

AKSU Journal of Social Sciences (AKSUJOSS)
ISSN: 2504 – 933X
Vol.4,No.1(April)2024,pp.1-13
DOI:https:// doi.org/10.61090/aksujoss.2024.001
URL: htpp://www.aksujournal.com/vol.4.1

Received: **1st February, 2024**
Accepted: **3rd March, 2024**
Published online: **1st April, 2024**

Community-Based Organisations and Crime Management in Nigeria: A Study of Rural and Urban Centres of Akwa Ibom State

Aniekan Sampson Brown
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
aniekanbrown@uniyyo.edu.ng

&

Okoro Sunday Asangausung
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
Akwa Ibom State University, Obio Akpa Campus, Nigeria
okoroasangausung@aksu.edu.ng

&

Nkereuwem Ndarake James
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
nkereuwemndarake@gmail.com
&
Akaninyene E. Bassey
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria
danielbassey2527@gmail.com

Abstract

The complementary potency of Community-Based Organisations (CBOs) to government efforts informed the need for this study on "CBOs and crime management in Nigeria: a study of rural and urban centers of Akwa Ibom". It aimed at appraising the role of CBOs in crime management, the effectiveness of such roles, and the possible factors that affect the CBOs in their bid to contribute to crime management with emphasis on a comparative analysis of such realities in urban and rural centers. The study was guided by the assumptions of the Goal Theory made popular by McClelland, Humble, Locke, and Cole. Utilizing the survey research method, a multi-stage sampling technique was employed to select two hundred and forty (240) respondents who were of value and the chi-square test was the instrument for statistical analysis. Emerging

data showed that CBOs had not played significant roles in the management of crime, there was a similitude in roles played by the CBOs irrespective of the center, and there were urban-rural based differences in the kind of problems the CBOs experienced. In the main, the study acknowledged that CBOs are capable of contributing positively to crime management; but they should be intentional and more focused on managing crime in their areas of operation.

Keywords: Community-Based Organizations, Crime Management, Rural Centre, Urban Centre

Introduction

Judging from media reports, public attitudes and government responses, it is evident that available institutions and agencies for managing crime in the Nigerian society have been overwhelmed by its incidence and rate of increase (Brown & Okorie, 2014; Asangausung et al. 2022). In response to the helplessness of the national establishments to effectively combat crime (Okorie et al. 2020; Okorie et al. 2021), the Nigerian government has tended to emphasise the need for concerted efforts in the fight against crime. Community-based organizations (CBOs) have been identified as bodies that can play critical roles in this new approach to crime fighting in Nigeria (Brown, 2006; Okorie, 2023).

Little empirical research has, however, investigated the actual performance of CBOs concerning crime management in Nigeria, suggesting a need for further research. The present study is aimed at evaluating the role and performance of CBOs in the management of crime in rural and urban areas. It focuses on Akwa Ibom State and addresses the following questions: What roles do CBOs play in crime control and management? What has been the performance of CBOs in crime control and management in rural and urban areas? And, what factors affect the role and performance of CBOs in the management and control of crime? Undoubtedly, answers to these questions will have serious policy implications and can contribute to plans and programmes to effectively combat crime in the Nigerian society.

Conceptual and Theoretical Discourse

Rural-Urban Realities

In terms of rural and urban community realities, Tonnies' (1987) concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft present the threshold for considering the differences or similarities between rural and urban types of communities. In his was a bipolar conception. Sequel to these idealised modes of differentiation, several very general differences between rural and urban places has been identified. These differences are based on: size of place; population density and composition; closeness to nature; predominant occupation; simplicity of culture; social interaction, social differentiation; social stratification; social mobility; social control as well as levels and standards of living (Ekong, 2003).While the rural type is closer to nature, simpler in culture, and lower in levels and standards of living, the urban type assumes the opposite. Even a cursory assessment of the characteristics suggests that some urban traits tend to enhance criminality (Palen, 1993). However, the reality that the bipolar society type is merely ideal grants value to Ekong (2003) which finds Nigeria – and indeed Akwa Ibom State as a classical example of a society within the continuum (rural-urban).

Management Issues

Management has been defined in a variety of ways but mainly within the twin confines of functional and structural biases (Marshall, 1988; Cole, 1996; George and Jones, 1996; and Akpakpan, 1991). Every need for management suggests the existence of task(s). To this end, community-based organizations constitute the structure of management (the persons to perform

management functions), while their drive to reduce crime underscores the functional indicators. Simply put, the operational value of management as a concept here hinges on prevention, surveillance, reporting, control, and combat. In this case, the organizations must be driven by the goal of managing crime (Cole, 1998).

Issues on Crime

Whether in urban or rural areas, crime is a law-violating behaviour of an adult which, if detected by a (willing) appropriate authority, would expose the actor to legally prescribed sanctions. The characteristics related to sex, age, socio-economic status, location/residence, etc. In the main though, crime is understood from the standpoint of behaviourism. A permissive philosophy holds that the criminal is not responsible for his/her crimes against society, but that society is responsible. Richard M. Nixon, however, disagrees but posits: *"…society is guilty of crime only when we fail to bring the criminal to justice. When we fail to make the criminal pay for his crime, we encourage him to think that crime will pay"* (Scarpitti, 1984:379).

A residual assessment of the sociological theories shows that the problems of urbanisation include poverty (Weatherburn& Lind 1998; and Mayer, 1998), unemployment (Walsh and Poole, 1983:227), corruption (McMullan, 1961), drug abuse and high technology (Dambazau, 1997) are major social and environmental causes of crime. In addition, mention is also made of the fact that crime is said to be on the increase in the urban centres (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1989; Asangausung et al. 2022); and that it is mainly a youth affair. Thus, while contributing to the demographic analysis of crime at the instance of age and sex, (Palen, 1993) asserts that crime is an activity of the young with about 90 per cent of arrests for violent crimes being of males.

Crime comes in types, and depending on the prevalence of crime type and the cultural realities of specific areas, the styles of policing tend to vary (Okorie et al. 2021). Thus, Alderson opines that styles vary according to cultural, religious, legal and political systems. Such styles include informal, passive, punitive, and preventive policing. Policing could also be repressive whose main duty is to serve a strong or alienated government. This style thus seeks to support governments that lack popular support. There is also the case of communal policing which entails four distinct styles of social control through community effort or a mixture of community and government efforts as opposed to only the effort of government. The sub-styles include primitive-communal; totalitarian-communal; unofficial-communal; and democratic-communal (Alderson, 1999). In acknowledgment of this, Barlow (1996) submits that these variations and complexities have made comparative studies very necessary.

In sum, there have been collective reactions to crime such as the establishment of community groups to reduce residents' risks of victimisation, e.g. neighbourhood watch programmes (vigilante); but it has been unclear whether they are effective (Micthe, 1995). Evan Berman doubts the level of effectiveness and so submits that for collective reactions to be effective, a sound network of multiple organizations must be established with the leadership stoutly facilitating the mobilisation of members and implementing decisions on a consensual note (Berman, 1998).

Theoretical Framework

The nature of this study demands that emphasis be placed on the Goal Theory. The theory was popularized by McClelland (1961), Humble (1967), Locke (1968), and Latham et al. (1988). Cole (1998) argues that the main thinking of the Goal Theory is that motivation is primarily driven by the goals or objectives that individuals or groups set forth themselves. Such goals must

be specific and not vague. The efficacy of such is dependent on the quality of feedback that is available and the level of commitment to pursuing the goal as well as the level of self-efficacy. First, our society is an organisational one (Etzioni, 1964). These organisational realities have taken a toll on populations, which occupy or inhabit particular areas otherwise known as communities. Wilkins (2013) opines that numerous communities constitute a society.

Despite the lack of a generally accepted definition, the study revolves around the definition of a community as:*"…a local grouping within which people carry on a full round of life activities but often used (with emphasis) for any locality or category of people"* (Horton and Hunt, 1984:544). More particularly, it could be argued that community-based strategic planning (organisation) has become a well-defined approach that helps communities forge collective responses for dealing with community-wide problems (Berman, 1998:106). Thus, Oliver (1995:91) asserts that "no one person can solve our problems…traditionally, we looked for someone to be our answer. We are realising that we are the answer".

In this case, it could be said that Community-Based Organisations should be an act of consensus-building among often disparate individuals and groups (Fowler, 1991; Wood & Gray, 1991). This assertion is strengthened by the fact that improving local development and security requires coordinated efforts by businesses, government agencies, community colleges, and other organizations. However, business and community colleges do not interact much with each other to address mutual, community-wide issues. Likewise, many public safety issues involve local police, schools, neighbourhood, associations, churches and parents' associations. All these are now employed in many countries (Brown, 2006).

It should be noted that the overall process is designed to build agreement and commitment to common goals. In spite of the enormous potential of the community approach to crime combat, Moore et al. (1988) regret the police reluctance to encourage neighbourhoods and communities to develop their self-defense capability and often fail to realise that community support is vital to the success of police anticrime efforts. They thus advocate new initiatives, which they refer to as neighbourhood, problem-solving, or community policing. This approach enjoys the tendency of being marketed to the world at large (Barlow, 1996; Koch & Bennett, 1993; Manning, 1989; and Rosenbaum, 1994). Though some scholars (including Walker, 1989) criticised and disregarded the potential of community-based policing, some see a long, tortuous road ahead (Moore, 1992).

In light of the above, one is compelled to hesitate to optimism as to the extent to which the community approach can deliver. Thus, Barlow (1996) posits that until these uncertainties can be cleared up, prudence counsels a hedged rather than whole-hearted commitment to the new ideas. It is believed that the outcome of this study will go a long way to effecting certainties over uncertainties.

Methods and Materials

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The comparative focus of this study informed the choice of Uyo (urban) and Etim Ekpo Local Government Areas (rural) in Akwa Ibom State. The sample size for the study was one hundred and twenty (120) respondentsrandomly selected from the CBOs. The interior areas of Etim Ekpo with a reflection of the clans were chosen. These had been purposively selected. The approach was multi-dimensional. Using the list of registered Community-Based Organizations in Uyo Local Government Area, the fish bowl sampling procedure was employed to identify and select six (6) CBOs. But owing to the lack of such a list in EtimEkpo Local Government Area, key informants were used to identify and select six CBOs (Community leaders were used as the key informants). In each local government area, two male-oriented organisations were selected; two others were female-oriented; and the remaining two

were mixed. From each CBO, ten (10) members who were mainly in leadership positions (i.e. executive members) were selected. Regrettably, conscious efforts at identifying crime management-oriented CBOs proved unyielding. So, the CBOs used were those identified.

In addition to the above sample size, both local government areas were divided into clusters (six each). From each clustered zone, ten (households) were systematically (after every two households) selected and a gender-sensitive position was adopted to select the leaders of each household for interview and questionnaire administration. One hundred and twenty (120) respondents were also surveyed. Altogether, two hundred and forty (240) persons were targeted for the survey. With the interview schedule and questionnaire as the instruments of data collection, questions pertinent to the research objectives were designed and administered and the responses attracted are presented in Tables 2, 3 and 4. Simple percentages were used for presentation of numerical data. The chi-square was used for statistical analysis in order to test the hypotheses at significant level of 0.05. These are in Tables 5, 6 and 7.

Results

Table 1:Survey findings on CBO in relation to crime management

S/N	Nature of Question	Response Guide	Response Distribution (%)				Total n(%)
			Uyo LGA (Urban)		EtimEkpo LGA (Rural)		
			Male n(%)	Female n(%)	Male n(%)	Female n(%)	
1	Whether criminal activities occur in the area	Yes	28(93.3)	29(96.7)	27(90)	28(93.3)	112(93.3)
		No	-(-)	1(3.3)	1(3.3)	1(3.3)	3(2.5)
		Don't know	-2(6.7)	-(-)	2(6.7)	1(3.3)	5(4.2)
2	**Whether there are CBOs** in the area	**Yes**	29(96.7)	30(10.0)	28(93.3)	28(93.3)	115(95.8)
		No	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)
		Don't know	1(3.3)	-(-)	2(6.7)	2(6.7)	5(4.2)
3	Whether CBOs fight Crime in the area	Yes	12(40)	14(47.67)	11(36.7)	13(43.3)	50(41.7)
		No	16(53.33)	12(40)	15(50)	16(53.3)	59(49.2)
		Don't know	2(6.67)	4(13.33)	4(13.3)	1(3.3)	11(9.2)
4	The roles played by CBOs in Crime Control In the area N/B: *Influenced by response to 3 above.*	Preventive	5(41.7)	7(50)	5(45.5	8(61.5)	25(50)
		Arrest	1(8.3)	-(-)	1(9.1)	-(-)	2(4)
		Reporting	2(16.7)	3(21.4)	2(18.2)	1(7.7)	8(16)
		Surveillance	4(33.3)	4(28.6)	3(27.2)	4(30.8)	15(30)
5	The Rating of CBOs' performance in respect of Crime management.	Very Poor	5(16.7)	-(-)	2(6.7)	-(-)	7(5.8)
		Poor	6(20)	8(26.7)	7(23.3)	5(16.7)	26(21.7
		Average	10(33.3)	12(40)	12(40)	17(56.7)	51(42.5)
		Above average	6(20)	8(26.7)	4(13.3)	4(13.3)	22(18.3)
		No Idea	3(10)	2(6.7)	5(16.7)	4(13.3)	14(11.7)
6	Ranking the major constraints Facing CBOs in Crime	Finance	12(40)	9(30)	4(13.3)	5(16.7)	30(25)
		Fear of Reprisal	6(20)	7(23.3)	11(36.7)	12(40)	36(30)
		Lack of co-operation by community dwellers	2(6.7)	4(13.3)	3(10)	2(6.7)	11(9.2)

	Control.	Poor police-CBOs relations	6(20)	4(13.3)	10(33.3)	8(26.7)	28(23.3)
		Pressure from influential people	4(13.3)	6(20)	2(6.7)	3(10)	15(12.5)
7	Most enhancing factor In CBOs' fight against Crime	Enhanced economy	13(43.3)	10(33.3)	6(20)	4(13.3)	33(27.5)
		Confidence building by the police	9(30)	10(33.3)	12(40)	7(23.3)	38(31.7)
		Co-operation from community members	4(13.3)	7(23.3)	10(33.3	15(50)	36(30)
S/N	**Nature of**	**Response Guide**	**Response Distribution (%)**				**Total**
		Education of community dwellers	4(13.3)	3(10)	2(6.7)	4(13.3)	13(10.8)

Source: Field Survey (2024)

Table 1 shows the findings on Community-Based Organisations about crime management. Seven interrelated questions were asked of the respondents. Responses showed similarities in some cases and dissimilarities in others.For instance, on the issue of crime occurrence, 93.3 per cent of the respondents agreed that criminal activities occur in the area; 2.5per centnegated the position and 4.2per cent of them were ambivalent. It could thus be agreed that criminal activities occur in the areas. In terms of the existence of CBOs in the area, 95.8per cent of the respondents admitted to the existence of CBOs in the areas; 4.2per cent of them claimed ignorance of such existence. But none of them negated the existence of CBOs in the areas. Therefore, without a doubt, it could be agreed that CBOs exist in the area.

On the issue of CBOs and crime combat, 49.2per cent of the respondents posited that CBOs do not fight crime in the areas; 41.7 per cent of them opined that CBOs fight crime in the areas; while 9.2per cent did not have knowledge to share on the issue. This creates doubts as to the extent to which the CBOs have fought crime in the areas. As informed by the respondents' positions on the issue of CBOs and crime combat, those who admitted that CBOs fought crime in the areas were requested to contribute information as to the roles played by CBOs in crime combat. Also, 50per cent of the respondents noted that the CBOs played preventive roles; 4% (all male) opined the arrest role; 16 per cent identified CBOs with reporting roles; and 30% of them acknowledged the surveillance role of the CBOs. It could thus be argued that the CBOs are mostly given preventative roles. On this note of roles played by the CBOs, the respondents ranked the CBOs' performance in respect of crime management thus: average (42.5%), above-average (18.3%), poor (21.7%), very poor (.8%), no idea (11.7%). If the "above average" and the "average" are collapsed into one variable, then one can submit that the CBOs have performed relatively well.

In terms of constraints faced by CBOs in crime management, some disparities were recorded here. For instance, 30per cent of the respondents identified fear of reprisal as the greatest constraint (but only 36.1per cent of this was recorded in the urban area whereas 63.9per cent was recorded in the rural area). But in terms of finance (which constituted the second most worrisome constraint), 70per cent of the respondents recorded this in the urban area while 30% recorded it in the rural area. Also, while only 12.5per cent of the respondents opined that pressure from influential people was a major constraint, only 33.3per cent of them were rural respondents while a whopping 67.7per cent of them were urban respondents. This suggests that social differentiation may not be as much in rural areas as it is in urban areas. The rural dwellers are also more scared of the police than the urban dwellers; and with very slight differences, the study reveals that urban dwellers were more doubtful of co-operation by community dwellers

than the rural dwellers.

Finally, data in the table reveal that the most enhancing factor in CBOs' fight against crime is confidence building by the police (31.2%); this is followed by the need for cooperation from community members (30%). This was, however, the overbearing disposition of the rural dwellers, which constituted 69.5per cent against urban dwellers' 30.5per cent. In turn, an enhanced economy of 27.5per cent placed third in rank. But most of the raw score was recorded by urban dwellers (69.7%) while only 30.3per cent opined for an enhanced economy. The need for the education of community dwellers on anti-crime matters was adjudged the least in rank.

Table 2: Survey findings on CBO leaderships to formation of organisation and crime management

S/N	Nature of Question	Response Guide	Response Distribution				Total
			Uyo LGA (Urban)		EtimEkpo LGA (Rural)		
			Male n(%)	Female n(%)	Male n(%)	Female n(%)	
1	The nature of the CBO	Economic	12(33.3)	13(54.2)	17(38.6)	5(31.23)	47(39.2)
		Socio-cultural	6(16.7)	7(29.2)	6(36.4)	10(62.5)	39(32.5)
		Political	18(50)	4(16.7)	11(25)	1(6.25)	34(28.3)
2	Whether organisation was established with crime management in view	Yes	3(8.33)	1(4.17)	4(9.1)	1(6.25)	9(7.5)
		No	24(66.67)	18(75)	32(72.7)	13(81.25)	87(72.5)
		Not Quite	9(25)	5(28.83)	8(18.2	2(12.5)	24(20)
3	Whether CBO has contributed in the area of crime management	Yes	32(88.9)	22(91.7)	28(63.64)	11(68.75)	93(77.5)
		No	1(2.8)	-(-)	6(13.64)	2(12.5)	9(7.5)
		Not Quite	3(8.3)	2(8.3)	10(22.72)	3(18.75)	18(15)
4	If (3) above is no, whether one wishes to contribute in the area of crime management	Yes	3(75)	2(100)	13(81.25)	4(80)	22(81.5)
		No	-(-)	-(-)	1(6.25)	1(20)	2(7.4)
		Not Quite	1(25)	-(-)	2(12.5)	- -	3(11.1)
5	If (3) above is yes, whether what ways has CBO has contributed to crime management	Prevention	12(37.5)	10(45.5)	12(42.9)	8(72.7)	42(45.2)
		Surveillance	14(43.75)	9(40.9)	10(35.7)	2(18.2)	35(37.6)
		Reporting	4(12.5)	3(13.6)	5(17.9)	1(9.1)	13(14)
		Arrest	2(6.25)	-(-)	1(3.6)	-(-)	3(3.2)
6	If (4) is yes, whether in what ways would one wish to contribute to crime management?	Prevention	1(33.33)	1(50)	5(38.5)	3(75)	10(45.5)
		Surveillance	2(66.67)	-(-)	4(30.8)	1(25)	7(31.8)
		Reporting	-(-)	1(50)	3(23)	-(-)	4(18.2)
		Arrest	-(-)	-(-)	1(7.7)	-(-)	1(4.5)

Source: Field Survey (2024)

This table presents data raised to ascertain the bearings of CBOs about their bases of formation and their crime management bearings courtesy of six questions. The questions here were limited to CBOs' leadership. It shows that 39.2 per cent of the respondents opined that their CBOs were economic by nature; 32.5 per cent opined a socio-cultural base of their CBOs; and 28.3 per cent opined a political base. It is noted at this point that CBOs are not directly crime-management based. This position collaborates in their response to question two (2) – where a whopping 72.5 per cent of respondents opined that their CBOs were not established with crime management in view. Only 7.5 per cent posited that their CBOs were established with a crime management view, but 20 per cent were ambivalent.

In spite of the above primarily non-crime management background of CBOs, 77.5 per

cent of the CBO leadership agreed that their CBOs have contributed in the area of crime management (58.1% were urban responses; while 41.9% were rural responses). More rural responses of 72.2 per cent were recorded in the ambivalence class. Rural responses were also more in the group that negated if CBOs have contributed in the area of crime management. To those who admitted that their CBOs have not been contributing to crime management, 81.5 percent of the respondents consented to their wishes to start contributing and 77.3 per cent of these were rural respondents. And to those who asserted that their CBOs have been contributing to crime management, 45.2 per cent of them agreed to play a preventive role. Slightly, more urban dwellers opined to the preventive role than rural dwellers that played second fiddle to urban dwellers in all spheres of crime management.

Finally, as informed by responses to question four (4), 45.5 per cent of those who declared their willingness to contribute to crime management in the future preferred the area of prevention (80% were rural responses). Rural responses also topped the chart in the areas of surveillance, reporting, and arrest. This is, however, reflective of the disparity between the two areas regarding their involvement in crime management.

Table 3: Percentage distribution of respondents by record of constraints to attempts at crime management

S/N	Variables	Response Distribution (%)				Total n(%)
		Uyo LGA (Urban)		EtimEkpo LGA (Rural)		
		Male n(%)	Female n(%)	Male n(%)	Female n(%)	
1	Finance	11(30.6)	9(37.5)	8(18.2)	2(12.5)	30(25)
2	Fear of reprisals	5(13.9)	2(8.3)	10(22.8)	6(37.5)	23(19.2)
3	Confidentiality	4(11.1)	3(12.5)	4(9.1)	1(6.25)	12(10)
4	Lack of Co-operation from community members	6(16.7)	2(8.3)	6(13.6)	2(12.5)	16(13.3)
5	Lack of confidence in the police	4(11.1)	4(16.7)	8(18.2)	2(12.5)	18(15)
6	Pressure from influential people	6(16.7)	4(16.7)	8(18.2)	3(18.75)	21(17.5)

Source: Field Survey (2024)

Table five (3) presents data raised by CBO leadership about what they witness as barriers to crime management. Top in rank as a barrier is the issue of finance (25%), comparatively, 67 per cent of them were urban responses, while 33 per cent were rural responses. However, 19.2 per cent of them considered fear of reprisals as the main barrier, 69.6 per cent were rural responses, and 30.4 per cent were urban responses). Lack of confidence in the police institution constituted 15 per cent of the responses (55.6% were rural responses, while 44.4 per cent were urban responses).Another constraint was recorded in the area of lack of cooperation from community members (13.3%). Urban responses were slightly higher here. Pressure from influential people and the problem of confidentiality constituted 17.5 per cent and 10 per cent of responses respectively. The urban responses were more in both cases.

In line with the objectives of this study, and as a result of the data (as shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3, and the discussions effected thereafter), the following are implied:

First, from the surveys, both the leadership of CBOs and the community dwellers opined that CBOs have played preventive, surveillance, reporting, and arrest roles. In both communities, the most common way crime management role was played was in the area of prevention. And while more people in the urban centre preferred surveillance, fewer people in the rural preferred

same. Women in the two areas did not prefer arrest at all. Generally, the least preferred role was that of arrest.

Second, here only the community dwellers' response was countenanced. As such it was found out from the people's perception of the CBOs' performance, in the area of crime management that the CBOs had mostly performed fairly well. Interestingly, no female respondent in the two areas opined a very poor performance against the CBOs. Collapsing the average and above average on the one side; and the poor and very poor ratios on the other side, one can only but proclaim an overwhelming position that the CBOs have been more positive than negative in the area of crime management.

Third, in terms of factors that function as constraints to CBOs' performance in the area of crime management, the surveys reveal that on a collective note, finances posed the greatest impediment; while pressure from influential people constituted the least. But on a comparative note, while the issue of finance dominated the urban constraints, the issues of fear of reprisals, lack of confidence in the police, and pressure from influential members of the society constituted the most constraints in the rural areas.On the other hand, the enhancing factors in CBOs' fight against crime were (at the instance of the people's perception) ranked from the need for confidence building by the police, cooperation from community members, and an enhanced economy. This was in descending order (see Table 1, Question 7).

Fourth, it should be noted that the survey reveals that the CBOs were not established with crime management originally in view and that the CBOs principally were economic, socio-cultural, and political in outlook and nature. But on a comparative note, they were more socio-cultural than economic in the rural area.By implication, the study reveals that though community-based organizations exist in the areas, and whereas they tend to play some roles in the area of crime management, they were however not originally conceived for crime fighting or control roles. As such, they are capable of doing more in that regard. Also, the differences in area types that transcend the people's perceptions of crime and its management as well as gender dispositions all point to some serious policy implications.To complement the above, the chi-square test offered the following:

Hypothesis 1: *Urban and rural-based CBOs do not play significant roles in crime management*

Table 4: CBOs and level of significance in roles played

Response	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	80	63	143
No	29	39	68
Don't Know	11	9	20
Total	120	111	231

$\xi^2 = 3.4$; df = 2; p = 0.05; and table value = 5.991

The test above shows that CBOs (urban and rural) do not play significant roles in crime management. This is in tandem with the indications from data in table 2, question 3.

Hypothesis 2: *Urban and rural CBOs do not differ in the roles they play in crime management*

Table 5: Differences in crime management roles played by rural and urban CBOs

Roles	Urban	Rural	Total
Arrest	3	2	5

Prevention	34	33	67
Surveillance	31	19	50
Reporting	12	9	21
Total	80	63	143

$\xi^2 = 1.25$; df = 3; p = 0.05; and table value = 7.815

The test shows that there is no difference in the roles played by CBOs in urban and rural areas. CBOs therefore are argued to be playing the same kinds of roles.

Hypothesis 3: *Urban and rural CBOs do not differ in problems experienced in crime management*

Table 6: Rural and urban CBOs and their differences in problems encountered while managing crime

Problems	Urban	Rural	Total
Finance	41	19	60
Fear of reprisals	20	39	59
Lack of co-operation	14	13	27
Poor police community relations	18	18	36
Pressure from influential people	20	16	36
Confidentiality	7	5	12
Total	120	110	230

$\xi^2 = 15.7$; df = 5; p = 0.05; and table value = 11.070

It is argued here that urban and rural CBOs do differ in problems experienced in crime management. For instance, in Table 3 and 6, while finance was the greatest problem experienced by urban CBOs, fear of reprisals was in the main for the rural CBOs.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, it could be reiterated that the study generally aimed at underscoring the viability and possible invigoration of CBOs in the area of crime management in urban and rural centres in Akwa Ibom State on a comparative note. With Uyo, the Capital City of the State representing the urban centres and EtimEkpo Local Government Area representing rural centres, the study reveals that CBOs, though not established originally for crime management, have somewhat inadvertently delved into crime management. It also reveals differences between the areas about areas of constraints. To the urban CBOs, the greatest problem is in the area of finance; while in the rural area, the major problems are those of fear of reprisal attacks, lack of confidence in the police, and pressure from influential community dwellers.

Also as informed by the chi-square test, it is revealed that the CBOs under survey do not play significant roles in crime management; and that their locations do not make them vary in the paltry roles they play. But the only real area of difference is in the problems encountered by the CBOs in the process of crime management. Furthermore, while the results are considered important, they are also considered preliminary as they tend to raise certain questions that need to be addressed. Specifically, gender issues and thematic suggestions of the findings may need to be addressed in subsequent studies or inquiries. In sum, if the recommendations of this paper are followed, CBOs will perform better in the area of crime management.

Recommendations

Having regard to the findings of the work, the following suggestions are proffered as

recommendations toward possible crime-free rural and urban centres in Akwa Ibom State (with the role of Community-Based Organizations in mind):

1. Since the CBOs were established without the challenge of crime management in view, it is considered needful to encourage the establishment of such organizations with the sole or principal aim of crime management. This will justify their goal (in line with the adopted theory).
2. Most people opined that the CBOs mostly contributed to crime management in the area of crime prevention but also complained of lack of funds, crime management-oriented CBOs should therefore be offered special grants by governments and other bodies to encourage such preventive measures.
3. Also, the police should very vigorously pursue a mission to build up the people's confidence in the police institution. This should be done more necessarily in the rural areas. This would be achieved by creating informal social sessions between the police and the community dwellers and an investment in community/public relations personnel in the police workforce.
4. Governmental authorities should consider ways of bringing influential people in the communities, who frustrate attempts at crime management, to sanctions.
5. Particularly in rural areas, protective measures such as intelligence informationand community support among others,should be made available to participants in anti-crime CBOs to guarantee their safety against reprisals from criminals.
6. Also, anti-crime education should be "foisted" on the membership of crime-management CBOs. In this wise, proper monitoring of the CBO's activities would be secured to forestall possible negative roles there-from (the vigilante – Police face off is in view here).
7. It is also necessary for the various community dwellers to cooperate with CBO members through moral and financial supports to curbthe challenge of crime in the areas. Moreover, the confidentiality of volunteer informants who may wish to survey and report criminals to the authorities must be guaranteed by all those concerned.

References

Akpakpan, B. A. (1991). "Prudent management and utilization of the assets of Akwa Ibom State" (pp. 547-560). In Ukpong, Ignatius I. *and* Peter Iniodu (eds.). *Priorities for the development of Akwa Ibom State*. Uyo: Centour Press.

Alderson, J. (1999). *Policing freedom*. London: Evans.

Asangausung, O. S., Okorie, E. J. &Nnnana, J. C. (2022).Opay commercial tricycles and crime reduction in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.*International Journal of Research, Innovations and Sustainable Development, 11*(1), 1-15.

Barlow, H. D. (1996). *Introduction to criminology*(7thed.). New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Berman, E. M. (1996).Local government and community-based strategies.*American Review of Public Administration*, 26(1), 71-91.

Berman, E. M. (1998). *Productivity in public and non-profit organizations*. London: Sage.

Brown, A. S. (2006). *Informal crime management organizations in rural and urban Nigeria: a comparative study of Akwa Ibom State*. A PhD Dissertation to the Department of Sociology, Graduate School, University of Port Harcourt.

Brown, A. S. &Okorie, E. J. (2014). The police is your friend: analysis of public perception and the police 'image-making' campaign in Nigeria". *Global Journal of Academic Research Forum*,2(1), 186-209.

Cole, G. A. (1996). *Management: theory and practice*. London: Letts Educational.

Cole, G. A. (1998). *Organizational behaviour*. London: Letts Educational.

Dambazau, A. B. (1997)."A review of the effectiveness of the laws on drug abuse in Nigeria". Criminology Series: Studies in Law, Crime and Justice, 1(3).

Dambazau, A. B. (2007). *Criminology and criminal justice*(2nd ed.).Spectrum Books Limited, Ibadan.

Ekong, E. E. (2003). *Rural sociology* (2nded.). Uyo: Dave Educational Publishers.

Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern organizations*.New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (1989). Uniform crime reporting programme data (United States). Albany, NY: State of New York Division of Criminal Justice Services.

Fowler, A. (1991).The role of NGOs in changing state-society relations: perspectives from Eastern and Southern Africa. *Development Policy Review, Overseas Development Institute*, 9(1), 53-84.

George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (1996).*Understanding and managing organizational behaviour*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Horton, P. B. & Hunt, C. L. (1984).*Sociology*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Humble, J. (1967). *Improving business results*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Koch, B. and Bennett, T. (1993).*Community policing in Canada and Britain*. Home Office Research Bulletin, Summer, 36-42.

Latham, G. P., Erez, M. & Locke, E. A. (1988).Resolving scientific disputes by the joint design of crucial experiments by the antagonists: application to the Erez-Latham dispute regarding participation in goal setting.*Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 753-772.

Locke, E. (1968). "Towards a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives." Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, May.

Manning, P. K. (1989). *Community policing*. In Roger G. Dunham and Geoffrey P. Alpert, (eds). *Critical issues in policing*. Illinois: Waveland.

Marshall, G. (1998). *A dictionary of sociology*. Oxford: University Press.

Mayer, S. E. (1998). "The consequences of inequality: the state of current research." *Poverty Research News, 11*(3), 18-19.

McClelland, D. (1961). "*The achieving society"*. New York: Van Nostrand.

McMullan, M. (1961).“*Theory of corruption*.”*Sociological Review*, 9, 181-210.

Miethe, T. D. (1995). Fear and withdrawal from urban life.*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 539, 14–27.

Moore, M. H. (1992). “*Problem-solving and community policing*.”In Michael Tonny and Norval Morris, eds. *Modern policing*. Chicago: University Press.

Moore, M. H., Trojanowicz, R. C. & Kelling, G. (1998).*Crime and policing*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Okorie, E. J.,Mboho, K. S. Asangausung, O. S. &Ekposon, W. (2021).The role of security agents in curbing violent crimes in Nigeria: a study of Akwa Ibom State. *Journal of Criminologists and Security Practitioners of Nigeria, 3*, 36-60.

Okorie, E. J., Asangausung, O. S. &Adaka, S. S. (2020).Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras and its effectiveness in preventing shoplifting and promoting sustainable development in selected supermarkets in Uyo.*International Journal of Scientific Innovations, 8*(1), 60-70.

Okorie, E. J. (2023). *Introduction to criminology and security studies*.University of Uyo Press Ltd, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

Oliver, M. (1995).*Building healthy communities*.Orlando: Sentinel.

Palen, J. J. (1993). “*The urban world”*. New York:McGraw-Hill.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994).*The challenge of community policing*. California: Sage.

Scarpitti, F. M. (1984). “*Social problems”*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Tonnies, F. (1987).“*Community and society”*. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing.