from Very High Extent (VHE) to Very Low Extent (VLE). Reliability testing using Cronbach Alpha coefficients on 10 non-sample principals in Akwa Ibom State yielded values from 0.70 to 0.75, with an overall reliability of 0.73, indicating adequate internal consistency. The researcher and six assistants distributed the questionnaire, achieving a 91% response rate with 238 completed forms returned. Data analysis involved mean and standard deviation calculations to address research questions,

with t-tests at a 0.05 significance level to test null hypotheses. Decision rules were based on the real limits of the rating scale, assessing the extent of principals' security management practices across the education zones.

4. Result, Analysis and Discussion of Data

4.1 Answers to Research Questions

Research Question 1

To what extent do principals apply security management procedures for effective administration of public secondary schools in Cross River State?

Table 1: Respondents mean ratings on their extent of application of school security management procedures for effective administration of public secondary schools

S/N	Security Management Procedures				Rural	Urban	Male	Female			
D	X	SD	D	X	SD	D	X	SD	D	X	SD
1.	Carrying out constant risk/threat assessment in and around the school premises for effective administration of public secondary schools.							2.22	0.41	LE	2.40
	0.50	LE	2.40	0.50	LE	2.33	0.47	LE			
2.	Instituting a threat assessment team which comprises of principals, guidance counsellors, mental health professionals and security, police, and fire personnel, as well as social service agencies for effective administration of public secondary schools.							2.22			
	0.41	LE	2.06	0.24	LE	2.25	0.44	LE	2.06	0.23	LE
3.	Having a specific process for screening students reported for threatening or violent behavior for effective administration of public secondary schools.							2.14	0.35	LE	
	2.13	0.33	LE	2.25	0.44	LE	2.06	0.23	LE		
4.	Having a code of conduct for all students in the school for effective administration of public secondary schools										
	2.22										
	0.41										
	LE										
	2.38										
	0.49										
	LE										
	2.48										
	0.50										
	LE										
	2.11										

0.32

LE

5. Having a clearly defined code of ethics for school staff for effective administration of public secondary schools

2.14

0.35

LE

2.00

0.50

LE

2.08

0.28

LE

2.06

0.53

LE

6. Instituting a clear security plan that is known by school staff for effective administration of

public secondary schools

2.14

0.52

LE

2.19

0.39

LE

2.25

0.60

LE

2.11

0.32

LE

7. Organizing constant training programmes for the school threat assessment team for effective administration of public secondary schools

2.14

0.65

LE

1.87

0.49

LE

1.83

0.69

LE

2.11

0.46

LE

8. Providing procedures for identifying and addressing mental health needs for effective administration of

public secondary schools.

2.22

0.56

LE

2.07

0.66

LE

2.08

0.28

LE

2.18

0.77

LE

9. Having a laid down procedure to track reports of worrisome behaviours over time in the school for effective administration of public Secondary schools

2.14

0.35

LE

2.13

0.33

LE

2.25

0.44

LE

2.06

0.23 LE

10. Providing an anonymous hotline to report threatening behaviour from students for effective administration of

public secondary schools.

2.14

0.35

LE

1.88

0.60

LE

2.08

0.28

LE

1.95

0.62

LE

11. Providing an anonymous hotline to report threatening behaviour from teachers for effective administration of

public secondary schools

2.00

0.54

LE

2.06

0.24

LE

1.92

0.50

LE

2.11

0.32

LE

12. Developing an “all hazards” emergency preparedness plan that covers natural disaster for effective administration of public secondary schools.

2.07

0.46

LE

2.00

0.42

LE

2.17

0.37

LE

1.94

0.23

LE

13. Developing an “all hazards” emergency preparedness plan that covers man-made threats for effective administration of public secondary schools.

2.21

0.41

LE

2.13

0.33

LE

2.17

0.37

LE

2.16

0.37

LE

14. Developing a clear ranking structure that defines the duties and responsibilities of all school members during crisis for effective administration of public secondary schools

2.42

0.50

LE

2.06

0.24

LE

2.17

0.37

LE

2.27

0.45

LE

15. Having a clearly specified procedures for checking and admitting visitors into the school premises for effective administration of public secondary schools

2.29

0.46

LE

2.00

0.24

LE

2.25

0.44

LE

2.06

0.23

LE

16 Instituting a crisis response team for school emergencies for effective administration of

public secondary schools.

2.14

0.35

LE

2.44

0.50

LE

2.48

0.50

LE

2.11

0.32

LE

17 Ensuring that students and staff are familiar with emergency evacuation drills including those for use at night, in case of

fire for effective administration of public secondary schools. 2.07 0.60 LE

2.06 0.24 LE 2.17 0.69 LE 2.00 0.24 LE

Grand Mean 2.17 0.45 LE 2.11 0.40 LE 2.32 0.45 LE

2.34 0.39 LE

Data in Table 1 reveal that the 17 listed security management procedures had mean ratings ranging between 1.83 to 2.48 according to gender and location of principals in secondary schools. This means that principals apply them for effective administration of public secondary schools at a low extent. The grand mean scores of 2.17 for principals in the rural area and 2.11 for principals in urban areas shows that public secondary school principals in Cross River State apply security procedures for effective administration of public secondary schools at a low extent. This is also consistent with the grand mean scores of 2.32 for male principals and 2.34 for female principals which show a low extent of application security management procedures for effective secondary school administration in Cross River State. Standard deviation scores for all the items are within the same range which shows that the respondents are not wide apart in their rating.

Research Question 2

To what extent do principals apply physical security management practices for effective administration of public secondary schools in Cross River State?

Table 2: Respondents mean rating on their extent of application of physical security management practices for effective administration of public secondary schools

S/ N	Physical Security Management Practices						Rural	Urban	Male	Female		
	X	SD	D	X	SD	D	X	SD	D	X	SD	
1.	Building fence round the school premises for effective administration of public secondary schools											
	3.42	0.83	ME	3.75	0.67	HE	3.50	0.77	HE			
	3.66	0.76	HE									
2.	Installing burglary bars on all windows in the school premises for effective administration of public secondary schools.											
	2.44	0.61	ME	2.44	0.61	LE						
	2.25	0.44	LE	2.43	0.41	LE						
3.	Installing iron doors in the classrooms for effective administration of public secondary schools											
	2.29	0.59	LE	2.25	0.67	LE	2.25	0.44	LE			
	2.39	0.59	LE									
4.	Providing for appropriate security lighting system in and around the school premises for effective administration of public											
	2.19	0.39	LE	2.40	0.53	LE	2.47	0.56	LE			
	2.00	0.48	LE									
5.	Ensuring that access points in the school are clear of any obstructions such as big shrubs, trees or signs for effective administration of											
		2.07	0.42	LE	2.18	0.53	LE	2.32	0.63	LE		
	2.41	0.68	LE									
6.	Providing a secure parking spot for visitors and staff for effective administration of											
		2.31	0.52	LE	2.76	0.54	ME	2.00	0.41	LE		
	2.06	0.41	LE									

7.	Limiting the entrance-and- exit access points to the school to one or at the most two for effective administration of public secondary schools.	2.07	0.26	LE	2.13	0.33	LE	2.08	0.28	LE	2.11	0.32	LE
8.	Ensuring that the school has a functional security gate for effective administration of public secondary schools.	2.95	0.62	ME	3.56	0.74	HE	3.65	0.69	HE	3.59	0.77	HE
9.	Ensuring that all areas and blocks in the school are adequately labeled with signs and instructions for effective administration of public secondary schools	2.38	0.35	LE	2.24	0.51	LE	2.42	0.57	LE	2.18	0.37	LE
10	Installing fire detection system in the school administrative block for effective administration of public secondary schools.	2.11	0.42	LE	2.08	0.43	LE	2.08	0.46	LE	2.40	0.62	LE
11	Installing fire detection system in the classrooms for effective administration of public secondary schools	2.27	0.54	LE	2.33	0.56	LE	2.10	0.50	LE	2.19	0.48	LE
12	Ensuring that the school's main office have a direct view of the front entrance and clearly marked as the main office for effective administration of public secondary schools.	1.58	0.34	LE	2.12	0.48	LE	2.19	0.43	LE	2.32	0.51	LE
13	11 Ensuring that parking lots, playgrounds, and fields near school building are easily observed and closely monitored for effective administration of public secondary schools.	2.31	0.41	LE	2.21	0.31	LE	2.20	0.58	LE	2.47	0.54	LE
14	Establishing safe areas in different sections of the school for effective administration of public secondary schools	2.17	0.67	LE	2.18	0.55	LE	2.21	0.49	LE	2.21	0.48	LE
		2.33	0.39	LE	2.43	0.44	LE	2.25	0.56	LE	2.10	0.63	LE
	Grand Mean	2.33	0.49	LE	2.47	0.53	LE	2.40	0.52	LE	2.43	0.54	LE

Data in Table 2 revealed that the respondents apply item 1 for effective administration of public secondary schools at a high extent with mean ratings of 3.75, 3.50 and 3.66 for principals in urban areas, male principals and female principals respectively. However, principals at the rural areas applied item 1 at a moderate extent with mean rating of 3.42. Principals in the urban area also applied item 6 at a moderate extent with mean rating of 2.76. They also applied item 8 to a high extent with mean ratings of 3.56, 3.65 and 3.59 for principals in urban areas, male principals and female principals respectively while principals at the rural areas applied item 8 at a moderate extent with mean rating of 2.75. They also apply 13 items with mean ratings ranging between 1.58 to 2.47. The grand mean scores of 2.33 for principals in the rural area and 2.47 for principals in urban areas shows that public secondary school principals in Cross River State apply physical security management practices for effective administration of public secondary schools at a low extent. Similarly, the grand mean scores of 2.40 for male principals and 2.43 for female principals also indicate that the extent of application physical security management practices for effective secondary

school administration in Cross River State at a low extent. Standard deviation scores for all the items are within the same range which shows that the respondents are not wide apart in their rating.

4.2 Testing the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals in rural and urban secondary schools in Cross River State on the extent they apply school security management procedures for effective school administration.

Table 3: t-test analysis on the Mean Ratings of Principals in Rural and Urban Secondary Schools on the extent they Apply School Security Management Procedures

Variable	N	Mean	SD	df	α	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision	
Rural Principals	122	2.17	0.45	236	0.05	0.67	1.96	Not Significant	
Urban Principals	116	2.11	0.40						

Data in Table 3 show that the calculated t-value of 0.067 at 236 degree of freedom and at 0.05 level of significance is less than the critical value of 1.96. This shows that the location of the respondents did not significantly affect their application of school security management procedures for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals in secondary schools in Cross River State on the extent they apply school security management procedures for effective school administration based on gender.

Table 4: t-test analysis on the Mean Ratings of Male and Female Principals in Secondary Schools on the Extent they Apply School Security Management Procedures

Variable	N	Mean	SD	df	α	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision	
Male Principals	86	2.32	0.45	236	0.05	0.54	1.96	Not Significant	
Female Principals	152	2.34	0.39						

Data in Table 4 show that the calculated t-value of 0.54 at 236 degree of freedom and at 0.05 level of significance is less than the critical t-value of 1.96. This shows that the gender of the respondents did not significantly affect their application of school security management procedures for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals in rural and urban secondary schools in Cross River state on the extent they apply physical security management practices for effective school administration.

Table 5: t-test analysis on the Mean Ratings of Principals in Rural and Urban Secondary Schools on the extent they Apply Physical Security Management Practices

Variable	N	Mean	SD	df	α	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision
Rural Principals	122	2.33	0.49	236	0.05	0.72	1.96	Not Significant
Urban Principals	116	2.47	0.53					

Data in Table 5 show that the calculated t-value of 0.72 at 236 degree of freedom and at 0.05 level of significance is less than the critical t-value of 1.96. This shows that the location of the respondents did not significantly affect their application of physical security management practices for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals in secondary schools in Cross River State on the extent they apply physical security management practices for effective school administration based on gender.

Table 6: t-test analysis on the Mean Ratings of Male and Female Principals in Secondary Schools on the extent they Apply Physical Security Management Practices

Variable	N	Mean	SD	df	α	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision
Male Principals	86	2.40	0.52	236	0.05	0.37	1.96	Not Significant
Female Principals	152	2.43	0.54					

Data in Table 6 show that the calculated t-value of 0.37 at 236 degree of freedom and at 0.05 level of significance is less than the critical value of 1.96. This shows that the gender of the respondents did not significantly affect their application of physical security management practices for effective administration of secondary schools in Cross River State. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

4.3 Discussion of the Findings

Application of School Security Management Procedures

Findings of the study indicated that principals of public secondary schools in Cross River State apply school security management procedures to a low extent. This might have resulted because there are no laid down security procedures for secondary schools in Cross River State. This impedes on the ability of the principal to make and apply security management procedures in their schools for effective administration. In another vein, some principals appear to be unaware of the need for having school security management procedures in their schools. Thus there lack of interest in applying security management procedures in their schools. Furthermore, the finding is in line with Nyakundi (2012) who found that public secondary schools do not adopt proper security procedures. According to Maritim (2014), safety procedures are formulated by the ministry and passed down to schools for application. However, Maritim noted that the ministerial guidelines are issued but are never implemented in many schools. Similarly, Ike (2015) also observed that despite the formulation of safety policies in some schools in Nigeria, it appears that the policies were not applied by the administrators in those schools. This situations result because funds might not have been

made readily available for school principals to implement the security management procedures in their schools.

The findings also revealed that the principals do not differ significantly in their mean ratings on their application of school security management procedures based on location. This shows that the location of the respondents did not significantly influence the extent of their application of school security management policies and procedures. This is also in line with the findings of Maritim (2014) who reported that principals of public secondary schools do not apply the safety guidelines and policies in their schools.

Furthermore, it was also revealed that male and female principals do not differ significantly in their mean ratings on the other six school security management procedures. This is also in agreement with Xaba (2016) who noted that school administrators irrespective of gender seldom apply security management policies and procedures in secondary schools in Africa. This might be because of lack of awareness of laid down school security procedures among the principals. It, therefore, becomes pertinent that a unified school security procedure should be mapped out by the state ministry of education or the post primary school service commission in collaboration with the school principals, parents, community vigilante groups and other stakeholders in education so as to ensure optimum safety in schools.

Application of Physical Security Management Practices in Secondary Schools

Findings of the study indicated that principals of public secondary schools in Cross River State apply physical security management practices to a low extent. This is in line with Van Jaarsveld (2011) who noted that public schools administrators have problems with maintaining adequate physical security in their schools. This finding in the researcher's view may have resulted as a result of poor support in the areas of funding and infrastructure provision by the government for secondary schools. In some of the secondary schools, the only form of physical security measure is fence which is in most cases dilapidated. According to Lombaard and Kole (2018), features within the school's physical environment can influence the chances of a crime(s) occurring. The physical environment may be used as a point of departure, aimed at encouraging school safety and security. If a school is well maintained and has a safe and secure physical security measures, it would be more difficult for threatening incidents to occur. Campbell (2017) further noted that offenders prefer to commit crimes that comprise of the lowest risks, require the least effort and offer the highest benefit. Therefore, if the physical environment of a school is well secured and has the necessary physical security measures in place, crimes are less likely to occur.

Furthermore, the findings also showed that principals do not differ significantly in their mean ratings on their application of physical security management practices based on location. This is in agreement with Lombaard and Kole (2018) who decried the low adoption of physical security management practices in schools. In another vein, principals do not differ significantly in their mean ratings on physical security management practices based on gender. This is in line with Sabir and Fozia (2016) who revealed that both male and female heads as well as public and private schools heads had no significant mean differences regarding physical safety and security measures at secondary level schools.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that the extent of public secondary schools principals' application of security management practices in secondary schools in Cross River State is low. The issue of low application of security management practices is

evident in both rural and urban public secondary schools irrespective of the gender of the principals' in-charge. Issue of low extent of principals' application of security management practices in Cross River State secondary schools, could be as a result of inadequate funding and poor attitude of principals towards ensuring safety in their schools. Security is a serious issue in terms of funding and application in order to ensure safety of life and property in the school.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher proffers the following recommendations:

1. Secondary school principals should be encouraged to maintain the application of security management procedures in their schools so as to curb cult and criminal activities. This can be done by organizing security workshops for school principals where they will be trained on current security management procedures for schools.
2. The State government through the State Ministry of Education should ensure the provision of physical security management infrastructures and tools for secondary school safety. This can be done by funding the building of fences around schools, provision of burglary proofs and provision of metal proofed gates at the entry and exit points in each school.

5.3 Implications of the Study

Findings of the study have implications for secondary school principals in Cross River State that the low application of security management procedures would result in poor security plan in the schools. This would expose the school to security threats that would increase fear and anxiety among teachers and students in the school.

The findings of this study also have implication that low application of physical security in the school will result in high rate of security breach in the school. The schools are exposed to security threats within and outside the school. The implication is the high rate of cult threats from students within and outside the schools. The implication is that government should be prepared to allocate money for purchasing the relevant security prevention devices in order to respond quickly and effectively to potential crises.

REFERENCES

- Abdulrasheed, O. & Bello, A. S. (2015). Challenges to secondary school principals' leadership in Northern Region of Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 3 (3), 1-5
- Ajayi, I.A. (2007). *Issues in school management*. Lagos: Bolabay Publications
- Amanchukwu, R. N. (2012). Application of intelligence indicators on secondary school safety and security as a measure of learning enhancement. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 5 (3), 151– 161
- Atlas, R. I. (2008). *21st Century Security and CPTED: Designing for critical infrastructure protection and crime prevention*. United States of America: Auerbach Publications: Taylor and Francis Group, LLC
- Burton, P. (2008). *Merchants, skollies and stones: Experiences of school violence in South Africa*. Cape Town: Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention

-
- Campbell, J. (2007). *Anticipating and managing crime, crisis and violence in our schools: A practical guide*. Youngstown, New York: Cambria Press
- Cowan, K. C., Vaillancourt, K., Rossen, E., & Pollitt, K. (2013). *A framework for safe and successful schools [Brief]*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists
- Dimsey, J. S. (2008). *Introduction to private security*. Belmont: Thomas Wadsworth Publishers
- Haruna, M. (2014). *Impact of agents of socialization on the academic performance of social studies students in junior secondary schools in Jigawa State (Master's thesis)*. Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
- Ike, A. O. (2015). *Security management situations in public Secondary schools in North Central Zone of Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation)*. Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka
- Kiel, L. D. (1993). Nonlinear dynamical analysis: Assessing systems concepts in a government agency. *Public Administration Review*, 53 (2), 148-153
- Lee, L. & Talib, O. (2012). *Emergencies, disasters, catastrophes and different phenomena*. Retrieved from <http://www.dspace.ude:80/80/dspace/bitstream/handle/19716/67/pp304.pdf>
- Lombaard, C. & Kole, J. (2008). *Security principles and practices, SEP111A: Units 1-10*. Pretoria: University of South Africa
- Maritim, J. C. (2014). *School safety and emergency preparedness: an assessment of public boarding secondary schools in Nandi North District, Kenya (Master's thesis, Department of Educational Management and Policy Studies, Moi University, Kenya)*.
- Matsitsa, G. M. (2011). *Exploring safety in township secondary schools in Free State*. South Africa *Journal of education*. Retrieved from <http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php>
- Mentiki, A. (2012). *The right to education. Action guide–aid Nigeria*. Retrieved from: <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2012/02/orgo-condems-rape-incidentinschoolsharponsexeducation>
- Nyakundi, Z. O. (2012). *Implementation of safety standards and guidelines in public secondary schools in Marani District, Kisii County, Kenya (Master's thesis, Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum studies, Kenyatta University)*.
- Odufowowu, B. A. (2011). *School plant planning as correlate of students' academic performance in Southwest Nigeria secondary schools*. Retrieved from www.sciedu.ca/1jbadoi:10.5430/1jba.v2n2P4j
- Ojo, J. (2016). *Making Nigerian schools safe*. The Authority. <http://authorityngr.com/2016/03/Making-Nigerian-schools-safe/>
- Oyoyo, A. O. (2014). *Appraisal of the application of total quality management in secondary school administration in Umuahia Education Zone (Master's thesis, Department of Educational Foundations University of Nigeria, Nsukka)*.
- Rogers, C. & Schoeman, J. (2010). *Security practice III: SEP3701, Units 1-5*. Pretoria: University of South Africa

Rogers, C. (2009). Security risk control measures I: SEP1504, Units 1-9. Pretoria: University of South Africa (UNISA).

Sabir, A. & Fozia, J. (2016). Comparative analysis of safety and security measures in public and private schools at secondary level. *Journal of Socialomics*, 5 (3), 1-8

Trump K. (2010). Education department redefines safety. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolsecurityblog.com/2010/8/ec>

Trump, K. (2012). School crisis plan. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolsecurityblog.comtagschool>

Usman, M. (2016). Police nab secondary school students in cult activities. Retrieved from [www.http://infonigeria.com/police-nab-secondary-in-cult](http://www.infonigeria.com/police-nab-secondary-in-cult)

Van Jaarsveld, L. (2011). An investigation of safety and security measures at secondary schools in Tshwane, South Africa (Master's thesis). University of South Africa

Xaba, M. (2006). An investigation into the basic safety and security status of schools' physical environments. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(4), 565-580