Community Capacity Building and Crime Reporting in Lagos, Nigeria

By Ayodele Johnson Oluwole

Lagos State University, Nigeria

Abstract- Various reasons cause community residents not to report crimes to the police. This study examined the capacity to report crimes among residents of communities in Lagos, Nigeria within the functionalist framework. A combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was adopted. The study was conducted in the three senatorial districts of Lagos. Data collection involved a survey of 948 respondents selected though a multistage sampling procedure, 6 In-Depth Interviews, 12 Key Informant Interviews and 10 Case Studies were conducted to elicit qualitative data. While quantitative data analysis involved the use of descriptive statistical tools, chi square and regression, qualitative data were content analysed. Findings show that 50.6% of respondents had no capacity to report crime due to ignorance and 48.2% because of pressures from social networks. Moreover, while 1.6% of respondents were less constrained to report crime to the police because they suspected the police, 33.2% were scared by police demand for bribes. The study concluded that victims were unaware that their relative safety depends on their ability to put local intelligence behind the police in solving crime. It recommends that government should criminalize stereotypes against reporting and include reporting capacity building norms in schools'curricula right from primary to tertiary levels.

Keywords: community capacity building, crime reporting, local intelligence, stereotypes, victims.

GJSFR-E Classification : FOR Code: 170113, 160201

COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING AND CRIME REPORTING IN LAGOS, NIGERIA

Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of :

Community Capacity Building and Crime Reporting in Lagos, Nigeria

Ayodele Johnson Oluwole

Abstract- Various reasons cause community residents not to report crimes to the police. This study examined the capacity to report crimes among residents of communities in Lagos, Nigeria within the functionalist framework. A combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was adopted. The study was conducted in the three senatorial districts of Lagos. Data collection involved a survey of 948 respondents selected though a multistage sampling procedure, 6 In-Depth Interviews, 12 Key Informant Interviews and 10 Case Studies were conducted to elicit qualitative data. While quantitative data analysis involved the use of descriptive statistical tools, chi square and regression, qualitative data were content analysed. Findings show that 50.6% of respondents had no capacity to report crime due to ignorance and 48.2% because of pressures from social networks. Moreover, while 1.6% of respondents were less constrained to report crime to the police because they suspected the police, 33.2% were scared by police demand for bribes. The study concluded that victims were unaware that their relative safety depends on their ability to put local intelligence behind the police in solving crime. It recommends that government should criminalize stereotypes against reporting and include reporting capacity building norms in schools'curricula right from primary to tertiary levels.

Keywords: *community capacity building, crime reporting, local intelligence, stereotypes, victims.*
Word Count: 200

I. Introduction

Many communities especially in developing countries are poorly equipped to respond to existing and emerging crime reporting demands. They lack the institutional framework, determination, financial, procedural and information resources to overcome the perceived hazards and risks inherent in crime reporting. Therefore, people and their social institutions must be included in the community planning process to increase the probability of achieving a successful outcome (Serageldin, 1994) in such an all important enterprise. The axiomatic argument behind this emphasis is that, for these programs to be effective, the people for which a program is intended should have a voice in the design and implementation of these interventions, as people's participation depends on what they consider meaningful and relevant in the context of their visions, experiences, and values (Jackson et al., 2003; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2007; Smith, Littlejohns, Hawe, & Sutherland, 2008). We define community as an

orientation for action, as the research dynamic was intended to be a facilitating process to foster assets, resources, and networking possibilities (Simpson et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2008; Walter, 2007). Thus, Chaskin (2001:295) sees community capacity building "as the interaction of human capital, organizational resources, and social capital existing within a given community that can be leveraged to solve collective problems, and improve or maintain the well being of that community".

In the process of capacity building, networks which are capable of providing "an infrastructure for collective action and act as visible proponents of group claims to help shape public discourse and debate" (Minkoff, 1997:614) emerge. To be productive, the UNDP outlines that capacity building takes place at three levels: First, at individual level, community capacity-building requires the development of conditions that allow individual participants to build and enhance existing knowledge and skills. It also calls for the establishment of conditions that will allow individuals to engage in the "process of learning and adapting to change. Second, at institutional level, community capacity building should involve aiding pre-existing institutions in developing countries. It should not involve creating new institutions, rather modernizing existing institutions and supporting them in forming sound policies, organizational structures, and effective methods of management and revenue control. Finally, at societal level, community capacity building should support the establishment of a more "interactive public administration that learns equally from its actions and from feedback it receives from the population at large." Community capacity building must be used to develop public administrators that are responsive and accountable (United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2006).

Some scholars have challenged the use of the community capacity building approach in research and intervention, highlighting the contested aspects of community and community capacity building (Craig, 2007; Diamond, 2004; Mowbray, 2005; Simpson, Wood, & Daws, 2003; Williams, 2004). However, if any new influences will modernize pre - existing crime reporting values, skills and norms as well as refine the people's pre - existing institutions to develop sounder policies and effective method of management without losing sight of the need to embrace more interactive public administration, they must be people focused and driven.

Author: Department of Sociology, Lagos State University, Lagos, Nigeria. e-mail: johnson.ayodele@lasu.edu.ng

It is for the foregoing logic that capacity building activities in the context of response to crime are commonly geared towards strengthening community authorities, norms and values. This is often intended to ensure the proper handling of crime prevention and control issues, the care of victims, the promotion of their self-reliance and the recognition of durable solutions to their traumatic challenges in the aftermath of victimisation. It is probably for the foregoing reasons that Amherst Wilder Foundation (2000) concluded that capacity building must rest on the notion that change is the norm and not a passing anomaly. The task of salvaging victims of crime cannot be accomplished by individuals alone. It requires a partnership framework involving community institutions and broader societal inputs, together with crime victims themselves. This is more so because the benefits of efforts to promote crime reporting to law enforcement are numerous and can provide police and lawmakers with accurate information for policy decisions (Kruttschnitt & Carbone-Lopez, 2009; Gartner & Macmillan, 1995)

If crime victims are acutely vulnerable to further victimization (Farrell, 1995; Pease & Laycock, 1996), non victims may achieve nothing concrete by rolling out the drums. It may just be a question of time and place for their own moments of misfortune to come. It is only by the instrumentality of community capacity building that a powerful army of crime reporters can be raised to make threatened communities liveable for vulnerable citizens. Remarkable as community capacity building initiative appears, it is open to diverse abuses. For example, one of its criticisms is that projects that promote "capacity" and "self-sufficiency" in the communities may be guises through which governments minimize their account-ability for larger social ills. Furthermore, community capacity building projects may act as a means to boost the reputations of politicians and government officials, playing upon the well intentioned connotations that surround the concepts of community, community capacity, and social capital (Mowbray, 2005). As a consequence, this diverts attention from the larger causes of socioeconomic disparities to the responsibility of the individuals living in lower income communities, thereby placing blame on the victim and focusing on "defective" populations (Craig, 2007; Mowbray, 2005; Williams, 2004).

The study adopted structural functionalism as its theoretical framework. This is a theory which essentially looks at society through the lenses of macro-level social structure and social functions that focus broadly on the society as a whole. A structural functionalist approach emphasizes social solidarity which gains different forms of expression in organic and mechanical environments, as well as stability in social structures. The pioneer structural functionalists such as Saint Simon, Comte, Parsons and others started their sociological investigations using the instrumentality of functionalism since the mid-1800's, the scientific status of the perspective did not enjoy universal acceptance until late nineteenth century when Durkheim mains-treamed sociology by empirically demonstrating its scientific significance with his study of suicide. Crime reporting is functional for an ordered society while the reverse is dysfunctional because it conceals the 'dark figures' of unreported criminal activities in communities. To the extent that crime reporting provides clearly defined clues to the apprehension of criminals, enrich crime statistics, keeps victims from being re-victimised and thus controls crime; community capacity building efforts, in the context of crime reporting, are functional for the collective safety of community dwellers.

There is no doubt that strong relationship exists between and among individual, family, group, organization and community development (Amherst Wilder Foundation, 2000) to make community capacity building efforts rely solely on people and their different levels and contents of interactions a sensible target. The fact that capacity-building strategies typically do not work well if they come from the "one-size-fits-all" realm that lacks the beauty of diverse values, assumptions, and intervention methods that characterise the community driven option underlies this study. The urgency of capacity building is significant because the scale of need for crime reporting is enormous, especially against the background of women remaining the dominant victim of domestic violence in Nigeria. There is no doubt also that violence against women in particular is inherently linked to gender roles, gender stereotypes, notions of masculinity and patriarchal values (Vetten, 2000) which have deprived them of the desirable skills and confidence to report their victimisation in most developing societies of the world. The appreciation of this culture of poor reporting among community residents appears rather too low for comfort. It is against this backdrop that the study asked the following questions: (i). why are crime victims not reporting all their victimisation experiences to the police? (ii). Could this unwillingness issue from victims' incapa-city to report crimes? (iii). How can the capacity of community residents for crime reporting be significantly improved?

II. Data and Methods

The study was conducted in Lagos State, in the South-West Geopolitical zone of Nigeria. The 2006 National Census puts the population figure of Lagos at 9,013,534 (Official Gazette, 2006). The presence of well protected and largely unprotected citizens in Lagos has potentials for crime commission, victimisation and crime reporting responses. Therefore, the fact that this study investigated the nexus between crime location and victims' reporting practices makes Lagos the right location for the inquiry. The study is based on two

categories of data, namely, the quantitative and qualitative data. While the survey method serves as the main source of primary quantitative data, a sample survey was conducted between September and November 2012 to elicit quantitative data from 948 respondents through a multi-stage sampling procedure. First, the study adopted the categorisation of Lagos State into three Senatorial Districts: Lagos Central Senatorial District, Lagos East Senatorial District and Lagos West Senatorial District by The National Population Commission (2006). Second, based on the findings of Soyombo (2009) and Alemika (2009) in respect of areas recognised as the "black spots" of crime in Lagos state as listed by the police, through simple random process the study selected Mushin, Lagos Island and Ibeju Lekki Local Government Areas from Lagos West, Lagos Island and Lagos East Local Government Areas in that order where Lagos Central, Lagos West and Lagos East Senatorial Districts represented urban, semi urban and rural communities of Lagos respectively.

Third, at this stage, the study adopted the 245 wards created by the Federal Government as its sample frame. Therefore, all the 19 wards in Mushin Local Government Area were included, 10 wards were randomly selected from those in Lagos Island Local Government Area and 5 wards were randomly selected from those in Ibeju Lekki Local Government Area in accordance with the proportion of their different population sizes. Fourth, in all the 13 political wards at Mushin Local Government, the study randomly selected 2 streets from which 20 houses were then randomly selected. Also at Lagos Island Local Government, the study selected 2 streets from each of the 8 selected political wards. From each of these selected streets, 20 houses were randomly selected. Finally, at Ibeju Lekki Local Government, the study selected 2 communities from each of the 5 selected political wards. Using the criteria of the NPC assigned house numbers; the study randomly identified and selected 20 houses from each of the two selected communities. (Ibeju Lekki Local Government Area under the Lagos East Senatorial District is uniquely rural). It does not have clearly designated streets. Therefore, the study opted for communities because they are more clearly recognised than streets. Overall, from each of these 42 streets and 10 communities, 20 houses were selected. Finally, one household was randomly selected from each of the selected houses. However, in a case where more than one household occupied a house; lottery method (yes/no) was used to select the respondent interviewed in such a situation. Copies of a questionnaire were administered on each of the 1040 household heads.

For qualitative data, In-depth interviews were conducted with 3 traditional rulers and 3 religious leaders selected equally from each of the three Senatorial Districts. Twelve key-informant interviews were also conducted 3 Divisional Crime Police Officers, 3 Chairmen of Landlord Associations and 6 Members of Victims' Family to elicit key crime reporting issues to validate and expand the researcher's understanding of crime reporting practices of the people. Ten case studies were conducted with victims of very serious violent crimes that were identified from the survey respondents to capture victims' losses, trauma, worries, intervention programmes, adjustment and reintegration in the aftermath of victimisation. Quantitative data collected were subjected to two levels of analysis. The first level was a univariate analysis which addressed the description of the socio-demographic and economic characteristics of respondents, and incidence of crime reporting that emerged from different geographical locations within the study site. Simple percentages, frequency distribution tables and graphs were used to provide general overview of the various socioeconomic that affect respondents' reporting practices from different spatial environments. The second level of analysis is bivariate analysis which involved the examination of the pattern of relationship between the dependent variable (crime reporting) and community capacity building variable. The qualitative data collected through hand written notes and tape recorders were transcribed and used for data analysis. The analysis was focussed on comparing the responses of respondents from the three selected senatorial district area locations to see whether a similar pattern of responses existed among them. Based on these themes, global summaries of the views on each objective were synthesized, analyzed and some striking expressions were pulled out for ethnographic summaries. Data gathered from residents in rural, semi urban and urban locations were finally compared to see whether they were related and had implications for crime control in society.

III. RESULTS

a) Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1 provides the selected socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. The sample included 66.1% of males and 33.9% of females. The proportion of male to female has positive cultural implications for crime reporting in the study area. In some important ways, age affects exposure to, avoidance and report of victimisation. In this study, a 10-year age grouping was used. The age patterns of respondents indicated that respondents between the age brackets of 21-30 and 31-40 years account for 72.4% of the total study population; 27.8% of respondents were between 31 – 40 years; about 44.6% of the entire study population is between ages 21 – 30 years; 14.2% fall between 41 – 50 years; 11.4% respondents were 51 years and above while only 1.9% of respondents were aged less than 20 years. The data

on Table 1 indicate that 61.2% of respondents had tertiary education; secondary education (20.3%), primary education (10.4%) and no formal education (8.1%)

Data on marital status of respondents reveal that 46.5% of the respondents is single, married (44.6%), separated, divorced or widowed (8.9%). Also, data show that majority (68.7%) of the respondents are Yoruba, Igbo (20.6%) while Hausa and those from other ethnic groups (10.8%) respectively. The distribution of respondents by religion shows that Christians constituted 56.3% followed by Muslims (42.7%). Traditional and other religions had 0.9 percent. About 54.4%; 38.6% and 7.0% of the respondents lived in semi-urban, urban and rural communities of Lagos respectively. In addition, 62% of the respondents were businesspeople, 27.2% are either students, applicants, apprentices or retirees while 11.1% are civil servants. In most cases, particularly in capitalist environments, occupation is a critical determinant of income. Respondents who earned N10, 000,000 and above constitute the majority (58.6%) in the study.

b) Resources that Boost and Encumbrances that Inhibit Respondents' Capacity for Crime Reporting

In Table 2, respondents identified a number of police practices which reduced effective victims' crime reporting in the study site. More respondents (51.4%) considered bribery as the most discouraging police practice that keeps victims away from gainful crime reporting practices. Next is ineffectiveness (49.1%); corruption (48.1%); lack of integrity (47.4%); police complicity in crime (40.0%) and nonchalance (33.3%). On the cultural beliefs that influence crime reporting, 58.0% of the respondents identified ethnicity, 56.8% respondents had no idea, traditional voodoo (46.9%), sex (47.8), witchcraft (46.2%), age (45.2%) and no beliefs (42.5%). In terms of the extent to which places of worship influence crime reporting in the community, 54.2% of the respondents said it indoctrinates crime reporting; positively persuades crime reporting (48.0%); they have no influence whatsoever on crime reporting (38.1%) and they negatively persuade crime reporting (20.0%). While 49.1% of the respondents admitted that taboos have no influence on crime reporting, 47.2% s suggested fear of exclusion as a means of discouraging crime reporting and 45.3% agreed that some taboos actually encourage crime reporting.

Examining the influence of home training on crime reporting, 49.2% of the respondents said home training can imbue children with the courage to report crime to earn justice; the fear to report crimes may be inherited from parents by children (49.0 %), home training can serve as a control against crime reporting (45.9%); home training has no effect on crime reporting (43.8%) and home training can cause children as future adults to internalise dissent (38.3%). Considering the

extent of influence which extended family connection has on crime reporting, 62.2% of the respondents said it discourages crime reporting, extended family connections offer cooperation that sometimes conceals household crimes (46.9%), they encourage crime reporting (43.0%) and put considerable sympathy behind the crime reporter (42.9%).

Table 3 shows the reasons that compel extended family connections to influence crime reporting, 54.9% of the respondents said the nuclear family option is rapidly replacing extended family, civilization (19.8%), religion(17.9%), no effect (5.5%) and others(1.9%). While 65.0% of the respondents said traditional ways of crime control in the communities influence crime reporting, 35.0% disagreed. On the traditional ways of crime control influence crime reporting, 54.2% of the respondents admitted it is by referral, partnership (52.9%), community place compliant (52.3%), information (52.1%) and provision of back up resources (50.0%). Considering the taboos that influence crime reporting, 53.3% of the respondents said taboos do not exist, incestuous conduct is a private affair (53.0%), children do not report crimes (46.9%), reporting crime is not the norm (45.6%) and women do not report crimes (38.9%).

c) Qualitative Evidence

The evidences from case study, in-depth and key informant interviews indicate that respondents lacked appreciable crime reporting capacity building facilities in the study site. With the people's abiding faith in their conventional crime reporting impeding stereotypes and taboos, only a marginal portion of the victimisation that respondents experienced actually got to the notice of the police.

A female in-depth interview respondent observed:

Why must a woman who strongly feels her privacy has been recklessly invaded wait to have approval from a man who is her father, husband, uncle or something before seeking redress through lawful means? I do not want my girl children to face the ordeal I was socialised to endure. To desirably equip her, government should, therefore, ensure that equal right of crime reporting is accorded her and she is thought to assert her crime reporting right in school , not necessarily by proxy.

A male in-depth interview respondent acknowledged:

Up till today, some residents maintain solidarity with criminals which make the crusade for improved crime reporting a little bit problematic. Rather than joining crime reporters to condemn the bad conduct of offenders some community people take solace in fraternising with criminals by discrediting and describing crime reporters as intolerant of neighbours. This is rather demeaning because it is anti culture.

A sixty five year old male in-depth interview respondent noted:

> In some communities, especially rural areas in which tradition is more intense in compliance by community residents, a family from which reports of crime to the police emanate as a matter of principle may be labelled as rebels. Consequently, some members of the same community may exclude members of the crime reporting families in terms of socio-economic and even cultural interactions.

A fifty four year old female in-depth interview respondent admitted:

> I hate the police because in or outside their stations, nothing goes for nothing. If you report a crime without greasing the palms of the police, you may end up becoming the criminal if the actual offender is richer and more generous to the police. They will bribe the police who will in turn teach the criminals the loopholes to explore to make criminals become slippery for the law to track down and supply them with the technical points to inescapably incriminate the original crime reporter. This is why potential crime reporters see police stations as commercial points for the exchange of justice with injustice which is not healthy for the effective partnership against crime.

A male key informant interview respondent observed:

> What members of the public do not understand is that he who goes to the police first may not be the righteous one in law. If you want to go to equity, at least you should equip yourself with clean hands. Quite often, investigations have shown that persons who rush to the police have adversarial intensions to conceal to the authority. When their claims are weighed against evidences, they are often proven beyond every reasonable doubt that they are the criminals and not crime reporters they claim to be.

Finally, a seventy three year old in-depth interview noted:

> There is yet no structured effort made by public policy to introduce culturally acceptable means by which crimes could be reported without running the risks of paying dearly for that civil service initiative. Police ethos as they are presently understood and used does not support members of the public to report crimes. The criminals seem more protected than information providers in the regime that subsists. There may be the need for members drawn from across the various strata making up all the communities to evolve culturally useful and useable norm of crime reporting to make contemporary communities safer to live in.

IV. Discussion

There have been fears as to the safety of crime victims and witnesses who desire to volunteer information to the police. Religion is considered the beliefs and practices associated with the supernatural. It is in this connection that the resort to the patronage of informal social control mechanism by community dwellers in Lagos becomes instructive. The preponderance of Yoruba in the study should not be surprising; given that the study was conducted in Yoruba speaking communities. Nigeria is a multi-ethnic state with about 350 ethnic groups (Otite, 1979). This ethnic variety is found in towns and cities throughout Nigeria. Ethnicity is an important variable in the study of demographic characteristics of a population. All over the world, ethnic groups have cultural norms, beliefs and practices which influence decision making in the context of how individuals and groups live their daily lives, appreciate positive interactions and respond to conflictual ones accordingly. The latter essentially include crime reporting. Quite generally, marital status has demographic, economic, socio-cultural implications for crime reporting. These probably underlie the universal recognition of marriage as the main social arrangement within which cultural socialisation primarily takes place. Considering the critical role which education could play in mobilising respondents to report crimes or not, this variable was among the many considered in the present study. Through education, cultural knowledge, values, norms and competences of a people are transferred to their younger generation to enable them develop a shared understanding of the dynamics of offences, their effects and report much in ways that most community dwellers will find culture consistent and therefore pleasing.

Every peaceful environment appreciating government will enable development for its subjects so as to establish and sustain social order in communities under its domain of influence. Consequently, it should stimulate the making of crime, criminal victimization and public responses to them issues of community concern. If 57.8% of respondents who are in the age category of 41 – 50 years reported more crimes in this study, then, it is consistent with earlier studies conducted by Sampson and Bartusch (1998), Kusow, Wilson and Martin (1997) and Correia and Lourich (1996). However, individuals within these age brackets are frequently more powerful than those younger and older than them. As a result, their strength makes them more able to acquire easily stolen items. They are expected also to possess more vigorous power of expression and determination that enable them fight for their rights. These may make these respondents pursue the reporting of crimes in the study area more passionately and strengthen the belief that older persons view police more favourably than younger persons. What role then did citizens between 18 and 40

years play in the communities in terms of crime reporting? Young people's active lifestyles tend to attract considerable proactive police intervention (Crawford, 2009; Hopkins, 1994; Loader, 1996) because, too often, they have a greater propensity to engage in behaviour which challenges and confronts the established structures and agencies of authority (Hartless, Ditton, Nair, & Philips, 1995; Radford, Hamilton, & Jarman, 2005). In fact, youth and young adults commit a disproportionate amount of crime in Canada. In 2009, for instance, age-specific rates for individuals accused of crime were highest among those aged 15-22, with the peak age at 17 (Dauvergne & Turner, 2010). Why are respondents within this age cohort passive if they played no remarkable role in crime causation? What should they have done? What could have prevented them from performing the heroic task of keeping their communities crime-free through crime reporting?

However, a few other studies including Cao, Frank and Cullen (1996) did not find age to be important. Findings regarding the impact of gender are relevant here. This study found males reporting crimes 7.2% more than females. Some researchers, including Correia, Reisig and Lourich (1996) corroborated the above finding. However, Cao, Frank and Cullen (1996) found females to be more positively disposed toward the police compared to males. Why are females' reporting rate lower? Are they inhibited by culture? What role does the fact of marriage play in female crime reporting? How can this shortfall be addressed? It is not surprising that the sample contained more male than women. In the study site, more commonly, male adults are more culturally held to have a healthier credential for crime reporting than females. For example, anecdotal evidences have it that in most homes, male household heads will consider it an affront for their wives to report crimes for which they had not given their tacit prior approval to the police. Findings of the present study confirmed that rural residents view police more favourably than the urban residents. Respondents' places of residence play a significant role in the formation of beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviour patterns which eventually determine their perceptions and direction of responses to crime events. Contrary to the observations of Brown and Benedict (2002) that some studies have found that rural residents view police less favourably than residents of urban areas, why, in the study site, did the urban residents view police less favourably than rural residents? In rural communities of Lagos, crime reporting taboos and stereotypes exist in abundance, how come these taboos and stereotypes not have equally overwhelming impact on victimisation in the rural communities that went so high as to 87.9% without a corresponding effects which only allowed 59.1% of victimisations to be reported to the police in the rural communities of Lagos. Rural norms do not favour bribery or immediate gratification even if they do delayed appreciation.

This study therefore expands the frontiers of public knowledge about encumbrances that prevent community residents from freely reporting their victimisation experiences to the police. Specifically, within the functionalist theoretical framework, the current study investigated the effects of social networks of individuals on a victim's decision to report crime to police. Using this framework, the present study demonstrated the significant influence of individuals, being functional constituents, on the dynamics of reporting decisions among respondents in the study site. Current findings established that the social network in which victims decide whether or not to notify the police about their victimisation is complex. It involves community norms of items forbidden as practices that are not condoned in communities. For example, contemporary American society is dominated by the norms of minding one's own business (Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, & Birch, 1981; Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, & Neuberg, 1997; Stürmer, Snyder, & Omoto, 2005) which is rapidly displacing Africans' normative belief in being their brothers' keepers. This normative explanation has been used to understand and explain actions related to a variety of crime contexts, such as bystander intervention (Hart & Miethe, 2008; Luckenbill, 1997; Miethe & Deibert, 2007; Miethe & Regoeczi, 2004). Following this theoretical explanation, though semi-urban and urban witnesses and victims might have played passive roles in crime reporting because they felt that nothing will accrue to them from reporting, the efficacy of norms of items forbidden as unacceptable practices in the communities, taboos and stereotypes should not be swept under the carpet.

V. Conclusion

The present study presents a pioneering insight into the growing need for community capacity building initiative that has received little prior research attention for the purpose of enabling community residents partner with justice systems so that community safety in the study area is guaranteed. Since the challenge for law enforcement is to equally protect and serve people from all backgrounds, though the complexities of policing multicultural communities are numerous (Shusta, Levine, Harris & Wong, 2002), the findings of the present study have policy and practical implications for crime reporting actors in the communities, traditional crime control framework and societal institutions. Capacity building is a critical component in a broader set of enabling requirements for meaningful community ownership and support effectiveness. If these are not structured in ways that make community residents active participants in the crime reporting enterprise, the collective intention to solve crime may become elusive.

There should be desirable synergy between community people and the police such that both parties will see one another as partners in progress along the direction of making the community liveable and deprived of intimidating victimisation. The study therefore concluded that until victims recognise that their relative safety depends on their ability to effectively put local intelligence behind police crime fighting efforts through crime reporting, most residents will not access all available crime reporting resources to make Lagos communities safer. It therefore recommends that government should, in the interim, criminalize all stereotypes against crime reporting and as a long term solution, include crime reporting capacity building values, norms and attitudes into education curricula right from primary through secondary to tertiary levels in Nigeria.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, (2000). "Capacity Building." Accessed in June 2000 from http://www. wilder .org/suc/capbuild.html.
2. Chaskin, R. J. (2001). Building community capacity: A definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. Urban Affairs Review, 36, 291-323.
3. Craig, G. (2007). Community capacity-building: Something old, something new. Critical Social Policy, 27, 335-359.
4. Crawford, A. (2009). Criminalizing sociability through anti-social behaviour legislation: Dispersal powers, young people and the police. Youth Justice, 9, 5-26.
5. Dauvergne, M., & Turner, J. (2010). Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2009. Juristat, 30, 1-37.
6. Diamond, J. (2004). Local regeneration initiatives and capacity building: Whose "capacity" and "building" for what? Community Development Journal, 39, 177-189.
7. Farrell, G. 1995. Preventing repeat victimization. In Building a safer society: Strategic approaches to crime prevention, edited by M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington.Vol. 19 of Crime and justice: A review of research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
8. Hartless, J., Ditton, J., Nair, G., & Philips, S. (1995). More sinned against than sinning: A study of teenagers experience of crime. British Journal of Criminology, 35, 114-133.
9. Hopkins, N. (1994). School pupils' perceptions of the police that visit schools: Not all police are 'pigs'. Journal of Community & Applied School Psychology, 4, 189-207.
10. Innes, J. E., & D. E. (1997). Metropolitian Development as a Complex System: A New Approach to Sustainability. Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Working Paper 669. Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley.
11. Jackson, S. F., Cleverly, S., Poland, B., Burman, D., Edwards, R., & Robertson, A. (2003). (2003). Working with Toronto neighbourhoods toward developing indicators of community capacity. Health Promotion International, 18, 339-350.
12. Loader, I. (1996). Youth, Policing, and Democracy. London: Macmillan Press.
13. Minkoff, D. C. (1997). "Producing Social Capital: National Social Movements and Civil Society." American Behavioural Scientist 40 (5): 605–18.
14. Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2007). Improving health through community organization and community building: A health education perspective. In M. Minkler (Ed.), Community organizing and community building for health (2nd ed., pp. 26-50).
15. Mowbray, M. (2005). Community capacity building or state opportunism? Community Development Journal, 40, 255-264.
16. Pease, K. & Laycock, G. (1996). Revictimization: Reducing the heat on hot victims. Research in Action, NCJ 162951. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
17. Radford, K., Hamilton, J., & Jarman, N. (2005). 'It's their word against mine': Young people's attitudes to the police complaints procedure in Northern Ireland. Children & Society, 19, 360-370.
18. Serageldin, I. (1994). "Making Development Sustainable." In Making Development Sustainable: From Concepts to Action, edited by Ismail Serageldin and Andrew Steer. Environmentally Sustainable Development Occasional Paper Series No. 2. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
19. Shusta, R. M., Levine, D. R., Harris, P. R. & Wong, H. Z. (2002). Multicultural law enforcement (2nd ed.) Upper Saddle River NJ: Pearson Education
20. Simpson, L., Wood, L., & Daws, L. (2003). Community capacity building: Starting with people not projects. Community Development Journal, 38, 277-286.
21. Smith, N., Littlejohns, L. B., Hawe, P., and Sutherland, L. (2008).Great expectations and hard times: Developing community indicators in a healthy communities initiative in Canada. Health Promotion International, 23, 119-126.
22. United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration, (2006). Definition of basic concepts and terminologies in governance and public administration. United Nations Economic and Social Council. Retrieved on October 15, 2013 fromhttp://www.unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan022332.pdf
23. Vetten, L. 2000. "Race, Gender and Power in the Face of Social Change: Deconstructing Violence Against Women in South Africa", in Reclaiming Women's Spaces: New Perspectives on Violence Against Women and Sheltering in South Africa, ed.

by Yoon J. Park, Joanne Fedler and Zubeda Dangor (Johannesburg: NISAA), pp.47-80.

24. Walter, C. L. (2007). Community building practice: A conceptual framework. In M. Minkler (Ed.), Community organizing and community building for

health (2nd ed., pp. 66-78). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

25. Williams, C. C. (2004). Community capacity building: A critical evaluation of the third sector approach. Review of Policy Research, 21, 729-739.

Table 1 : Socio Economic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	627	66.1
Female	321	33.9
Total	948	100
Age		
Less than 20 years	18	1.9
21 – 30	423	33.2
31 – 40	264	27.8
41 – 50	135	14.2
51 and above	108	11.4
Total	948	100
Education		
No Formal Education	77	8.1
Primary Education	99	10.4
Secondary Education	192	20.3
Tertiary Education	580	61.2
Total	948	100
Marital Status		
Single	441	46.5
Married	423	44.6
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	84	8.9
Total	948	100
Ethnicity		
Ibo	195	20.6
Hausa/ Others	102	10.8
Yoruba	651	68.7
Total	948	100
Religion		
Christianity	534	56.3
Islam	405	42.7
Traditional/Others	9	.9
Total	948	100
Residence		
Urban	366	38.6
Semi urban	516	54.4
Rural	66	7.0
Total	948	100
Occupation		
Civil Servant	105	11.1
Business Person	585	61.7
Student/Applicant/Apprentice/Retiree	258	27.2
Total	948	100
Annual Income In Naira		
No Income – N 1,000,000:00	219	23.1
N 2,000,000 – N 5,000,000	99	10.4
N 6,100,000 – N 9,000,000	74	7.8
N 10,000,000 and above	556	58.6
Total	948	100.0

Source : Author's Field Survey, 2012

Table 2 : Resources that Boost and Encumbrances that Inhibit Respondents' Capacity for Crime Reporting

Police Practices that Inhibit Reporting	Respondents' Report of The Incident of Crime					
	Yes		No		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Bribery/Extortion	51.4	(162)	48.6	(153)	100	(315)
Ineffectiveness	49.1	(81)	50.9	(84)	100	(165)
Corruption	48.1	(111)	51.9	(120)	100	(231)
Nonchalance	33.3	(30)	66.7	(60)	100	(90)
Lack of Integrity	47.4	(54)	52.6	(60)	100	(114)
Police Complicity in Crime	40.0	(6)	60.0	(9)	100	(15)
Others	50.0	(9)	50.0	(9)	100	(18)
Total	47.8	(453)	52.2	(495)	100	(948)
Chi sq. p v = > .05						
Cultural Beliefs that Influence Crime Reporting						
Sex	47.8	(75)	52.2	(82)	100	(157)
Age	45.2	(57)	54.8	(69)	100	(126)
Witchcraft	46.2	(117)	53.8	(136)	100	(253)
Ethnicity	58.0	(58)	42.0	(42)	100	(100)
No Beliefs	42.5	(31)	57.5	(42)	100	(73)
Traditional Voodoo	46.9	(83)	53.1	(94)	100	(177)
I Have No Ideas	56.8	(21)	43.2	(16)	100	(37)
Others	44.0	(11)	56.0	(14)	100	(25)
Total	47.8	(453)	52.2	(495)	100	(948)
Influence of Places of Worship on Crime Reporting						
Positively Persuades Crime Reporting	(363)	48.0	(393)	52.0	(756)	100
Negatively Persuades Crime Reporting	(3)	20.0	(12)	80.0	(15)	100
Indoctrinates Crime Reporters	(39)	54.2	(33)	45.8	(72)	100
No Influence on Crime Reporting	(24)	38.1	(39)	61.9	(63)	100
Others	(24)	57.1	(18)	42.9	(42)	100
Influence of Taboos On Crime Reporting						
Fear of Exclusion discourages Reporting	(257)	47.2	(287)	52.8	(544)	100
Taboos Encourage Crime Reporting	(29)	45.3	(35)	54.7	(64)	100
Taboos Have No Influence On Reporting	(167)	49.1	(173)	50.9	(340)	100
How Home Training Influences Reporting						
Control	(67)	45.9	(79)	54.1	(146)	
Internalises Dissent	(23)	38.3	(37)	61.7	(60)	100
Courage to Report to Earn Justice	(324)	49.2	(335)	50.8	(659)	100
Fear to Report May be Transferred to Children	(25)	49.0	(26)	51.0	(51)	100
Home Training has No Effect on Crime Reporting	(14)	43.8	(18)	56.3	(32)	100
How Extended Family Connection Influences Reporting						
Encouragement	(99)	43.0	(131)	57.0	(230)	100
Sympathy	(48)	42.9	(64)	57.1	(112)	100
Cooperation Sometimes Conceals Household Crimes	(214)	46.9	(242)	53.1	(456)	100
Discouragement	(61)	62.2	(37)	37.8	(98)	100
Other	(31)	59.6	(21)	40.4	(52)	100

Source : Author's Field Survey, 2012

Table 3 : Resources that Boost and Encumbrances that Inhibit Respondents' Capacity for Crime

Police Practices that Inhibit Reporting Chi sq. p v = > .05	Respondents' Report of The Incident of Crime					
	Yes		No		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Effect of Traditional Crime Control on Reporting						
Referral	45.8	(77)	54.2	(91)	100	(168)
Through Partnership	47.1	(114)	52.9	(128)	100	(242)
Information	47.9	(116)	52.1	(126)	100	(242)
Provision of Back Up Resources	50.0	(104)	50.0	(104)	100	(208)
Community Place Compliant	47.7	(42)	52.3	(46)	100	(88)
Total	47.8	(453)	52.2	(495)	100	(948)
Taboos that Influence Crime Reporting	*Chi sq.* p value = < .05					
Reporting Crime Is Not The Norm	45.6	(47)	54.4	(56)	100	(103)
Women Do Not Report Crimes	38.9	(49)	61.1	(77)	100	(126)
Children Do Not Report Crimes	46.9	(150)	53.1	(170)	100	(320)
Incestuous Conduct Is A Private Affair	53.0	(178)	47.0	(158)	100	(336)
Taboos Do Not Exist	53.3	(24)	46.7	(21)	100	(45)
Others	27.8	(5)	72.2	(13)	100	(18)
Total	47.8	(453)	52.2	(495)	100	(948)
How Crime Reporting Ensures Community Safety						
Police Using Victims Reported Crime Data	(57)	48.0	(75)	56.8	(132)	100
Impartiality of Police In Law Enforcement	(72)	48.0	(78)	52.0	(150)	100
Punishment of Criminals	(60)	50.0	(60)	50.0	(120)	100
Protection of Crime Reporters	(96)	51.6	(90)	48.4	(186)	100
Creation of Awareness for other Community Residents	(27)	39.1	(42)	60.9	(69)	100
Safeguards Future Occurrence	(99)	45.2	(120)	54.8	(219)	100
Crime Reporting Cannot Cause Community Safety	(18)	54.5	(15)	45.5	(33)	100
Crime Reporting Can Lead to Earlier Crime Detection	(18)	54.5	(15)	45.5	(33)	100
Others	(6)	100.0	(0)	0.0	(6)	100

Source : Author's Field Survey, 2012