Research Paper   Open Access

Social Capital and Fear of Crime: A Test of Organizational Participation Effect in Nigeria

Adesina Shoyode (PhD)

Arkansas Department of Correction, Wrightsville Unit, P O Box 1000 Wrightsville AR 72183

ABSTRACT: Fear of crime has been a major research topic over the past several decades, due in part to the growing awareness that the consequences of fear reach beyond feelings of personal anxiety, and also because it affects people from all strata of life. Although a plethora of research has been conducted on the subject in the Western world, however, there remains a paucity of such study in developing countries like Nigeria. Thus, this study has as its primary objective to examine the effect of organizational participation on fear of crime in Nigerian context. To test this, the study used data from Afrobarometer Round 6, 2015-2016 on the quality of democracy and governance in Nigeria. To achieve the objective of the study, several analyses were conducted. Specifically, the study utilized descriptive statistics and correlation. The finding indicates that organizational and community groups participation in Nigerian does not allay fear of crime in the neighborhood and at home.

I.   BACKGROUND

The central focus of this study is to examine the effect of (if any) organizational participation, an element of social capital, on fear of crime in Nigeria. For the past 4 decades fear of crime has constituted an important topic among scholars especially in the field of social sciences (Lee, 2001), majorly because, it is a phenomenon that, if not controlled could have some adverse effects on individuals in particular and the community at large. Studies have shown that it undermines the quality of life, leads to anxiety, depression, and community withdrawal which consequently (i.e., the community withdrawal) could lead to disorder and crime (Box, Hale & Andrews 1988; Hale 1996). It has also been established to increase divisions between the rich and the poor (Putman 2000).

There are three main theoretical models in the explanation of the concept of fear of crime, these are: the vulnerability model, the disorder model and the social integration model. While the primary focus in the first and second model, i.e., vulnerability and disorder model is on what facilitates fear, the focus on social integration model is on what inhibits fear of crime (Franklin, Franklin and Fearn, 2008). The vulnerability model postulates that those who feel that they are unable to defend themselves, such as women, the elderly, individuals in low socio-economic resistance and crime victims will be more fearful of crime than the others (Alper and Chappell 2012; Franklin, et al., 2008). The disorder model posits that when there is an extensive form of incivilities in the community there will be an increase in fear of crime among the residents. This model originates from the broken windows perspective put forward by Wilson & Kelling (1982) that neighborhood incivilities influence perceptions of crime.

The social integration model from where the current study is framed out, argues that, those who are well socially integrated within their neighborhoods experience lower levels of fear of crime than those who are not as well integrated. In sum residents who become familiar with their neighbors and develop connectedness in their neighborhood would show lower level of fear (Franklin et al., 2008). This connectedness includes possessing personal investments in the neighborhood, having social ties to neighbors, and feeling emotional attachment to the community (Kanan & Pruitt, 2002). Other forms of connectedness include involvement in neighborhood activities, engaging in neighborhood information sharing, presence of friends or relatives living in the neighborhood (Bursik & Grasmick, 1993), and participation in formal organizations (Austin, Woolever, & Baba, 1994). This connectedness among the residents in the community creates a form of capital that is referred to as social capital (Farrell, 2007)

Social capital, according to Savage & Kanazawa (2002), is a resource obtained by social relationships with other human beings that can be employed for numerous benefits. It is the value inherent in social connections and reciprocities (Farrell, 2007). There is a plethora of scholarly work that has linked social capital to numerous socio-economic, psychological, and health benefits. For example, studies have shown that social capital improves the citizens' health (Putnam, 2000), improve the economic situation of individuals and or the community (Tiepoh, Nah, & Reimer, 2004), and increase educational performance (Putnam, 2000).

Studies have also demonstrated that social capital reduces suicide rates in the community (Helliwell, 2007), lower crime (Moore & Recker, 2016), victimization of crime (Hawdon & Ryan, 2009), and fear of crime (Sargeant, et al. 2017).

Although, there is a consensus among scholars on the socio-economic and health benefits of social capital to individuals and community at large, there is a divergent view on the specific role played by it in crime related situation. In addition, there is disagreement among scholars regarding the role played by each of its element in certain crime related situation. Some argue that social capital at large and each of its elements in particular helped reduce crime and fear of crime; others postulate that some of these elements affect differently (Moore & Recker, 2016; Deller and Deller (2010). In the view of Moore and Recker (2016) the reason why social capital is effective in some form of crime and not in others is because some crimes are most often committed behind the closed door, example violent crimes, and thus making social capital less effective in such situation.

In a study carried out in Dallas by Ferguson & Mindel (2007), several positive influences of social capital elements were found to lowering fear of crime; among these elements are, social support networks, neighborhood satisfaction, and collective efficacy. Also, in a study carried out by Sargeant et al. (2017), collective efficacy, an element of social capital, is found to have the strongest relationship to reduced fear of crime in the community. Whereas these studies and many others showed positive relationship between elements of social capital and fear of crime, others showed little or no significant impact of these elements on certain type of crime and fear of crime (McCrea, Shyy, Western & Stimson, 2005; Alper & Chappell 2012; Moore & Recker, 2016). In sum, scholars remain divided per the role social capital and its elements play in crime and fear of crime.

Interestingly, while there is abundance of studies on this subject in regards to fear of crime in the developed nations the reverse is the case in the developing nations like Nigeria. A review of the literature on fear of crime in Nigeria showed that none of the studies that have been carried out has specifically examined the influence of social capital on fear of crime in Nigeria. Few of the studies on fear of crime in Nigeria focus largely on factors that facilitate fear of crime rather than those factors that inhibit it. Some of the studies carried out in Nigeria include Adigun (2013), Adigun & Adedibu, (2013), Ayoyo, (2013, 2014).), Radda & Ndubueze (2013), Badiora, Ojewale, & Okunola, (2015). None has specifically examined the effects of social capital in general and its elements, especially organizational participation, on fear of crime. Thus, to fill the void in literature in Nigerian context, the current study, therefore, test the effect of organizational participation, an element of social capital, on fear of crime in Nigeria.

II.   THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Ab initio, the concept of social capital had been implicitly used for decades in social sciences to understand interconnectedness and social relations in the society long before Putman, Coleman, and Bourdieu popularized it (Farrell, 2007). It has been defined in various ways by various scholars, and thus, we have as many definitions of social capital as there are scholars in the field. Briefly put, it is generally referred to as a resource attained via social interactions with other human beings which can be utilized for various benefits (Savage & Kanazawa, 2002). Putnam (2000), defined it as the "connections among individuals—social networks and norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them … in a sense social capital is closely related to what some have called 'civic virtue'" (p. 19).

In general, the use of social capital in literature refers to the following themes, community (Taylor, 1982), trust (Fakuyama, 1995), reciprocity (Putnam, 2000: Taylor 1982),   interlocking network of relationships between individuals and groups (Putnam, 1993). Others include social norms (Putnam, 1993; Coleman, 1988), and collective efficacy (Sargeant et al. 2017; Sampson, 2001).

Basically, social capital derived much of its philosophical justification from a communitarian perspective (Taylor, 1982). Community is a "condition sine qua non" in social capital and the combined effect of the other themes produce a strong community. For social capital to grow, it has to involve the active and willing engagement of citizens within participating community (Onyx & Bullen, 2000). Trust in a social setting is the ability to take risk with the certainty, that others will react in a mutually beneficial way and with no intention to do harm (Onyx & Bullen, 2000).

Reciprocity is the ability to be selfless in the immediate and be egotist in the long-run (Taylor, 1982). In a community where the people have a high level of reciprocity, they will protect each other's interests ((Onyx & Bullen, 2000). Social norms are unwritten but commonly understood formulas both for determining what pattern of behavior are expected, valued or socially approved. In neighborhood where social capital is high, there is little crime and little need for formal policing because of high level of trust and various social norms (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995).

Collective efficacy refers to the shared expectations and mutual civic engagement by community members in local social control, with an emphasis on inhabitants' joint ability to act together to produce answers for neighborhood issues (Sampson, 2001). Examples of community safety initiatives grounded in principles of collective efficacy include neighborhood watch and public forums, in which community problems are discussed and locally driven solutions are generated.

Finally, the interlocking networks of relationship between individuals and groups mean voluntary association whereby everybody is equal. And for a community to generate social capital, the people have to act and relate together. It depends on a proclivity for sociability, but a spontaneous sociability, a capacity to form new associations and to cooperate within the terms of references they establish (Fukuyama, 1995). Putman sums all this up by suggesting that social capital refers to connections among individuals - social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them' (2000: 19). The social connectedness, according to Putnam (2000) can enhance community cohesiveness and on the other hand consolidate and perpetuate social divisions.

Putman differentiates two basic aspect (not 'either/or' categories) of social capital: bridging social capital and bonding social capital. The bridging social capital is the inclusive social networks that cut across various lines of social cleavage, linking people of different races, ages, and classes and so on. While the bonding social capital is the exclusive social networks that are bounded within a given social category (Putnam, 2004: 669). He states that the bridging social capital helps us 'get by' while the second helps us to 'get ahead'. Furthermore, Putman (2000) states that for the biggest collective problems bridging social capital is most needed but toughest to create (p. 363).

The implication of this important distinction is that social capital is both exclusive and inclusive. The social connectedness can on the one hand (and at the same time) enhance community cohesiveness while on the other it can consolidate and perpetuate social divisions. Szreter and Woolcock (2004) have been involved in one of the more recent and most sophisticated refinements in social capital theory in their elaboration of a third dimension of the concept, the idea of 'linking' social capital. They use 'linking' social capital to distinguish 'vertical' social relationships across power differentials, (particularly between the public and private spheres) from 'all those relationships that would otherwise be grouped together in the bridging social capital category' (P. 655).

In popular discourses the emphasis is often on volunteering, club membership and civic activity, and social capital is often understood as that which binds those of us who see ourselves as alike, particularly at neighborhood or community level. It is frequently understood as a normative 'thing' from which many benefits arise. Empirically it is often measured by proxies for civic and social activity, such as voting, newspaper readership, trust, volunteering, group membership and neighborhood relations. Conceptually, has been stretched to encompass three very different dimensions of social interaction and relationships (bonding, bridging and linking). Although social connections can be inclusive and exclusive and their purpose can be both positive and negative, the emphasis following Putnam has often been on the beneficial aspects of social capital.

III.   SOCIAL CAPITAL AND FEAR OF CRIME

There is no consensus among scholars on the effects of social capital and fear of crime. While some studies have proved that it inhibits fear of crime, others found no significant relationship between the two (Sargeant et al., 2017; Ferguson & Mindel, 2007; McCrae et al., 2012; Alper & Chappell, 2012; Moore & Recker, 2016). In addition to this, studies have also been carried out on how each element of social capital influences fear of crime with different results. For example, in a study of fear of crime and neighborhood satisfaction (an element of social capital) it was demonstrated that neighborhood satisfaction has effect on fear of crime (Alvi, Schwartz, DeKeseredy, and Maume, 2001; McCoy et al., 1996). Furthermore, McCoy et al. (1996) research showed that individual's overall level of dissatisfaction with the surrounding neighborhood was the best predictor of fear of crime.

In addition, research has showed that when an individual is victimized or directly and indirectly witnesses a victimization experience in his or her neighborhood, it can heighten his or her level of anxiety (Johnston, 2001). Other studies, however, have identified a weak relationship (Garofalo, 1979). The other elements of collective efficacy, social support network, and organizational participation have also all been individually studied to determine their influence on fear of crime with conflicting results. As with the other elements of social capital, the role of collective efficacy in predicting fear of crime is clouded by contradictory findings. While some studies have shown the functionality of some of the programs of the collective efficacy such as Neighborhood Watch in lowering neighborhood fear of crime, other research indicated that such program will only heighten the levels of fear of crime in the neighborhood (Gibson et al.; 2002; Lee & Earnest, 2003; Stein, 2014; Zhao et al. (2002)

Jackson (2004) finds perceptions of social cohesion and neighborhood informal social control partially mediate the relationship between perceptions of disorder and risk perceptions. Swatt et al. (2013), on the other hand, find contradictory results within their own study: collective efficacy directly predicts fear of crime in two out of the four Colorado neighborhoods they investigate. And Sargeant et al. (2017) found that among the various elements of social capital, collective efficacy a non-comparable element, which has the strongest relationship to a lowered fear of crime.

Evidence of social support network influence on reducing anxiety and fear of crime is also less clear (Ferguson & Mindell, 2007). In Agnew (1985), it is demonstrated that participation in social support networks can improve the ability of an individual in the community to access information and human and material resources, and thus lower the commencement of incidents of victimization. Other studies revealed the reverse. In Thompson & Krause (1998) it was demonstrated that being ingrained in social support networks had no effect in reducing feelings of anxiety and vulnerability related to one's residence in crime-ridden neighborhoods. Contrarily, Sacco (1993) corroborated that increased participation in social networks actually heighted residents' feelings of anxiety about being victimized by neighborhood crime.

Rupasingha, Goetz, and Freshwater (2006) attempted to measure different forms of social capital by dividing organizations into Olson-type (O-Groups) and Putnam-type (P-Groups). O-Groups were organized as rent-seeking organizations where individuals have a financial incentive to form and join groups. P-Groups were organizations that involved societal interaction, which promoted trust and cooperation within a community. Rupasingha et al. (2006) concluded that, overall, P-Groups are a better indicator of social capital than O-Groups. Moore and Recker (2016) in furtherance to the study of social capital divided it into specific measures and classified it as P-Group, O-Group, and R-Group parochial control measures. They classified the P-Group measures as religious organizations, civic organizations, and nonprofit organizations. These organizations are places where individuals converge in public and develop social networks and promote trust and cooperation. The O-Group measures comprised of business organizations, political organizations, and labor organizations. These organizations are based on acquiring financial and economic rewards as a result of membership for the individuals in these groups. The R-Group measures were made up of bowling centers, fitness centers, and the number of public golf courses. These were seen as areas where individuals engage in recreational activities. Their findings revealed that in the aggregate form, social capital is an effective tool in reducing crime in neighborhoods. However, when examined separately, results indicate that some of the variables used to measure social capital increase crime (Moore & Recker, 2016).

The P-Group measures did significantly reduce property crime. In particular, religious organizations reduce total, property, and violent crime in counties across the United States. The civic organization rate was not significant for total or property crime. Within the classification of the O-Group, only the business organization reduced crime while political and labor organizations increase crime within a neighborhood. And in R-Group, only the organizations that promote group bonds such as bowling centers and golfs courses reduce crime while solitary fitness clubs increase crime. Thus, from Moore and Recker (2016) analysis, one could infer that, the crime-reducing organizations could also inhibit fear of crime. It is based on this inference that the current study hypothesizes that the religious organizations and community group membership as classified under the P-Group by Moore and Recker (2016) will serve as inhibitors of fear of crime in Nigeria.

IV.   METHOD

Data Source and Sample
The primary objective of this study is to examine the effect of organizational participation on fear of crime in Nigerian context. To test this, the study used data from Afrobarometer Round 6, 2015-2016 on the quality of democracy and governance in Nigeria. Afrobarometer used the 2006 population and housing census of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to draw their sample size of 2,400, which consisted of citizens of Nigeria who are 18 years old and above. The sample design was made to reflect every group within the country including the rural and urban dwellers; it was nationally representative, random, clustered, stratified, and multi-stage area probability sample.

The country was divided into strata from where the Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) was drawn. To get the PSU, Afrobarometer used probability proportionate to population size (PPPS) and 8 households per PSU were drawn. The first point of the household was randomly selected, then was followed by walk pattern using 5/10 interval. The final selection which involved the selection of an individual respondent from each household was gender quota filled by alternating interviews between men and women respondents of appropriate gender listed, after which household member draws a numbered card to select individuals. The contact rate according to Afrobarometer was 89.9% and the response rate was 69.5%.

Measures
Dependent Variable
Fear of crime is the dependent variable for this study. And to measure this, Afrobarometer asked from the respondent this question, "Over the past year, how often, if ever, have you or anyone in your family: Felt unsafe

walking in your neighborhood?" The values are: 0-4, 9, 98, and 98. For 0 = Never, 1 = Just once, 2 = Several times, 3 = Many times, 9 = Don't know, 98 = Refused to answer, and -1 = Missing. Furthermore, respondents were asked: "Over the past year, how often, if ever, have you or anyone in your family: Feared crime in your own home?" The values for this question are the same as the above.

Independent Variables

The independent variable for the study is organizational participation. Specifically, the study examines the effects of religious organizational participation and membership in voluntary/community groups on fear of crime. To measure this, the respondents were asked whether they are an official leader, an active member, an inactive member, or not a member of a religious and voluntary/community group? The values are: 0-3, 9, 98, -1. While 0=Not a Member, 1=Inactive member, 2=Active member, 3=Official leader, 9=Don't know, 98=Refused to answer, -1=Missing.

The demographic distribution of the study respondents is presented in Table 1. The respondents are evenly split based on gender, 50.2% male and 49.8% female, with an average age of 31 years (SD = 10.60). About 52.6% were employed. The majority of the respondents' educational level falls into senior high school or below (63.8%), while 27.3% have higher educational level. About 43.6% of the respondents dwelled in the rural areas while 56.4% dwelled in the urban areas. (Afrobarometer, 2016).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of participants in the study

Study Variables			Mean (SD)%
Age (min. = 18 and max. = 56-101)			31.78 (10.60)
Male			50.2
Employed			52.6
Education			
Senior high school or below			63.8
More than senior high school			27.3
Urban-rural divide			
Rural			56.4
Urban			43.6
Religious Groups Membership Status			
Active member			41.5
Inactive member			17.5
Not a member			39.3
Voluntary Association/Community Group			
Active member			27.6
Inactive member			18.5
Not a member			52.2
Fear of Crime			
Felt unsafe walking in neighbourhood			38.6
Feared crime in the home			33.3
Afrobarometer, 2016			

Plan of analysis

To achieve the primary objective of the study, several analyses were conducted. Specifically, the study utilized descriptive statistics and correlation. A correlation matrix was used as a bivariate technique to determine the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable and to assess whether such relationships were significant.

Results

The table 2 below shows the individual correlation between organizational participation (religious group membership and voluntary association or community membership) and fear of crime (how often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood) at a significant level of p<0.01.

The Pearson correlation between religious group membership and how often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood is 0.061 and the significant level is p=0.003<0.01. This shows that there is a very weak significant positive relationship between being a member of a religious group and feeling unsafe to walk around in the neighborhood. This implies that, the more the organizational participation in religious groups, the more the people felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood. In essence, organizational participation in religious groups could not allay the fear of crime in terms of safety feeling about walking in the neighborhood. Consequently, the Pearson correlation points to the fact that organizational participation in religious groups is not absolute (very

weak relationship) in determining the individual safety level or fear of crime. Hence, organizational participation in religious groups, only to a certain extent made the respondents felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood.

Similarly, the Pearson correlation between voluntary association or community group membership and how often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood is 0.106 and the significant level is p=0.000<0.01. This shows that there is a very weak significant positive relationship between being a member of a voluntary association or community group and how often they felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood. This implies that, the more the organizational participation in voluntary association or community groups, the more the people often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood. In essence, organizational participation in voluntary association or community group could not allay the fear of crime in terms of safety feeling about walking in the neighborhood. Subsequently, the Pearson correlation points to the fact that organizational participation in voluntary association or community activities is not absolute (very weak relationship) in determining the individual safety level or fear of crime. Hence, organizational participation in voluntary association or community groups, only to a certain extent made respondents felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood.

In addition, the table (i.e., table 2) shows that the relationship between voluntary association or community group participation and how often respondents felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood is higher when compared with the relationship with religious group participation.

Table 2. Correlation between Organizational Participation (Religious Group Membership and Voluntary Association or Community Membership) and Fear of Crime (How often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood)

		Religious Group Membership	Voluntary Association or Community Group Membership
How often felt unsafe walking in the neighbourhood	Pearson Correlation	0.061[**]	0.106[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.003	0.000
	N	2400	2400
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Table 3 shows the individual correlation between organizational participation (religious group membership and voluntary association or community membership) and fear of crime (how often feared crime in the home) at a significant level of p<0.01.

The Pearson correlation between religious group membership and how often feared crime in the home is 0.1 and the significant level is p=0.000<0.01. This shows that there is a very weak significant positive relationship between being a member of a religious group and often fear of crime in the home. This suggests that, the more the organizational participation in religious groups, the more the people feared crime in the home. In essence, organizational participation in religious groups could not allay the fear of crime in the home. Hereinafter, the Pearson correlation points to the fact that organizational participation in religious groups is not absolute (very weak relationship) in determining the individual safety level or fear of crime. Hence, organizational participation in religious groups, only to a certain extent made the respondents fear crime in the home.

Comparably, the Pearson correlation between how often feared crime in the home and voluntary association or community group membership is 0.133 and the significant level is p=0.000<0.01. This indicates that there is a very weak significant positive relationship between being a member of a voluntary association or community group and how often the respondents felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood. In other words, the more the organizational participation in voluntary association or community groups, the more the people feared crime in the home. In essence, organizational participation in voluntary association or community group could not allay the fear of crime in the home. Henceforward, the Pearson correlation points to the fact that organizational participation in voluntary association or community activities is not absolute (very weak relationship) in determining the individual safety level or fear of crime. Hence, organizational participation in voluntary association or community groups, only to a certain extent made respondents the feared crime in the home.

In addition, from table 3, it shows that the relationship between voluntary association or community group participation and how often respondents feared crime in home is higher when compared with its relationship with religious group participation.

Table 3. Correlation between Organizational Participation (Religious Group Membership and Voluntary Association or Community Group Membership) and Fear of Crime (How often feared Crime in the Home)

		Religious Group Membership	Voluntary Association or Community Group Membership
How often feared crime in home	Pearson Correlation	0.100[**]	0.133[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000
	N	2400	2400
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)			

Multiple Regression

The effect of how organizational participation (i.e. Religious Group Membership/Voluntary Association or Community Group Membership) predict or allay fear of crime (i.e. How often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood and How often feared Crime in the Home) was tested using multiple regression analysis.

a. Multiple Regression on how Organizational Participation predict fear of crime (i.e. How often felt unsafe walking in the neighbourhood)

Table 4a shows the regression summary, R value = 0.106 represents the simple correlation which indicates a low degree of correlation between Religious Group Membership and the two variables tested. From the same regression summary – table 4a, R Square value = 0.01 shows that fear of crime (i.e. How often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood) variable is only about 1% predictable using participation in organizational activities (i.e Religious Group/Voluntary Association or Community Membership).

In addition, in table 4a, under the change statistics, it shows that the regression model significantly predicts fear of crime (i.e. How often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood) as p = 0.000<0.05. In other words, both independent variables analyzed, i.e., membership of religious organization and community groups, have significant effect on fear of crime (i.e. how often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood).

In furtherance to the information provided on table 4a, the standard error of the estimate = 1.24129 and this is a litmus test indicating the validity of the data analyzed. Hence, the result of this analysis can be trusted.

Lastly, table 4b shows that fear of crime (i.e. how often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood) can be predicted significantly by the two independent variables of organizational participation (i.e. Religious Group Membership and Voluntary Association or Community Group Membership) by the formula below;

$Y = 0.709 - 0.004X_1 + 0.096X_2 + 1.24129$

Where   Y = Fear of crime (i.e. How often felt unsafe walking in the neighborhood)

X_1 = Member of a Religious Group

X_2 = Member of Voluntary Association or Community Group

Table 4a. Regression Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
	.106[a]	.011	.010	1.24129	.011	13.691	2	2397	.000

Table 4b. Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.709	.034		21.045	.000
Member of a Religious Group	-.004	.022	-.004	-.164	.870
Member of Voluntary Association or Community Group	.096	.022	.109	4.293	.000
a. Dependent Variable: HOW OFTEN FELT UNSAFE WALKING IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD					

b. ***Multiple Regression on how Organizational Participation predict fear of crime (i.e. How often feared crime in home)***

From table 5a which shows the regression summary, R value = 0.135 represents the simple correlation which indicates a low degree of correlation between Religious Group Membership and the two variables tested. From the same regression summary – table 5a, R Square value = 0.017 shows that fear of crime (i.e. How often feared crime in home) variable is only about 1.7% predictable using participation in organizational activities (i.e Religious Group/Voluntary Association or Community Membership).

Also, table 5a under the change statistics, shows that the regression model significantly predicts fear of crime (i.e. How often feared crime in home) as p = 0.000<0.05. In other words, both independent variables analyzed have significant effect on fear of crime (How often feared crime in home).

In addition to the information provided on table 5a, the standard error of the estimate = 1.22136 and this is a litmus test indicating the validity of the data analysed. Hence, the result of this analysis can be trusted.

Lastly, table 5b shows that fear of crime (how often feared crime in home) can be predicted significantly by the two variables of organizational participation (i.e. Religious Group Membership/Voluntary Association or Community Group Membership) by the formula below;

$$Y = 0.566 + 0.028X_1 + 0.099X_2 + 1.22136$$

Where   Y = Fear of crime (i.e. How often feared crime in home)
X_1 = Member of a Religious Group
X_2 = Member of Voluntary Association or Community Group

Table 5a. Regression Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
	.135[a]	.018	.017	1.22136	.018	22.302	2	2397	.000

Table 5b. Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.566	.033		17.069	.000
Member of a Religious Group	.028	.022	.032	1.269	.205
Member of Voluntary Association or Community Group	.099	.022	.114	4.501	.000
a. Dependent Variable: HOW OFTEN FEARED CRIME IN HOME					

V.   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Fear of crime has been a major research topic over the past several decades, due in part to the growing awareness that the consequences of fear reach beyond feelings of personal anxiety, and also because it affects people from all strata of life. Although a plethora of research has been conducted on the subject in the Western world, however, there remains a paucity of such study in developing countries like Nigeria. It is based on this problem that the current study has examined organizational participation effect on fear of crime in Nigeria. The study is based on the hypothesis that, organizational participation plays a big role in allaying fear of crime in the neighborhood and at home. This assumption is based on the social capital model.

Social capital has been referred to as a resource attained via social interactions with other human beings (Savage & Kanazawa, 2002) or connections among individuals (Putman, 2000). While it is agreed by some scholars that social capital as a whole inhibits fear of crime others find no evidence to support this (Sargeant et al., 2017; Ferguson & Mindel, 2007; McCrae et al., 2012; Alper & Chappell, 2012; Moore & Recker, 2016). Furthermore, disagreements persist among scholars per the specific role played by each elements of social capital in allaying fear of crime. Scholars have found that some of these elements play more significant role than the others in the study of fear of crime. For example, the role of collective efficacy, an element of social capital, in predicting fear of crime is mixed. Whereas some studies have shown that it is negatively related to fear of crime (Sargeant et al. 2017; Lee & Earnest, 2003; Stein, 2014), others found no evidence (Zhao et al. 2002; Swatt et al. 2013).

Furthermore, Thompson & Krause (1998) discovered that embeddedness in social support networks had no effect on allaying feelings of anxiety and vulnerability related to one's residence in crime-ridden neighborhoods. Conversely, Sacco (1993) found that increased participation in social networks actually intensified residents' feelings of anxiety about being victimized by neighborhood crime. It is partially based on this lack of consistency among scholars that the current study was carried out to test the veracity of the organizational participation, an elements of social capital. To test this, the study used Afrobarometer data (R6) collected through survey in Nigeria from 2014-2016. Two variables from the data were used to measure organizational participation, which are membership of religious organization, and membership of community group. Furthermore, two variables were used to measure fear of crime, they are: how often the respondents felt unsafe walking their neighborhood and how often they feared crime in their homes.

The preliminary results of the analysis showed that majority of the respondents feel relatively safe when walking in their neighborhood and in their homes. However, a large fraction (over 30 %) of the respondents did not feel safe walking in their neighborhood and in their homes. And when the study hypothesis was tested, the result revealed a positive (although weak) significant relationship between organizational participation and fear of crime. In other words, the analysis revealed that, the higher the level of organizational and community group participation, the higher the level of fear of crime. Thus, organizational and community groups participation in Nigerian context does not allay fear of crime in the neighborhood and at home as hypothesized.

Given the religiosity of the people, one would have expected that religious group participation will play a strong role in allaying fear of crime among the people, but this is not the case in the current study. The outcome of this study buttress Alper & Chappell (2012) finding that organizational participation is not significantly correlated with either fear of personal crime or fear of violent crime. Furthermore, the finding in this study is also similar to the conclusion reached by Ross and Jang (2000) in their study on the buffering role of social ties with neighbors; they concluded that informal participation was a significant predictor of fear.

Although, the data and methodology used in the current study do not permit firm conclusion, it is possible to speculate why organizational participation has no significant effect in inhibiting fear of crime in Nigerian context. One possible reason for this is that participation in these groups, i.e., both religious and community groups help connect the people more with their neighbors and community thereby making them more conscious of the crime going on in their surroundings.

The finding in this study extends our understanding of fear of crime in the Nigerian context, previous research carried out in Nigeria has examined the concept of fear of crime but none has specifically examined the role played by elements of social capital in allaying fear of crime. Few of the studies on fear of crime in Nigeria only focus on factors that facilitate fear of crime (Adigun, 2013; Adigun & Adedibu; 2013; Ayoyo, 2013, 2014; Radda & Ndubueze; 2013; Badiora, Ojewale, & Okunola, 2015). Thus, by introducing an element of social capital – organizational participation in the study of fear of crime in Nigeria, the current study has added to the body of knowledge in the Nigerian context.

The present study is not without limitations, and these must be acknowledged. Firstly, this study used secondary data from Afrobarometer survey which was primarily designed to explore the quality of democracy and governance in Nigeria, which made it impossible to ask further questions regarding the subject matter. Secondly, the measure of fear of crime in the study is solely based on the general measures used by Afrobarometer, which may not have accurately measured the specific crime that the respondents fear. Thus, there is suggestion on several courses for future research. Scholars should attempt to replicate and expand the result in the current study from the Nigerian context. And, although the current study sees organizational participation as not an inhibitor of fear of crime in Nigerian context, it is interesting to note that the prelim results of the study identify a larger percentage of the respondents (70%) as feeling safe at home and in their neighborhoods. Thus, future study should strive to identify those factors that inhibit fear of crime or make them feel safe at home and in their neighborhood.

REFERENCES

[1].   Adigun, F. O. (2013) Residential Differentials in Incidence and Fear of Crime Perception in Ibadan. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences. Vol.3, No.10. P. 96-105.

[2].   Adigun & Adedibu (2013) Correlates of Residents' Response to Crime in Nigerian Cities.Global Journal of Human Social Science Political Science. Volume 13 Issue 5 Version 1.0

[3].   Agnew, R. S. (1985). Neutralizing the impact of crime. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 12(2),   221-239.

[4].   Alper, M., & Chappell, A. T. (2012) Untangling Fear of Crime: A Multi Theoretical   Approach to Examining the Causes of Crime-Specific Fear. Sociological Spectrum, 32: 346–363, 2012.

[5].   Alvi, S., Schwartz, M. D., DeKeseredy, W. S., & Maume, M. O. (2001). Women's fear of crime in Canadian public housing. Violence Against Women, 7, 638-661.

[6].   Austin, D., Woolever, C., & Baba, Y. (1994). Crime and safety-related concerns in a small community. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 19, 79-97.

[7].   Ayoyo, D. D. (2014) A Study of the Socio-Demographic Aspects of Fear of Crime in Akure, Nigeria. Scottish Journal of Arts, Social Sciences, and Scientific Studies. Vol. 21,   Issue 11. P. 96-110

[8].   Ayoyo, D. D. (2013) Fear of Crime and Coping Strategies: Implications for Bank Safety and Customers' Patronage In Ikare, Southwest Nigeria. British Journal of Arts and Social   Sciences. Vol.12 No.I. P 52-68.

[9].   Badiora, A. I., Ojewale, O. S., & Okunola, O. H. (2015) Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime in Public Transport Nodes: The Experience from Nigerian Transit Environment. `International   Journal   of Criminal Justice Sciences Vol 10 Issue 2. P. 139-151.

[10].   Box, S., C. Hale and G. Andrews (1988) 'Explaining Fear of Crime', British Journal of   Criminology 28: 340–536.

[11].   Bursik, R.J. and H.G. Grasmick (1993) Neighbourhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of   Effective Community Control. New York: Lexington Books.

[12].   Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal   of Sociology, 94, S95-S120.

[13].   Deller, S. C., & Deller, M. A. (2010). Rural crime and social capital. Growth and Change, 41, 221-275.

[14].   Doran, B. J. & B. G. Lees. 2005. ''Investigating The Spatiotemporal Links between   Disorder, Crime, and the Fear of Crime.'' The Professional Geographer 57:1–12.

[15].   Fukuyama, F. (1995). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. New York: Free Press

[16].   Farrell, C. (2007) Thinking Critically about Social Capital. Irish Journal of Sociology Vol. 16.2,2007, pp. 27-49. ISSN 0791-6035.

[17].   Ferguson, K.M. and C. Mindel (2007) 'Modeling Fear of Crime in Dallas Neighbourhoods: A   Test of Social Capital Theory', Crime & Delinquency 53: 322–336.

[18].   Franklin, T. W., Franklin, C. A., & Fearn, N. E. (2008). ''A Multilevel Analysis of the Vulnerability, Disorder, and Social Integration Models of Fear of Crime.''   Social   Justice Research 21:204–227.

[19].   Garofalo, J. (1979). Victimization and the fear of crime. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16(1), 80-97.

[20].   Gibson, C., Zhao, J., Lovrich, N., & Gaffney, M. (2002). Social integration, individual   perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. Justice Quarterly,   19, 537-564.

[21].   Hale, Chris. (1996). ''Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature.'' International Review of Victimology 4(2):79–150.

[22].   Hawdon, J., & Ryan, J. (2009). Social capital, social control, and changes in victimization rates. Crime & Delinquency, 55, 526-549.

[23].   Helliwell, P. J. (2007). Suicide amongst anaesthetists-in-training. Anaesthesia, 38,   1097.

[24].   Hinkle, J. C. & D. Weisburd. 2008. ''The Irony of Broken Windows Policing: A Micro-Place Study of the Relationship between Disorder, Focused Police Crackdowns   and Fear of Crime.'' Journal of Criminal Justice 36:503–512.

[25].   Hunter, Albert. 1978. ''Symbols of Incivility: Social Disorder and Fear of Crime in Urban Neighborhoods.'' Presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of   Criminology,   Dallas, TX.

[26].   Jackson, J. (2004) 'Experience and Expression: Social and Cultural Significance in the Fear   of Crime', British Journal of Criminology 44(6): 946–66.

[27].   Johnston, L. (2001). Crime, fear and civil policing. Urban Studies, 38, 959-976.

[28].   Kanan, J.W. and M.V. Pruitt (2002) 'Modeling Fear of Crime and Perceived Victimization Risk: The (In)significance of Neighborhood Integration', Sociological Inquiry 72(4):   527–48.

[29].   Kruger, D. J., Hutchison, P., Monroe, M. G., Reischl, T., & Morrel-Samuels, S. (2007).   Assault injury rates, social capital, and fear of neighborhood crime. Journal of   Community Psychology, 35, 483-498.

[30].   Lee, M. (2001) The Genesis of "Fear of Crime". Theoretical Criminology. Vol 5 (4): 467-   485.

[31].   Lee, M.R. and T.L. Earnest (2003) 'Perceived Community Cohesion and Perceived Risk of Victimization: A Cross-national Analysis', Justice Quarterly 20: 131–57.

[32].   McCrea, R., T.K. Shyy, J. Western and R.J. Stimson (2005) 'Fear of Crime in Brisbane: Individual, Social and Neighbourhood Factors in Perspective', Journal of Sociology   41: 7–27.

[33].   McCoy, H. V., Wooldredge, J. D., Cullen, F. T., Dubeck, P. J., & Browning, S. L. (1996). Lifestyles of the old and not so fearful: Life situation and older persons' fear of crime.   Journal   of   Criminal Justice, 24, 191-205.

[34].   Møller, V. (2016). Living with crime: Does crime affect victims' perceived quality of life? South African Crime Quarterly, 9, 25–30.

[35]. Moore, M. D., & Recker, N. L. (2016) Social Capital, Type of Crime, and Social Control Crime & Delinquency 2016, Vol. 62(6) 728–747

[36]. National Population Commission 2017 http://population.gov.ng/

[37]. Onyx, J., & P. Bullen (2000). Measuring Social Capital in Five Communities. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science; 36; 23

[38]. Perkins, D.D. and R.B. Taylor (1996) 'Ecological Assessments of Community Disorder: Their Relationship to Fear of Crime and Theoretical Implications', American Journal of Community Psychology 24(1): 63–107.Putnam, R. D. (1993, Spring). The prosperous community. Social capital and public life. The American Prospect, 35- 42.

[39]. Putnam, R. (1993) Making Democracy Work. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

[40]. Putnam, R. D. (1995, December). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. The 1995 Ithiel de Sola Pool lecture. Political Science and Politics, 664-683.

[41]. Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster.

[42]. Putnam, R. (2004) 'Commentary: 'Health by Association': some comments', International Journal of Epidemiology, 33 (4): 667-71.

[43]. Radda, S. I & Ndubueze, P. N. (2013) Fear of On-line Victimization Among Undergraduate Students: A Comparative Study of Two Selected Urban Universities. African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies: AJCJS, Vol.7, #s1 &2. P 35-46.

[44]. Rader, N. E., & Haynes, S. H. (2011) Gendered Fear of Crime Socialization: An Extension of Akers's Social Learning Theory. Feminist Criminology 6(4) 291–307.

[45]. Ross, Catherine E. and Sung J. Jang. 2000. ''Neighborhood Disorder, Fear, and Mistrust: The Buffering Role of Social Ties with Neighbors.'' American Journal of Community Psychology 28:401–420.

[46]. Rupasingha, A., Goetz, S. J., & Freshwater, D. (2006). The production of social capital in US counties. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 35, 83-101.

[47]. Sampson, R. J. (2001). Crime and public safety: Insights from community-level perspectives on social capital. In S. Saegert, J. P. Thompson, & M. R. Warren (Eds.), Social capital and poor communities (pp. 89-114). New York: Russell Sage.

[48]. Sargeant, E., Liu, Y., St John, N., Hong, N., Huu, T., Chen, J., & Mazerolle, L. (2017) Social capital and fear of crime in Brisbane. Journal of Sociology 2017, Vol. 53(3) 637–652.

[49]. Savage, J., & Kanazawa, S. (2002). Social Capital, Crime, and Human Nature. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, Vol. 18 No. 2, P. 188-211.

[50]. Saville, G. (2009). SafeGrowth: Moving forward in neighbourhood development. Built Environment, 35, 386–402.

[51]. Skogan, W. (1986). Fear of crime and neighborhood change. Crime and Justice, 8, 203–229.

[52]. Sprott, J. B.,Webster, C. M., & Doob, A. N. (2013). Punishment severity and confidence in the criminal justice system 1. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 55, 279–292.

[53]. Stafford, M., Chandola, T., & Marmot, M. (2007). Association between fear of crime and mental health and physical functioning. American Journal of Public Health, 97, 2076– 2081.

[54]. Stein, R. E. (2014) 'Neighborhood Residents' Fear of Crime: A Tale of Three Cities', Sociological Focus 47: 121–39.

[55]. Swatt, M.L., S.P. Varano, C.D. Uchida and S.E. Solomon (2013) 'Fear of Crime, Incivilities, and Collective Efficacy in Four Miami Neighbourhoods', Journal of Criminal Justice 41: 1–11.

[56]. Szreter, S. and M. Woolcock (2004) 'Health by Association? Social Capital, Social Theory and the Political Economy of Public Health', International Journal ofEpidemiology, 33 (4): 650-67.

[57]. Taylor, M. (1982). Community, anarchy and liberty. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[58]. Tiepoh, M., Nah, G., & Reimer, B. (2004). Social capital, information flows, and income creation in rural Canada: A cross community analysis. The Journal of Socio- Economics, 33, 427-448.

[59]. Thompson, E. E., & Krause, N. (1998). Living alone and neighborhood characteristics as predictors of social support in late life. Journal of Gerontology, 53B, S354-364.

[60]. Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L., (1982). Broken Windows. Atlantic Monthly, 249 (3) 29-38.

[61]. Zhao, J.S., C. Gibson, N. Lovrich and M. Gaffney (2002) 'Participation in Community Crime Prevention: Are Volunteers More or Less Fearful of Crime than Other Citizens?', Journal of Crime and Justice 25: 41–61.