

**VICTIMS OF CRIME AND ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
SYSTEM IN NIGERIA: A CASE STUDY OF LAFIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA
OF NASARAWA STATE**

BY

ANZAKU SYLVESTER ALEX

NSU/SS/SOC/MSC/555/12/13

**BEING A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIOLOGY, SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, NASARAWA STATE
UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER DEGREE IN SOCIOLOGY.**

JANUARY, 2017

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this research work was conducted by me and I bare the full wrath and responsibility of any error that may be found therein.

.....

Anzaku Sylvester Alex

.....

Date

CERTIFICATION

The Dissertation Crime Victims and Administration of Criminal Justice System in Nigeria meets the regulations governing the award of Master of Science (Msc.) Degree in Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

.....
Prof. John O. Ukawuilulu
Supervisor

.....
Date

.....
Dr.T.D. Lagi
(Head of department)

.....
Date

.....
Dr. F.O Onu
Internal Examiner

.....
Date

.....
Prof. Y.K Gandu
External Examiner

.....
Date

.....
Prof. S.A.S Aruwa
Dean Post Graduate School

.....
Date

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to my family and the entire Nigerian Students who will one day find it as a source to them.

To Mrs.Tani A. Alexander and Otuji A. Ovorumu Ogah who stood firmly to see the end of this work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank God for his infinite mercy upon my life for giving me the grace, wisdom, knowledge, faith and courage to finish this project work.

My profound gratitude goes to my project supervisor Prof. John Obioma Ukawuilulu who extensively guided and corrected me in order to see the success of this work. To my lecturers, Prof. Igbo, Prof. Hauwa, Dr. Usman, Dr. F.O Onu, Dr. Osiosegun, Dr. T.D lagi Dr. Karimu, and so forth. I want to say a big “thank you” for your immense inculcation of knowledge throughout my stay in Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

I also want to express my joy and happiness to my parent Mr. and Mrs. Otuji Alexander Ovorumu and Tani Akolo Alexander for their moral and financial support in my life up to this present moment, and to my brothers Mr. Sunday Alexander, Friday and Ozigi who gave me worm support in the cause of this project work.

To my friends, I want to say thank you for your advice and encouragement in my life. May almighty God bless and reward everyone who contributed to the success of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	i
Declaration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Certification		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Dedication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Acknowledgements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
Abstract	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vi
Table of contents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vii

CHAPTER ONE

1.1	Background of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.2	Statement of the problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
1.3	Objective of the study -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
1.4	Research questions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
1.5	Signification of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
1.6	Scope of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8

CHAPTER TWO

	Literature review and theoretical framework	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
2.1	conceptual review	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
2.2	History of the criminal justice system in Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
2.3	The working relationship of the components of criminal justice system	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
2.4	Empirical review -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24
2.5	Social ecology of victimization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24
2.6	The effects of criminal victimization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27
2.7	Crime victimization and the report to the police	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30
2.8	Victimization as antecedent to violent behaviour	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
2.9	The criminal justice system	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33

2.10	Crime victims and criminal justice administration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
2.11	Theoretical framework	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
2.12	Marxist theory of criminal victimization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41
2.13	Criticism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44
CHAPTER THREE									
	Research methods	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47
3.1	location of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47
3.2	Research design	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48
3.3	Population and sample size	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49
3.4	Sampling design	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49
3.5	Techniques/ method of data collection	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
3.6	Techniques/method of data analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51
3.7	Problems encountered in the field	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51
CHAPTER FOUR									
	Data presentation, analysis and interpretation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
4.1	Socio demography variable of the respondents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
4.2	Age distribution of the respondents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54
4.3	Marital Status of the respondents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54
4.4	Employment Status of the respondents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55
4.5	Information on the criminal victimization of the respondent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56
4.6	Number of criminal victimization of respondents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56
4.7	The nature of respondents victimization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57
4.8	Types of dwelling of the respondents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58
4.9	Residential neighborhood of the respondents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59
4.10	Respondents perception on crime rate in the community	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59
4.11	Respondents perception on general safety in the community-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60
4.12	Times victimization mostly take place	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61

4.13	Respondents views on the criminal justice administration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62
4.14	Police performance in crime control	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62
4.15	Victims report of crime to the police	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63
4.16	Assessing the treatment of crime victims in criminal justice Administration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64

CHAPTER FIVE

	Discussion, summary and conclusion/recommendation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65
5.1	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65
5.2	Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
5.3	Conclusion/recommendation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68
	References	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72
	Appendix A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	75					
	Appendix B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80

ABSTRACT

All over the world justice is not ensured to those who deserve it, Nigeria as a nation is not also left out in this regards. Due to the high rate of criminal activities in our society today, we are all at the risk of becoming victims of crime in one way or the other most especially now that Nigeria is witnessing high rate of insurgency. Criminal victimization has serious consequences for both the citizens and the society. The study however, examined the nature and problems faced by criminal victims most especially violent crimes such as robbery, murder, manslaughter, rap ,assault, etc. and property crime in the administration of criminal justice with reference to Lafia Local Government Area of Nasarawa State. The study used survey research design, and non-probability sampling technique was used, on the basis of that, the research used the various wards (Accruba, Agyaragu Tofa, Chiroma, Gayam, Makama, Waquwa and Zanwa) in Lafia town as cluster and snowball technique to select the sample size elements. Both primary and secondary sources of data was used, structured questionnaire was used to obtain information from the sample frame. Other method like interview as well as documentary study was used where ever it was required. Based on the information collected and analysed, it was clearly discovered that the victims of crime are given only passive recognition in the administration of criminal justice and they do not receive any services or programs like their criminal counterparts who receive reformatory and rehabilitative service in the prison or correctional institution, as such the study recommended that, there should be a designated programme and service for the victims of crime in other to ensure a balance between the criminal offenders and victims in the criminal justice system administration in Nigeria.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The importance of criminal justice to the smooth running of any society cannot be over emphasized. Indeed an effective criminal justice system is regarded by many as functional to the maintenance of law and order. However the Nigeria criminal justice system is not only dysfunctional it is also out-dated and absolutely not fit for the purpose. This much was highlighted by professor Yemi Osibajo (SAN) when addressing the charges of the criminal justice system in Nigeria by asserting ‘...many of the provision are out dated and some cases anachronistic’’. (Ayorinde, 2014). Besides, the loopholes in the law and procedure have become so obvious that lawyers, especially defence lawyers have become masters in dilatory tactics. It has thus become increasingly difficult to reach closure of any kind in much criminal case. Convictions and acquittals have become exceedingly rare’’. While the foregoing assertion is quite instructive, it is pertinent to note that these views are widely held among many legal practitioners and eminent jurist who have also called for fundamental reform to the Nigeria criminal justice system. The criminal justice system of Nigeria only gives cogent attention to the criminals and does nothing about the victims of such crime. Whenever there is a crime problem, intellectuals and policy makers are quick to ask of what can be done to the criminals and/ or the circumstantial events that precipitated such criminality. Very few ponder what can be done about the victim of his/her circumstances.

However, the total neglect of the victim of crime in either the study or understanding of crime is historical. Historically the trend that has characterised the

development of criminology has been nurtured on a faulty foundation. Such a foundation has been characterised by a uni-dimensional approach to the study of criminal phenomenon. This has manifested clearly in the development of criminological theories (Goldstein, 1984)

Starting from demo-logical explanation down through the Bio-psychological to the socio-cultural forces that produce the individual offender or the situation of crime and to the radical or even the Marxist perspectives, one common theme characterize them all: these concentrate on the analysis of the individual offender and/or the forces that motivated his/her action(McDonal,1975)

This historical anomaly reverberates most of the present day research efforts in criminology. After all, theories serves important guide in empirical research. But research efforts into crime and criminality have relegated the victim to the background. The United States of American presidents commission on law enforcement and administration of justice, "one of the neglected in the study of crime is its victim" (Wolfgang et-al (eds), 1971:176). Odekunle (1979:238) reiterated this fact and further noted that government interests and efforts in criminology usually precede or forerun those in victimology. Victims are required by law to serve as principal witnesses in courts. In fact, in some jurisdictions (Golsdstain, 1984:519), the victim is told that crime is an offence against state and therefore, it is the business of the state to prosecute the offender on behalf of the victim.

Still in some jurisdiction, notably in Nigeria, while still suffering the effects of personal injuries, loss of property or both, the victim is legally bound to attend court sitting at his/her own expense. If, and when, the offender is convicted and

sentenced accordingly, the victim has lost two fold; one in favour of the offender, and two, in favour of the state.

Criminology is a discipline with many subject areas, these include, the scientific study of crime and criminal behaviour, investigating the nature and extent of crime, the possible explanations to criminal behaviour, including juvenile delinquency, the functions of the criminal law, the study and rehabilitation of the victims of crime, and the strategies for prevention and control of crime by the criminal justice system administrations (Dambazau, 2012).

However this research narrows down the focus to crime victimization most especially victims of violent crimes such as robbery, murder, manslaughter, rap, assault etc. and property crimes, and the administration of criminal justice system in Nigeria. Specifically, the study's focus is on Lafia L.G.A of Nasarawa State, Nigeria.

It is in the light of the above discussed that this study attempts to assess/analyse the problems faced by the crime victims in the criminal justice administration in Nigeria.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Victims of crime encounters varied and multiple problems which come both from the angle of criminal justice system and the society at large. The first among these is the direct impact of crime. The direct consequence of crime can take the form of financial losses, damage to property, bodily injury, loss of life, psychological trauma, social disadvantage etc. (Odekunle, 1989; Akanda, 1989). Victims of crime everywhere suffer one or more of these immediate consequences of whenever a crime occurs. Most instance of criminal victimization involve financial cost or

wastage either as a result of direct loss (as in stealing), cost damage to property, or due to cost incidental to victimization such as medical treatment, and litigation. (Igbo, 2006:248). The cost in monetary term arising from property, persons and other kinds of crime can be quite heavy and staggering.

Victims of crime do not only suffer from the direct impact of crime but also suffer mistreatment and neglect within the criminal justice system in the hands of the police and court, in the process of arrest, investigation and prosecution of offender.

Victims of crime perform fundamental roles in the process of solving crime. To underscore the critical importance of the victim in the criminal justice process, “there is no denying the fact that the victim as the closed to the crime event is an exceptionally valuable witness. In criminal proceedings, he additionally receives a series of lawsuit roles which he can directly pay” (Marek, 1984:10).

In spite of these significant roles played by the victim in the criminal justice process, victims are hardly accorded any significant attention and recognition, nor are they treated fairly by the criminal justice system. The criminal justice system is historically oriented towards criminal offender. At any material point in time, its major concerns are about the circumstances of the criminal offender; what is to be done with suspect; what are his rights, are his rights being protected, what are his need treatment, etc. The system also spend huge sum of public funds to support activities and projects (e.g prison service, community treatment programmes) which are offender oriented or offender friendly (Igbo, 2006:249).

However, concerning the crime victim, it has been observed that (he) has been given a room in the court house where he can wait comfortably and securely for the hearing to begin. He is left to wait in the halls or some drab room to which the

defendant whom he is accusing has free access (Goldman, 1971). He is threatened by the defendant inches of police, prosecutors, and judges and nothing happens (Ziegenhagen, 1974). He or she must recount to the prosecutor and sometime the prosecutor intimate degrades and upsets details of unspeakable crimes while standing in a crowded, noisy hallway with strangers milling around and listening in (Subin, 1966). If a criminal viciously kills someone and later he is found not guilty by reason of insanity, society will spend (huge sum of money) supplying him with psychiatric treatment, special facilities, correctional counselling, job training, and legal aid. But the family of the victim which may have been shattered by the crime will be left to fend for itself (cf. McDonald, 1975:249-250).

This neglect of victims of crime within the criminal justice system has been variously described as secondary victimization (Huang, 1987), second assault (Marek, 1984), second injury (Odekunle, 1987). The criminal justice system as it is, merely uses the victim and dumps him. He is seen simply as a conduit by which the state is able to extort its penalty from a non-conformist individual.

The plight of the victim extends beyond the criminal justice system to social welfare services. In Nigeria in particular, and developing countries in general, emergency relief funds and /or material are often provided to the victims of other disaster like fire, draught, religious disturbances, oil spillage, erosion, flood, etc. the argument has always been that victims of such disaster have suffered monetary/material losses, personal injuries, socio-psychological and emotional stress and therefore need some relief in the form of compensation or restitution to alleviate their hardship (Gyong, 1989). Even though victims of crime may have suffered similar losses or injuries, these same humanitarian gestures are hardly ever extended to them.

Based on the aforementioned discussion, the purpose of this study is to uncover all the positive and negative realities behind the treatment received by the victims of crime most especially violent and property crimes in the administration of criminal justice system.

1.3 Objective of the Study

Significantly and rationally, every human endeavour is meant to be guided and informed by certain fundamental objectives, and this work will not be an exception. Therefore, the general/primary objective for this study is to assess the general condition and plight of crime victims, particularly victims of violent crimes such as robbery, murder, manslaughter, rap, assault and property crimes, in the administration of criminal justice in Nigeria. However, in the course of this study, the research work intends to achieve the following specific objectives:

- a. To examine the nature of criminal victimization
- b. To examine some of the socio-demographic characteristics which expose an individual to the chances of criminal victimization.
- c. To examine the nature of treatment given to the victims in the administration of criminal justice
- d. To trace the socio-psychological problems faced by crime victims in the criminal justice administration.
- e. To examine and recommend strategies based on the above objective, to improve the situation of crime victim as well as the criminal justice system.

1.4 Research Questions

Qi. To what extent do criminal victims become vulnerable to crime due to the nature and area of residence?

Qii. How criminal victims become vulnerable to crime due to the nature and area of residence?

Qiii. How social class make an individual to be vulnerable to crime?

Qiv. What are the possible ways that criminal victims will not be vulnerable to crime?

1.5 Signification of the Study

The study has both practical and scientific significance. Since not much has been done on the problem of crime victims in Nigeria, this research work if carried out will elicit necessary feedback and remedy which can facilitate and aid in the improvement of the crime victims situation in the criminal justice system in Nigeria.

The study generally provides a window to glimpse into the factors that facilitate and inform the nature of the treatment of crime victims in the administration of criminal justice. And evidently, knowing the factors is like a half-way to solving the problem in question.

The study is also significant on the grounds that if carefully carried out, it will serve as a springboard for future researches in the field of crime victim and criminal victimization as well as criminal justice system in general.

The study also provides us with an insight into some of the service programmes which should be rendered to the crime victim in the criminal justice administration in Nigeria.

Study of such nature if carefully carried out, will also help in addressing the plight of victims of crime in the society having exposed the situation at hand.

Finally, it can also aid in policy making towards the improvement of criminal justice system in Nigeria. And this in effect goes a long way to ensure effective and efficient crime management, prevention and control in Nigeria.

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The question of crime victim is a universal issue just like the phenomenon of crime itself. The two questions are hardly separable. This is because whenever one is mentioned, the idea of the other always comes to mind.

From the subject matter of this study, it is clear that it concern the crime victims (particularly violent and property crime) and criminal justice system in Nigeria. However, due to the complex nature and heterogeneity characteristics of Nigerian society, it is always very difficult to carry out a study of this nature to cover the entire Nigerian society. It is in this wise that the area of coverage for this study is limited to Lafia Local Government Area of Nasarawa State. The idea behind the choice of Lafia as an area of coverage for this study is due to some very important factors of limitations which could render the objectives of this study unattainable. One of these limitations is the time frame for the study. A work of this nature has a time frame which is always limited to a short period of time. In this case, it will be very difficult, if not impossible to cover all the states in the country within this very limited period.

Another limitation in this regard is the resources. A work of this nature is always limited and constrained to some extent because of the resources involved-i.e.

financial resources. For example, one will need resources for transportation, production of necessary material for the research work, feeding and other things that can facilitate the research work. The absence of these will definitely render this impossible. Therefore, the only way to prevent this problem is to limit the area of coverage to certain location(s) within the larger society. Because of these same constraints, the researcher is unable to review all the literatures that concern the subject matter of crime victims in all walks of life in Nigeria society.

Security personnel and people who are affected in one way or the other by crime, their understanding about the purpose of this research work and their willingness to give proper information about the issues at hand in regards to the questions assigned to them in the course of this research work would also serve as a major factor in determining the quality of this research work.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter basically reviews earlier works related to the topic of the study. This review will look at the issue and concepts related to the research topic and try to synthesize available information that are relevant in order to develop a theoretical base for the study.

2.1 Conceptual Review

The concept of victim dates back to ancient cultures and civilization such as the ancient Hebrews. Its original meaning was rooted in the idea of sacrifice or scapegoat-the execution or casting out of a person or animal to satisfy a deity or hierarchy. Over the centuries, the word victim came to have additional meaning (Christie, 1986). During the founding of victimology in the 1940s, victimologists such as Mendelson, Von Hentig, and Wolfgang tended to use textbook or dictionary definition of victims as hapless dupe who instigated their own victimization (Shapland, 1986)

This notion of victim precipitation was vigorously attacked by feminists in the 1980s, and was replaced by the notion of victims as anyone caught in an asymmetric relationship or situation. Asymmetry means anything unbalanced, exploitative, parasitical, oppressive, destructive, alienating, or having inherent suffering (Schwartz and Pitts, 1995).

However, today the word victim is used indiscriminately, e.g. cancer victims, holocaust victims, accident victims, victims of injustice, hurricane victims, crime

victims, and others. The common element that runs through all these usage is an image of someone who suffers injury and harm by force beyond his or her control.

From an ideal point of view, a victim is viewed as any person or a category of individual when hit by crime-most readily is given the complete and legitimate status of being a victim (cf Fattah, 1986:18). The ideal victim in this context is a sort of public status of the same type and level of abstraction as that for example, of a hero or a traitor. It is difficult to count these victims just as it is difficult to heroes. But they can be exemplified.

Fattah (1986) further identified some attributes of an ideal victim by making reference to one simple example of a little old lady on her way home in the middle of the day after taking care of her sick sister. That she is hit on the head by a big man who thereafter grabs her bag and uses the money for liquor or drugs-in that case we come close to the ideal victim. According to Fattah (1986, 19), it is so by the following attributes:

1. The victim is sick, old or very young person particularly well suited as an ideal victim.
2. The victim was carrying out a respectable project caring for her sister.
3. She was where she could not possibly be blamed for being in the street during the day time.
4. The offender was big and bad
5. The offender was unknown and in no personal relationship to her

It means then to say that whenever an individual or group of individual is carrying out a respectable project where the chance of being victimized is not provided, and when hit by a crime from an unrelated offender, the individual(s)

become ideal victim(s). It implies that whenever one engage in an activities that exposes him to chances of victimization, he will not be regarded as an ideal victim when victimized.

Most importantly, an ideal victim is said to be weak compare to the unrelated offender, as well as having put a reasonable energy into protecting himself or herself against becoming a victim. These are necessary conditions, but not always sufficient.

The New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties (NSWCCL, 2009), sees victims of crimes as citizens who have had their lives interrupted by crime. Wikipedia (2007) noted that a victim of crime is an identifiable person who has been harmed individually and directly by the perpetrators rather than merely the society as a whole. It further observed that this may however not always be the case as with victims of white collar crime who may not be clearly identifiable or directly linked to the crime. In the same vain, the UN High Commission for Human Rights (1995) has contributed to the understanding of victims of crime. It defines victims of crimes as persons who individually or collectively have suffered harm including physical or mental injury, emotional suffering, economic loss or substantial impairment of their fundamental rights through acts or omissions that are in violation of criminal law operating within a 'state' including those laws prescribing criminal abuse of power. Furthermore, it says a person may be considered a victim of crime regardless of whether the perpetrator is identified, apprehended, prosecuted or convicted and regardless of the familiar relationship between the perpetrators and the victim. In addition, it argues that the term victim of crime also includes where appropriately, the immediate family or dependents of the direct victims or persons who have suffered harm in intervening to assist victims in distress or to prevent victimization.

The United Nations Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of power defines crime victim as persons who, individually or collectively, have suffer harm, including, mental injury, emotional suffering, economic loss or substantial impairment of their fundamental rights, through acts or omissions that are in violation of criminal law operatives within the member states. A crime victim is a person who suffers anything as personal injury, death or loss of or injury to personal or real property, as a result of crime.

In legal context, crime victim is defined in the following ways:

1. A personal who suffered direct or threatened physical, emotional or primary harm as a result of commission of crime.
2. An institution or entity that had suffered any of the same harm by an individual or authorized representative of another entity (Karmen, 1992).

Basically, crime victim can be classified into primary, secondary and tertiary crime victim. Primary crime victims constitute those who suffered the direct or threatened harm/injury first. Secondary victims are those who experienced the harm second hand, such as intimate partners or significant others of the rape victims or children of battered woman.

Tertiary crime victims experience the harm vicariously such as through media accounts or from watching television (Karmen, 1992). The implication of this classification is that at any point in time, everyone is victim of one crime or the other. Odekunle (1986; 93) asserts that the population of victims is remote and diffuse, but refers to the generality of Nigerians.

Defining Criminal

All over the world, there is no single definition or meaning of crime likewise that of a criminal. Who should properly be called a criminal has been a subject of disputation. Because of this problem, the thesis views criminal from a legal dimension. From the legal point of view, a criminal is someone who has committed a crime and has been found to commit the crime through a criminal justice process involving the police and the criminal court, leading to conviction. In order to ascertain that an individual is legally a criminal, that person must have violated a known criminal law; must have been processed through the criminal courts and found guilty; and subsequently convicted and punished.(Dambazzau, 2012:175).

However it has been established that there is problem with this strict legal definition because not all persons who violated the criminal law are processed through the criminal justice system. (Dambazzau, 2012:175), pockets out that the law excuses certain categories of persons from criminal responsibility, such as the insane. Similarly, by virtue of the positions certain persons occupy, they have immunity against criminal actions, and in this category are diplomats serving in foreign countries.

On the definition of crime, a United Nations Research Institute observed that:

Crime, in the sense of a breach of a legal prohibition, is a universal concept, but what actually constitutes a crime and how seriously it should be regarded, varies enormously from one society to another. Perceptions of crime are not determined by any objective indicator of the degree of injury or damage but by cultural values and power relations.

In a strict legal definition, crime is a violation of the criminal law, which is subsequently followed by legal punishment. In criminal law, a crime is an act of omission, which attracts sanction, such as fine, imprisonment, or even death. A crime in law consists of two basic elements, the actus reus and the mens rea. The actus reus is the physical elements or the guilty act, and it requires proof. Where there is no actus reus there is no crime. It includes all the elements in the definition of the crime with the exception of the mental element. The actus reus could be made up of conduct, its consequences and the circumstances in which the conduct takes place. The second element, mens rea, is the mental element or the guilty mind. It is basically the intention and a man is said to intend doing something if he foresaw and desired. The desire for the consequences is the basic factor of intention. Mens rea is not required for all crime. There is no singular definition of mens rea because every crime has its own mens rea. To demonstrate mens rea, it must be proven that an individual intentionally, knowingly, recklessly, or negligently behaved in a given manner or caused a given result. Crime can be dichotomised into serious and minor; felony and misdemeanour; mala in se and mala prohibita, crime against person and crime against property, etc.

Criminologists are very much concerned with all potentially criminal behaviour, but not only in the strict legal sense. The definition of crime among criminologists will therefore recognise factors such as value system, norms and religious attitude in a given culture. While the classical school dealt with the legal definition of crime, the positivists' school defined crime in the context of disease. Crime as a disease, according to the positivists, appeared non-randomly among the weaker, more defective class of the human race. The positivists' school therefore sought the definition of crime in the criminal, not criminal law. Lombroso, the leading

figure of the positivists' school, developed idea of a born criminal, fatally destined to commit crime because of his or her bio-psychological constitution. Positivists reject the legal definition of crime because, according to them, the concept of crime cannot be accepted as legal category since the factors which produce the legal definition are contingent and capricious.

Durkheim defined crime within a social context. He saw crime as asocial product, determined by social conditions, capable of being controlled only in social terms. Crime is therefore normal in all societies, according to him; society exempt from crime would necessitate a standardisation of moral concepts of all individuals which is neither possible nor desirable. In the final analysis, Durkheim defined crime as an act which offends strong and defined state of collective conscience. This is basically the functionalist or consensus view, which sees the society functioning as an integrated, stable structures because of agreement or consensus among its members on certain rules and values recognised and respected by all.

Criminal law is therefore seen to be concerned with public wrongs, or wrongs against society. Such wrongs involves acts of physical violence, such as murder, and rap; infringement of property right, such as theft, fraud and burglary; and crimes against health, morals, and public safety, such as prostitution, gambling, drugs abuse, homosexuality and so on. Allen, (1931), sums it up with the following observation that:

Crime is crime because it consists in wrongdoing which directly and in serious degree threatens the security or well-being of society, and because it is not safe to leave it redress able only by compensation of the injured party.

DEFINING JUSTICE

The word “justice” according to Rawls, “is the first virtue of social institutions as truth is of system of thought” he sees “... justice as fairness, the original position of equality corresponds of the state of nature in the traditional theory of social contract”. In the context of the social contract theory, justice as fairness simply means the observance of rights, duties and obligations on the part of both the governor and the governed. It is the ability to strike a balance between guaranteeing the fundamental rights of citizens by the governor and the observance of duties and obligations by the governed. (Dambazzau, 2012:176). In the criminal justice, the sum total of justice is equal to the fair application of rules to the effect that law should be fair and responsible in themselves.

2.2 History of the Criminal Justice System in Nigeria

Nigeria was previously a British colony. Therefore, the basis of Nigeria criminal law is the English law. (Nigeria’s capital territory of Lagos was annexed by the British in 1849. Later, other regions of Nigeria were declared protectorates and administered by Royal Niger company charter and limited.

In 1899, the charter granted the Royal Niger Company Limited was revoked, and the British Government took over the direct administration of Nigeria by 1900.

In 1861, after the colonization of the colony of Lagos and the protectorate of southern Nigeria and the Northern protectorate, the British consuls and the Royal Niger company, Ltd, sit up a legislative council to make laws to control the masses and regulate business activities involving many European countries and Africans.

British consuls and the Royal Niger Company Limited (chartered by Britain to administer Nigeria until 1900) established courts of justice and an armed constabulary to enforce laws and regulations. From 1861 to 1874, ten different courts were created, with only four devoted to criminal matter: the supreme court/police magistrate court, the court of civil and criminal justice, the West African court of Appeal (WACA), and the Privy Council (Elias, 1963). The laws enacted by colonial legislative council were based on the laws, values, and customs of the English people. When the British Government took over direct administration of Nigeria in 1900 from the Royal Niger Company Limited, it retained all of its courts, laws, and regulation.

The criminal code was originally introduced to the protectorate of Northern Nigeria in 1904 by the colonial Governor of the Northern protectorate, Lord Lugard. It was modelled after a code that was introduced into the state of Queensland, Australia in 1899 by Britain. (The Queensland criminal code was based on a criminal code drafted in Jamaica by a British criminal Law attorney, Sir James Frizstephen, in 1878).

After the uniting of the southern Protectorates in 1906 and the subsequent amalgamation of the southern and Northern protectorate of Nigeria in 1914, Lord Lugard made the criminal code of 1914 applicable to all the protectorates in Nigeria (Elias, 1967).

In 1959, the criminal code which was used throughout Nigeria did not apply to Northern Nigeria. Throughout the colonial era, the courts in the northern part of Nigeria had lacked professionally trained personnel in criminal law. In addition, the British judges were uncertain of how to deal with the Emirs with regard to various

offences and punishment under the Islamic (Malik) law, Emirs is the traditional rulers of the Muslim areas).

As a solution, a panel of jurists was set up to introduce a penal code that would take into account Moslem interests, values, and standards. Since Sudan was an Islamic state where the Muslim laws were similar to those of Northern Nigeria Moslems, the jurists modelled the penal code after Sudanese penal code (Nwabueze, 1963; Elias, 1967; Adewoye, 1977).

The Northern Nigeria penal code law applies to all persons living in the Northern Nigeria. Occasionally a non Moslem is brought before a Muslim court (Alkali court), where Muslims laws were applied. Although the defendant may not know the illegality of an act, In the Emirate, he/she must still stand before the Muslim court judge.

The Northern Nigeria penal code, therefore, was introduced to account for the difference between Muslim and non-Muslim laws, making the region's laws applicable to everyone. The guiding principle under the code's provisions was that since the majority of the people living in the region were Moslems, the penal code law should not be in conflict with the dictates of the Holy Quran (Elias, 1967).

While the Nigeria criminal code was applicable to the whole of Nigeria in 1916, most criminal cases were still governed by "Native Law and custom". This created problems, especially in Northern Nigeria because the Maliki Law contained many rules which were not acceptable under English Law (Okonkwo and Naish, 1964). The offence of homicide punishable by death includes many assaults ending with death, regardless of intent. In effect, the crime of manslaughter under the

Nigerian criminal code is prosecuted as murder in the Maliki Law (Okonkwo and Naish, 1964).

Due to the confusion occasioned in the administration of dual systems of criminal laws by the British or colonial courts which applied the Nigerian criminal code, and other by the customary courts which is Maliki Law, an attempt was made to abolish the customary law in 1933. However, the British administrators abandoned this idea, and instead introduced section 10 of the Native courts Ordinance which stated that the Native courts could administer customary law provided that the punishment did not involve mutilation or torture and was “not repugnant to natural justice and good conscience” (Elias, 1963).

Today, Nigeria uses a tripartite system of criminal law and justice: the criminal code (based on English common Law Legal practice); and customary Law (based on the customs and traditions of the people). In southern Nigeria, laws are written.

Nigeria achieved independence in 1960. Since then, both the Nigerian criminal code and Northern Nigeria penal code have made many amendments to reflect the norms, values, and standards of the Nigerian people (Karibi-white 1964; Elias, Ebbe, 1985). Interestingly, one of the effects of having criminal code based on the English common Law tradition was the criminalization of some of the Nigeria customs. For example, section 370 of the Nigeria criminal code prescribes a seven year prison sentence for any person who marries another while his/her marriage partner is still living. According to this section, “Bigamy is the contracting of a second marriage during the lifetime of one’s first” wife or husband. Section 35 of the Marriage Act declares such a second marriage as void, and there are penalty provisions in section

47 and 48 of the marriage Act (Elias, 1954, 1972, Ebbe, 1985). Such normative standards in Nigeria that were criminalized by the colonial administration have since been revoked. For example, in 1970, by Decree, the bigamy law in Nigeria criminal Law was declared null and void (Elias, 1972; Obilade, 1969; Ebbe, 1985).

2.3 The Working Relationship of the Components of Criminal Justice System.

Basically, the police, the courts, and prison or correction constitutes the major components or agencies of criminal justice. To understand how the criminal justice system works, it is necessary to grasp the working relationships of all its agencies: the use, functions and decision making process of the police, the structures of the court system and how judges reach decisions; and the intricacies of penal institutions (Dambazzau, 2004).

Criminal justice agencies are the main actors in the fight against crime; the police are responsible for detecting crime and apprehending people who violate criminal law; the courts decide the guilty or innocent, and sentence those who are convicted or those who plead guilty; the prisons or correction institutions carry out the sentence of the courts and rehabilitate criminal. For clarity, let's look at these component one after the other and their relationship with each other.

The police

The criminal justice response to crime begins when a crime is reported to the police or far less often when the police themselves discover that a crime has been committed (Bohm and Haley, 2002). The police provide entry point into the criminal justice system. The police lubricate the system through the arrest of the suspects, who are essentially the inputs into the criminal justice system. More often, an arrest

supported witness statement and crime scene evidence is sufficient to close a case, especially with less serious crime.

More often than not, though, the police must conduct an in-depth investigation to determine what happened about a particular crime. Even when the police start with a known crime or a cooperative victim or witness, the investigation can be lengthy and difficult. If the police investigation of crime is successful, and an arrest is effected, the suspect is brought to the police station to be booked.

On the whole, in criminal justice administration, the police perform the functions of arresting the crime suspects or criminal offenders; and also carry out an investigation so as to determine whether the crime has really taken place, and who were involved in the case, as well as evidences thereof. Alongside criminal investigation, the police are mandated to search every arrested or suspected person(s), buildings, motor vehicles, and so on.

The criminal courts

In the triangular relationship of the criminal justice system, the second most prominent component is the criminal court. A court is defined as an “agency set up by government to define and apply the law, to order its enforcement and to settle disputes on which individuals or group do not agree” (Dambazzau, 1999:102). Criminal court plays a pivotal role in the criminal justice system. According to Pound (1952), the administration of justice revolves around the court system.

In the administration of criminal justice, the courts adjudicate over cases in which there are reasonable causes to believe that an accused person has violated a specific law or laws. When a crime is violated, formal action must be channelled

through the courts. It is only the courts that have the power to determine the guilt or innocence of the accused person(s) and the decisions of the court have important consequences for the other component of the criminal justice system.

In the administration of the criminal justice, the primary role performed by the courts involves that of criminal trial and sentencing. In the criminal justice process, the criminal trial attracts the most public attention. It is the most significant of the criminal justice system, and according to Kaplan (1973), it is the “balance wheel of the entire process”. The criminal trial mainly consists of the presentation of evidence by both the prosecution and defence counsels arguing their cases, while judges use a balancing test in order to arrive at their decision.

At end of the trial in criminal courts and announcement of verdict, sentences are imposed on the guilty. Sentencing, it is said, “is the beginning and the end of the criminal justice system”. It is therefore, the verdict which imposes criminal sanction or punishment on the person convicted of crime. While the public expects that a convicted criminal should be punished, the accused knows that if considered, at the end of the process he goes through is the punishment he gets.

The Prison

In the working relationship of the component of the criminal justice system, the third leg carries the prison. The prison is responsible for the custody of the final product in the criminal justice process. Maintaining custody involves carrying out measures to prevent escapes, such as erecting high walls or chain-link fence, placing armed guards, constant checks of cells, providing a system of passes for movements within the prison, constant surveillance and such stringent measures which may be applied from time to time to prevent escapes, riots, and so on.

In justice administration, the prison is an apparatus for transforming criminal into a normal, law-abiding citizen. The prison transforms individual's attitudes to work, his physical training, his moral attitude, his state of mind and moral conduct and so on.

2.4 Empirical Review

2.5 Social Ecology of Victimization

Criminologists refers to the ecology of victimization as to where, when, and how people are victimized. According to the National Crime Victims Survey (NCVS) violent crimes are slightly more likely to take place in an open, public area such as a street, a park, or a field, in a school building, or at a commercial establishment such as tavern, during the day time or early evening hours.(Siegel, 2005:55).

Violent crimes take place most often at the night than at the day time. However, every non-violent offence or less serious forms of violence such as pick-pocketing, purse snatching and personal larcenies or theft take place often during day time. It is also argued that for serious offences or felonies, armed robbery, aggravated assault occur mostly at night but lesser serious offences such as assault and un-armed robberies occur mostly during the day (Siegel, 2005).

Most often, street crimes take place during the day. But conventional crimes most often occur at night. Crimes of rape and simple assault occur mostly in the home. It is however, argued that a significant number of rapes, robberies, and aggravated assault do occur in public places. Siegel (1992:106) has concluded that:

One's place of residence plays an important role in one's chances of victimization. Those living in central city had

significantly high rates of theft and violence than suburbanites; people living in non-metropolitan, rural areas had a victimization rate almost half than of city dwellers.¹

When violent crimes occur some victims are injured, others are killed, some require medical attention or hospitalization, those who are injured, received bullet wounds or wound produced by certain objects. The rate of injury from violent crime is highest for males who are between the ages of 19 and 24 (Siegel, 1992:106).

Several studies have shown that gender play a significant role in victimization. It is mostly argued that men are more likely to be victims of certain kinds of crime than women. Evidently, gender affects victimization risk, except for the crime of rape and sexual assault, male are more prone to be victims of violent crimes than their female counterpart. While male are almost twice likely than women to experience robbery, women are six times likely than men to be victims of rape or sexual assault (Siegel, 2005:56). For all crimes, it is posited that male are more likely to be victimized than female.

In another related dimension, while females are said to be most often victimized by persons they know, males are more likely to be victimized by stranger. With regard to those offenders victimizing female, about two-third were described as someone they knew or was related to. In contrast, only about half of male victims were attached to a friend, relative, or acquaintance (Siegel, 2005).

Under the social ecology of victims of crime, it is also advanced that marital status influence victimization. While never married males and females are victimized more often than married people, widows and widowers have the lowest

victimization risk. Siegel (2005:58) asserts that ‘this relationship between marital status and victimization is probably influenced by age, gender, and life-style: many young people, who have the highest victim risk, are actually too young to have been married; young single people also go out in public more often and sometimes interact with high-risk peers, increasing their exposure to victimization and widowers and widows suffer much lower victimization rates because they are old, interact with older people, and are more likely to stay home at night and to avoid public places.

Also the 1999 U.S National Crime victim Survey, which tried to establish nexus between the socio-demographic characteristic and the rate of victimization, has stated categorically how marital status affects individual chances of victimization. It was revealed that never married, divorced, or separated were nearly four times more likely than married persons and nearly nine times more likely than widowed person to be violent crime victims. According to the data, ‘the rate of never married rate of 14.4 for married persons and 6 for widowers (cf Bohn and Halley,2002:57).

This information simply suggests that people who are unmarried never married are more vulnerable or prone to victimization than those who are married. And this reality is a function of other socio-demographic factors such as age, gender, and lifestyle of the individuals.

The question of victimization is also linked to social status and social group that individual belong in the society. The poorest are seen as the most likely victims of violent crimes. It is argued that this association occurs across all gender, and age. Although the poor are more likely to suffer violent crimes, the wealthy are more likely the targets of personal theft crimes such as pick-pocketing and purse snatching

(Siegel, 2005). Perhaps the affluent, which sports expensive attire and drives better cars, attracts the attention of thieves.

According to Sagarin and McNamara (1975:73) some group of persons have higher risk rate of becoming crime victims than others because “(a) they are more likely to have what the criminal wants, or the criminal so believes; (b) they are more frequently present in high-crime areas, in situation in which plot are hatched and crime committed, or where there are temptation that lead to victimization; (c) they are defined as physically weaker than others and hence are liable to be “chosen” as easy targets by offenders; (d) they are believed to have relatively little access to law enforcement agencies; (e) they are engaged in activities that lend themselves to manipulation by predator; (f) they participate in high risk activities, either because of personality traits or because of goals that make the risk a necessity for assurance of success; and (g) they live on the periphery of the society, and receive so little social support for their activities that the normal constraints of ordinary persons are neutralized, because the latter define the victim as “worthless”. These factors identified are technically observable in police reports regarding the crime victim relationship in recognition of where, how and when the crime was committed, and by whom. Many more reason why different group of persons are at higher risk of becoming victims of crime than others can be established through survey research conducted with criminal themselves, self-report victims, ex-criminal offenders, present and former criminal justice agents, medical examiners and others.

2.6 The Effects of Criminal Victimization

The effects of criminal victimization are invariably synonymous to the impact of crime. In this regard, there are two dimensions; the impacts on the individual

victims; and the impacts on the society at large. However, the chief concern of this study is on the former-the impacts on the crime victims.

Fundamentally, crime is accompanied by certain consequences that seriously affect the general conditions of the crime victims. The primary and immediate effect on the victim is infliction of injury, harm or pain. Siegel (1992:106) asserts that “when violent crime occurs, some victims are injured, some others are killed, while some require medical attention or hospitalization”. Those who are injured either receive gunshot wounds or wounds produced by certain objects. Dambazzau, (1999; 126) in his attempt to conceptualize the word “victim” also rightly stated that a victim must have suffered such things as personal injury, death, loss of or injury to personal or real property as a result of crime” this simply indicates the fact that the primary effects of crime or criminal victimization are harm and injury to the victims. This harm or injury could be on the individual victims directly or their properties. Moreover, sometimes the harm could result or lead to the death of individual victims.

Another considerable effect of victimization on the crime victims is economic loss. In the words of Siegel (2005:52) “the cost of goods taken during property crime is added to productivity loss caused by injury, pain, and emotional trauma, the cost of victimization is estimated to be in the hundreds of billions of dollars”. Most instance of criminal victimization involves financial loss or wastage either as a result of direct loss (as in stealing), cost of damage to property, or due to cost incidental to victimization such as medical treatment, litigation, etc.

The cost in monetary terms of victimization arising from property, person, and other kinds of crimes can be quite heavy and staggering. And these cost are

inescapably borne by victims, except in a relatively few marginal cases when police allow reimbursement or indemnification (Igbo, 2006).

In addition, a crime victim is argued to have been abused by the system. The suffering endured by crime victims does not end when their attacker leaves the scene of the crime. They may suffer more victimization by the justice system in the hands of the police, and the courts in the process of investigation and persecution of offender (Igbo, 2006:248). They are often inconvenienced by the lack of consideration with regard to court scheduling of cases, harassed by the alleged offenders, and in some cases, threatened with further crimes.

Victims of crime also suffer stress and anxiety long after the incident is over and the justice process has been forgotten. For instance, spousal abuse victims suffer an extremely high prevalence of depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (and emotional disturbance following exposure to stress outside the normal human experience), anxiety disorder, and obsessive compulsive disorder (an extreme preoccupation with certain thoughts and compulsive performance of certain behaviors) (Siegel, 2005). Some victims are found to be physically disabled as a result of serious wounds sustained during episodes of random violence including a growing number that suffer paralyzing spinal cord injuries. And if victim have no insurance, the long term effects of the crime may have devastating financial as well as emotional and physical consequences.

Another considerable effect victimization has on crime victim is fear. People who suffer criminal victimization remain fearful long after their wounds have healed. A study concerning an effort to reduce gang crime and drug dealing in some of Chicago's troubled housing projects failed to meet its objectives because residents

feared relation from gang boys and possible loss of relationship; joining an effort to organize against crime placed them at extreme risk (Siegel, 2005:54). The fear of victimization is an affective emotional experience. It is both an expressed attitude and a psychological state provoke by an immediate sense of personal risk (Skogan, 1986). While individual holds belief about crime, they feel danger.

Another effect considered is anti-social behavior. There is growing evidence that crime victims are more likely to commit crime themselves. Being abused or neglected increase the odds of being arrested, either as a juvenile or an adult. People especially young males, who were physically or sexually abused, are much more likely to smoke, report significant amount of post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of prior victimization, which may in part explain their violent and criminal behavior.

2.7 Criminal Victimization and the Report to the Police

Victims of crime are most significantly links to the law enforcement and adjudication process. In most cases, “if the victim does not report the crime to the police, the event will not be dealt with by the criminal justice system” (C.F. Reid, 2000:38). The probability that a given crime will be handled by the criminal justice system is largely dependent on the decision of the victim to report or not to report his victimization to the police.

Studies in different parts of the world indicates that a large proportion of crime were not reported to the police by their victims due to several reasons: “nature of police-public relation; seriousness or extent of losses, police effectiveness in bringing the offenders to justice and recovery of property (in cases of property crimes), cost in terms of time, money and emotional stress) that may be incurred in reporting to the police; requirement of issuance or re-issuance of official documents; etc.” (cf Alemika

and Chuckwuma, 2005:32). Sometimes the decision as to whether to report or not to report victimization is informed by the nature and types of crime. Alemika and Chuckwuma (2005) in their studies on “Criminal Victimization and Fear of Crime in Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria”, discovered that murder, automobile robbery and automobile theft were the widely reported crimes. Sexual offences in particular have low rate or reporting insensitivity of law enforcement officials, statutory requirements for substantiation of allegations, prior relationships or acquaintance between offender and victims in majority cases.

In the said study, respondents who reported their victimization to the police advanced different reasons. However, the most important reasons given were the hope of recovering property lost from the criminals; desire to obtain help from police, to secure apprehension of the offender and seriousness of the criminal event.

In crime victim surveys in Nigeria, between 2005 and 2006, it was discovered that only 29.7% of the respondents reported to the police in 2005, while in 2006 the number had gone down to 11.4%. And the number of reasons given for not reporting to the police is that the police will not do anything about it, and that they solved it themselves for 2005 and 2006 respectively (Chuckwuman, 2008).

Invariably, in a British Crime Survey 2001/2002, those who did not report their victimization to the police did that because they thought the offence was too trivial or they thought the police would not have been able to do anything (Haralambus, Horlborn and Herald, 2004). Other patterns or considerations which produce non-reporting by crime victims are that: victimization is seen as a private/personal affair, not criminal matter; victim does not want to get involved in the police-court “come-today-come-tomorrow system” (Igbo, 2006:253)

All these information reveal that criminal victimization is a phenomenon that has not been properly addressed by the criminal justice system. The victims and even the general public do not have confidence on the police which is just like a gate-keeper of the criminal justice system. By extension, the philosophy of criminal justice system is basically offender centred to the detriment of the victim, who constitutes the essential element in any criminal justice process.

2.8 Victimization as Antecedent to Violent Behaviour.

A. from Victim to Offender: the importance of victimization as a casual factor in violent offending becomes all too evident when keeping in mind the fact that retaliation is a key ingredient in violence (Felson and Steadman, 1983) that revenge is the prevalent motive for the use of force. Gratuitous violence is the expression of a grievance, a response to an attack, injury, or provocation. As Black (1983) point out, violence is a mode of conflict management resembling the modes used in traditional societies which have little or no formal law.

Homicide, for example, is rarely predatory in nature. Relative few homicides are committed for gain or sexual gratification. In the vast majority of cases, the killing is reaction (or rather overreaction) to some form of victimization: the lover reacting to being cheated on, or abandoned, the victim of adultery avenging the offended honour, the drug dealer retaliating against the police informer, the hot-blooded young male stabbing the friend who got his sister pregnant , the land owner shooting the trespasser, the double-cross gang member applying his own brand of justice, the rape victim attempting to incapacitate the attacker, the drunk responding to an insult, threat or physical assault.

When aggression is met with aggression, violence is countered with violence, the roles are simply reversed. The initial aggressor becomes the victim and the initial victim ends up being the victimizer. Labels are applied responses, though defined as 'crime' by the law, is perfectly legitimate in the eyes of the perpetrator who perceive his retaliation as a justifier act, as a rightful reprisal.

B. from Offender to victim: not only is there a strong link between victimization and offending, but there is also a close link between offending and victimization. Involvement in criminal, illegal or deviant activity greatly enhances the chance of becoming a victim. Sampson and Lauristen (1990), found a significant relationship between the risk of victimization and involvement in violence, vandalism, and theft offending. In other words, person who engage in criminal offending sharply increase their overall risk of victimization. They further found that offence activity-whether of a violent or minor deviance, such as drinking or drug abuse-directly increase the risk of personal victimization.

The interrelationship between offending and victimization was reported in many other studies. Signer (1981), found that cohort members who were shot or stabbed were involved more frequently in official and self-reported criminal activity. His findings were corroborated by Savitz, lalli and Rosen (1977). Gotfredson (1984), discovered that for persons with at least one self-reported violence offence, is the likelihood of victimization for persons reporting self-reported violent offences.

2.9 The Criminal Justice System

The inevitability of crime phenomenon in human society necessitated the evolution and existence of certain agencies which are saddled with the responsibility

of managing, controlling, and preventing criminal behaviors. Formally, the agency saddled with such responsibility is the criminal justice system.

Criminal justice is a concept which is viewed from different angles by different scholars. According to Dambazzau (2012:178) criminal justice is defined as a legal process or as an academic discipline. That as a legal process, it involves the procedure of processing the person accused of committing crime from arrest to the final disposal of the case. On the other hand, as an academic discipline, criminal justice provides a thorough understanding of the criminal justice system in relation to the society. Students interested in pursuing professional carriers within the criminal justice focus on the subject for concentration on either law enforcement or corrections, or legal studies.

Bohn and Haley (2002:7-14) describe criminal justice system as both an institution and a system. The criminal justice system is essentially an instrument of social control; society considers some behaviour so dangerous and destructive that it either strictly controls their occurrence or outlaws them out rightly (Siegel, 2005). Like the family, schools, organized religion, media, and the law, criminal justice is an instrument of social control.

As an institution of social control, criminal justice is seen as “an organization that persuades people, through subtle and non-subtle means to abide by the dominant value of the society” (Bohm and Haley, 2002:7). Subtle means of persuasion include gossip, and peer pressure, whereas, expulsion and incarceration are examples of non-subtle means.

As an institution of social control, the criminal justice is said to differ from *others in two important ways. First, the role of criminal justice is restricted* officially

to persuading people to abide by limited range of social values: those whose violation constitutes crime. Although courteous behavior is desired of all citizens, rude behavior is of no concern to criminal justice, unless it violates the criminal law. Dealing with non-criminal rude is primarily the responsibility of the family.

Secondly, criminal justice is general to society's "last line of defence" against people who refuse to abide by dominant social values and commit crimes. Usually, society turns to criminal justice only after other institution of social control have failed.

On the other hand, criminal justice is also seen as a "system". A system is usually viewed as an organized or complex whole, an assemblage or combination of things or parts forming a complex or unitary whole. It is an entity which comprises of interconnected and interdependent parts which collectively constitute the whole, and still collectively work or function to ensure the maintenance and continuity of the whole system. (Danbazzau, 2009:173).

Based on this systemic idea or reality, criminal justice, as a system, is defined as "a machinery which a criminal, or someone suspected to have committed a crime, is processed and subsequently disposed" (Dambazzau, 1999:88). The criminal justice system is responsible for the regulation and control of criminal behavior. According to Dambazau (1999), criminal justice system is said to be valuable in two ways. First, the system is an instrument of practical purpose, accountable for the sufficient effective reduction of crime largely through distinct mechanisms, deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation.

Secondly, the system is also an instrument of justice, as a means of holding criminals accountable for their crimes, and simultaneously protecting their constitutional rights, which means that it is designed to produce justice.

2.10 Crime Victims and Criminal Justice Administration

It is in recent times that the role of the victim in the criminal system has risen into prominence. It is in this wise that there is plethora of studies in the world, especially in the developed societies, considering the victims experience, his views and his attitudes. Yet this recent upsurge of interest is in many ways surprising.

We have known for some time how vital the victim is to the operation of the criminal justice system. In a simplistic way, one might consider the system, and all the jobs and workings of the professionals within it as being built upon the actions of two people-the offender and the victim (Shapland, 1986). The numbers and types of cases entering the system and thereby providing the workload for the courts, prison service and the other conventional agencies, appear to be largely determined by the reporting behavior of victims and witnesses, not initiated by police (Clarke and Hough, 1980; Bottomley and Coleyman, 1981; Maguire, 1982).

Basically, there are two contradictory facets of the role of the victim-his practical importance and, in contrast, an ignorance of and ignoring of his attitudes and experiences by the professional in the criminal justice system. It is this paradox which is fundamental to our understanding of the victim's attitudes to the system.

First and foremost, it is argued that victims of crime are significant to the criminal justice system in the area of crime detection and reporting. In a study of victims of violent crimes, it was found that victims were vital in the reporting and investigation of cases and were also essential as providers of evidence for the courts (Shapland, 1986). In the said study, between 31% and 41% of cases were found to be reported by the victim himself, while another 50% were reported by other civilians, such as passers-by, neighbours, friends or those in charge of places where the offences

happened. This high percentage of the involvement of others is probably due to the violent nature of the offence and the consequent inability of the injured or the unconscious victim to report the offence himself. Only 3% and 4% cases were found discovered by the police themselves.

Indeed, the importance of the reporting of crime has been shown in many studies (McCabe, and Sutcliffe, 1978; Stear, 1980; Mawhy, 1979). The English Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure (1981) has stated that:

The overwhelming majority of (offences)
Is not discovered by the police,
But the public (of Fattah, (ed), 1986: 211).

Some studies revealed that the victims are important not only in crime but also in detection of crime and offenders (Maguire, 1982; Shapland, 1986). In the study of burglary victims and violent crime victims respectively, it is discovered that over 60% of cases were detected as a result of definite information (name or address) supplied by the victim another 8 to 13% were detected as a result of definite information supplied by witness, while only 14 to 25% of detection were the result of police actions.

However, this is not of course to deny a role for the police. Because without quick response by the police where victims have themselves apprehended the offender, or fast action when a name or address has been supplied, offenders would not be caught. The police may not be a major detection agency in these offences, but they are responsible for gathering evidence such that the offender, once caught can be prosecuted.

In addition, Igbo (2006) has tried to summarize the role play by victim or functions in the criminal justice administration. He thus stated:

The functions which victims perform are three-fold;
To report the crime to the police, to assist the police
In carrying out their investigations by providing
Vital information about the crime and the offender;
And to assist the courts in prosecuting offender by
Providing witness testimonies against accused
Persons (Igbo, 2006:249).

These contributions are fundamental inputs into the criminal justice process, and they go a long way to determine the degree of success achieved by the criminal justice in its crime prevention and control task.

On the other hand, crime victim is said to be neglected or ignored in the criminal justice process. The crime victims are not given that official recognition by the criminal justice system. Just like their counterpart-the offender/victimizer.

Dambazzau (1999:129-130) observes that “the crime victim is an observer or a passive participant in the criminal justice process. He is always represented by the state, and as such acts as a prosecution witness. He is rarely consulted in any decision making during the process. However, emphasis is so much laid on the rights of the accused; who enjoys some fundamental protection in order to ensure fair trial. The victim of crime does not enjoy legal protection, and in fact, he is made vulnerable to other victimization whenever he stands as a prosecutor witness”.

This clearly reveals the fact that the legal process does not consider interest rights, welfare, and all other needs of a crime victim which are usually informed by the impact of their victimization but rather concentrates substantially on the needs and interest of the crime suspect or offender.

In the criminal justice systems, the victims have an ideological interesting position. In its early stages, the criminal justice system may have been clearly victim-oriented (in offence with individual victims), but today's industrialized countries, all the decisions on how to deal with offences, even those offences with individual victims are regarded as the concern of the state; its prerogative and duty (Shapland, 1986).

Evidently, all these treatment given to crime victims has certain significant impacts in the relationship between the crime victim and the criminal justice system. In a study of victims of rape, it was found that the victims rated the police high only those that were disturbed about insensitive questioning and any attempt on the part of the police to regard the victim not as a person, but as evidence (Kelly, 1982).

However, in the middle of the investigation, in the same study, the initial high level of victim satisfaction with the police started to decline. This was due largely to lack of information for which the police were blamed. By the end of the police and court process, there was a significant decline in satisfaction with the police handling of the case and also the decision in attribution of positive qualities to the police generally. In that case, the police were described as being less-efficient, less over-worked, more offensive, less fair, less bureaucratic, more crooked, and less helpful" (c.f Fattah(ed) 1986:213).

In the criminal justice process, the victims are always obsessed with the need for information. Victims will like to know whether the offender is caught, what the charges are, whether he is in custody or on bail, when the court appearance would be, whether the victims would have to give evidence, whether the offender is convicted, and what the sentence is. The most important of these is however, the outcome, whether it will be conviction and sentence or just that the offender has not been caught, the police have no further leads and are filling the case. Of the total victims of rape studied, 88% felt that they should have received notification of the result of the case, and most of these put the responsibility on the police.

Criminal justice system can make more positive response to victims by keeping victims better informed, improving social service for victims, requiring restitution more frequently, and treating offender appropriately.

2.11 Theoretical Framework

A research of this nature requires a well framed theoretical base. In victimology there exist some theoretical ideas which attempt to explain the general issue concerning criminal victimization. These include theories like the victim-precipitation, life-style, routine activity, Marxist, environmental theories etc. As it is not possible to use all the theories at the same time to explain all issues, the Marxist theory of criminal victimization is reviewed and adopted to explain the issues in question. The reason behind the choice of Marxist theory of criminal victimization aside others, is due to its adequacy in explaining the issues at hand and its easy application to explain the situation of crime victims in the society.

2.12 Marxist Theory of Criminal Victimization

Marxism takes its name from its founder, the German-born philosopher, economist and sociologist, Karl Marx (1818-83). According to him, the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggle, ranging from communalism, slavery, feudal, capitalist, and socialist societies. He laid much more emphasis in the capitalist society.

The basic Marxist conception of capitalist society is that of a social order which is characterized by private accumulation of wealth, socio-economic inequality, competition, and conflict (Marx and Engels, 1976). These elements are the reflections of the dialectical interactions between the economic substructure and the superstructure of capitalist society. In this dialectical relationship the economic substructure exert the greater impact on the structuring of society and its institutions. The capitalist economy is characterized by a separation of the ownership of means of production from the direct producer (wage labourers) a condition which both establishes and maintain the existence of two unequal economic classes with opposing interests and unequal access to social power and socio-economic opportunities, leading to interclass conflicts. Marxists say that the character of *interclass* conflicts between these two classes, and the character of *intra*class conflict that goes on within each of the two classes determines the relations between the two major classes, as well as the character of law and all the other elements/institutions of society, in relation to intra-class conflicts. Marxists say that within/among the ruling class, the military, the merchants, bureaucrats, intellectuals, politicians conflict over the question of who exercise direct control of civil society. Among the subordinate classes the peasants, wage labourers, artisans, petty business people conflict over who

takes what share of the limited opportunities left for the subject classes by the dominant ruling class.

In general, the question of who and who are victimized by crime (i.e. who the victims of crimes are), as well as the problems encountered by victims of crime, are to be understood within the context of these series of dialectical relations within, and between social classes (cf. Gyong, 1994). As Marxists would say, all social phenomena (including criminal victimization) can be understood primarily from the nature of the contradictions inherent in the operative social order. Social phenomena as we observe them are the inherent products of the dialectical and historical forces propelling the social order. In capitalist society the bourgeois class by its dominant position and influence enjoys advantages which include protection from the state structure against criminal victimization. Because of the relatively better security which members of this class enjoy, only relatively occasionally, are some of its members victimized criminally by having their property stolen or their person assaulted etc. But even then, the chance of suffering victimization would depend on how much privileges particular bourgeois figures (or particular bourgeois subclass) derive from the state. In like manner, the treatment which the bourgeoisie receives as victims of crime within the criminal justice system, and their ability in the post-victimization phase to adjust to normal life in society depends largely on the amount of patronage they are able to muster from the state. In a similar way, the nature of criminal victimization experienced by members of the subject classes (the proletariat), and their treatment within the criminal justice system largely depend on their class situation, and the nature of the intra and interclass conflicts.

From a Marxists point of view, given the very nature (i.e. the structural arrangement) of capitalist society which emphasizes property accumulation and the

acquisition of commercial luxury goods, property –related victimization is exceptionally expectedly high in the system comparative to other forms of victimization e.g. person victimization. This pattern simply goes to confirm the Marxist assertion that the nature and character of criminal victimization does reflect the operative socio-economic order.

Ordinarily, the expectation would be that members of the bourgeois class are more prone to property victimization, being that they are the ones who own most of the property. One would have expected that by that reason the bourgeoisie would be the major targets of crime, however, this is not the case because of a number of reasons which have already been implied, namely that;

1. The bourgeoisie have more access to protection from the state and its law enforcement agencies and personnel, which safeguard their property and person's victimization.
2. Members of this class have huge resources at their disposal to provide themselves with additional protection and safety to complement those of the state.
3. In regard to treatment within the criminal justice system as victims, the great economic power and the recognition, status and respectability which the bourgeoisie command in society make it possible for them to enlist with ease the active attention and sympathy of criminal justice operatives. They are given fair treatment and receive sufficient cooperation.
4. Because of their affluence and social connections, the bourgeoisie are better able to cushion the negative impact of criminal victimization, and to adjust faster to normal life courses.

To conclude, for exactly the opposite reasons members of the underprivileged class have a not-too-pleasant scenario confronting them in their standing vis-à-vis victimization by crime. Their weak economic, political and social position in society puts them in a position of disadvantage. Their lot includes a tendency to suffer greater risk/vulnerability to several assortments of crimes; being less likely to be accorded fair and respectable treatment as crime victims by law enforcement officers; and a relative lack of capacity for fast adjustment to normal life. Members of the working class thus face greater problem and difficulties within the criminal justice administrative machinery than their more affluent counterparts (see Gyong, 1994).

2.13 Criticism

There is no single theory without shortcomings, for that reason, the Marxist theory is not also left out in this regards.

Ronald L. Akers, (Igbo, 2008:299), accuses Marxist criminologist of making static conclusions which are not derived from propositions that have been tested empirically. Akers claims that there is little empirical support for the claims made by Marxist criminologist.

Arguing along similar lines, postmodern feminist criminology has passed and extreme judgment on Marxist criminology describing it as a metanarrative, a master theory which is both unbelievable and indefensible. Feminist sociologists have given Marxist criminology a further serious bashing. They criticize conventional Marxist for its tendency to put excessive emphasis upon class inequality. (Igbo, 2008), Marxist they say have neglected the important role which patriarchy plays in influencing the operations of the criminal justice system.

Some sociologists also allege that Marxism likewise ignores the importance of racism in influencing criminal law enforcement, thereby making some class of individuals more victimized than the other class or group of people. Furthermore, some Marxists have been criticized for promoting a rather simplistic view of power distribution in capitalist society. The critics say that the view that capitalist ruling may have dominant control of power in the system is misleading. (Igbo, 2008).

Another aspect of Marxist criminology that has received attack from critics is the theory's inclination to over-emphasise the importance (i.e. dangerousness) of corporate crimes and white-collar crimes, and to deemphasise the harmfulness of common street crimes such as robbery, theft, burglary, assault and so on and so forth. Going by official police records, street crime has increased significantly in Britain, USA and most European countries since World War II (Young, 1993). They see the rising trend of street crimes as an indication that street crime has become serious crimes in those societies. Left realist criminologists believe also that street crimes cause the victims much more harm than Marxists (referred to as left idealists) appear to admit. Marxists have thus been accused of failing to take street crimes seriously (despite these evidences) and of romanticizing working-class criminals by asserting that criminals through their activities serve as a means of redistributing income and wealth from the rich to the poor.

Critics dismiss this claim on the grounds that in reality the main victims of working-class criminality are the poor themselves. Working-class criminals prey upon their fellow poor rather than stealing from the rich. Street crimes, not white-collar or corporate crimes, present the most concern to the majority of the populace. Also it is the poor, the deprived ethnic minorities and inner-city residents that face the highest

risks of victimization by common street crimes (Lea and Young 1984). For Marxist criminologist to downplay the importance of street crimes only to concentrate on crimes committed by the economic elite amounts to a lop-sided, nay, one-side analysis of crime. Both corporate crimes and street crimes ought to receive equal attention in Marxist criminology.

Finally, Marxist criminology is contrary to its assumption, as there is no simple straightforward and direct relationship, but rather a dialectical, mutual interplay or relationship between the economic base of society (the infrastructure) and the legal institution of society –the part of the superstructure of society which deals with the enactment and enforcement of criminal laws. That error which bothers on economic determinism has been rectified by neo-Marxist criminology.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Location of the study

The area of study of this research work is Lafia Local Government Area of Nasarawa State. Lafia is a town in central Nigeria and it was in 1976 that it was made the capital city of Nasarawa State and has a population of 330,712 inhabitants according to the 2006 census results. It is the largest town in Nasarawa state. Regionally, Lafia town is about 100km (straight distance) from the federal capital city Abuja and approximately southeast (SE) from federal capital territory (FCT). This means that Lafia town is within the 100km radius from the geographical centre of Nigeria. A regional trunk 'A' road passes through the city thus fostering inter-regional interaction. Cities that are of higher population size and higher order services that Lafia city interacts with are Makurdi (100km) south, Jos (190km) north east, and Abuja (180km) [see Fig. 2], Lafia in National/Regional setting. All these cities have express roads linking them to Lafia. As a state capital and large city, Lafia serves as a higher order city in the provision of consumer goods, administrative and other services to the immediate smaller towns that are directly linked to it. Such towns are, Nasarawa Eggon (20km and North of Lafia), Akwanga (60km, North) Doma (30km, South west) Kadarko (45km South) Assakio (40km West) and few other towns. Lafia as the headquarters of Lafia Local Government has several towns and villages, some of which have expanded and are mapped as independent nucleus of the larger Lafia area. Shabu, North of Lafia is a physical part of Lafia metropolis, also is Kwandare [See Fig. 3, map of Lafia LGA]. These were small independent towns some years ago

but are today part of the larger Lafia metropolis using the public facilities and services available to Lafia people. (Daniel and Obadiah, 2013)The major occupation of the people is farming. The following indigenous languages are found in today modern Lafia: Eggon, Mada, Kamberi, Ake, Gwandara, Migili, Ankwei, Tiv, Hausa, and Alago. (Ianna and Dugga, 2010:29).

3.2 Research Design

The central focus of this chapter is the outline of the procedure and the methodology employed to collect data for research work. Such an outline should enable an assessment of the reliability and validity of the data as well as inferences drawn from them. To achieve this, an appropriate research design was substantially used. And the chosen design for this research work was the survey design. This type of design usually involves collecting data from the field. The choice of this design basically was informed by its ability to elicit information from a large population and also to generate certain primary information from their original sources. The choice of the survey research design was due to its ability to elicit information from a large population. A survey generally collects data from a defined population under study using the variables in the research to make generalization. Hence, survey is designed to collect information from a small number of people so as to make generalization about the attitude, behaviors, perception and other characteristics of a much larger population.

For convenient administration, this survey will demand for the identification of the area of the study and also the determination of the population of the study. When these are done, the sample size would be determined using certain sampling techniques, after which the techniques for data collection would be identified and

applied. Usually in a design of this nature, it would also require the identification of the techniques to be used for data analysis, not only that, but also the anticipated difficulties the individual researcher would likely encounter, i.e., the anticipated field problems

3.3 Population and Sample Size

Since this research work is basically on the crime victims, the target population used for this study was mainly those individuals who have been criminally victimized in one way or the other, more importantly violent crimes such as robbery, murder, manslaughter, rap assault, etc. and property crime.

Since there were no any records of people who are victimized by crime in the area of study, (Lafia), everybody is a potential victim. Based on this, the research work utilized a sample size of 120 elements to represent the total population of the area of study which is 330712 inhabitants according to the 2006 census. And the choice of these elements was in order to effectively represent and justify the target population for the study, such that whatever was discovered at the end of the day could be said to be true of the entire target population.

3.4 Sampling Design

A study of crime victim requires certain specific sampling method or technique to be able to select an adequate and representative sampling size. As it is difficult to identify any area in Lafia town where there had never been a case of one crime or the other, the study used the various wards in the town. The existing recognized wards were used to serve as clusters for the study to make sure every segment of the town was represented in the study. Therefore, a non-probability

sampling technique was used. On the basis of this, the research work used wards as cluster and the snowball techniques to select the sample size elements, i.e. people that form the sample size of the study. Lafia Local Government Area is said to have thirteen (13) political wards, but out of these thirteen only seven (7) of them are situated in the town, namely: Accruba ward, Agyaragu Tofa ward, Chiroma ward, Gayam ward, Makama ward, Waquwa ward and Zanwa ward.

3.5 Techniques/Method of Data Collection.

A research of this nature calls for a specific approach to its data collection process. Thus, in any means in which the researcher will find useful information is not only important to him but also vital to research work. The study of the problem of crime victims in criminal justice administration requires substantially the use of both primary and secondary sources of data. To this end, this work drew and administered structured questionnaire in order to obtain information from the sample frame. The questionnaire majorly comprised of closed-ended questions and some few open-ended questions. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that it ensured the confidentiality of the respondents at the beginning of the exercise to clarify issues that may be raised in the questionnaire.

The questions on the questionnaire are grouped into three sections. Section A: for personal data or socio demographic variable of the respondents. Section B: for the nature and pattern of criminal victimization of the respondents. Section C: for the respondent's view on criminal justice administration, with particular reference to the treatment of crime victims. The questionnaire was drafted in a simple and straightforward language, and also as brief as possible. The use of questionnaire is

imperative since it allow people to state their options. The use of questionnaire is further justified on the basis of its convenience and is less time consuming.

Other methods like the interview techniques, as well as documentary study was paramount to this study or research work, and it was relevantly used wherever it was required. The interview was mostly used to elicit information from the representatives of criminal justice system, especially important and relevant agents from the police (such as the Division Crime Officer and the inspector of crime of Lafia police division) and the criminal court (such as the Registrar and the Court clerk of the Chief Magistrate Court, Lafia).

3.6 Technique/Method of Data Analysis.

For the purpose of this study, both quantitative and qualitative method of data analysis was employed. However, quantitative analysis covered most aspect of the analysis in order to achieve both reliability and validity of results. Quantitative analysis as the name suggests, involves description and data presentation in numerical form. In view of this, frequency and percentage, as well as contingency coefficient statistical measure of association was used in the analysis to determine the frequency of occurrence and the relationship between the variables. The choice of contingency coefficient was due to the fact that the variables in questionnaire usually assessed at the nominal level of measurement. While the information from the interview would be analyse through direct narration of the responses wherever it was applicable.

3.7 Problems Encountered in the Field

A research of this nature cannot be without problems or difficulties, these difficulties are basically in the area of field research.

One of these problems is the cost involved in going round all the areas involved in the research.

Other problem is in terms of the relationship between the researcher and respondents. It was a little bit difficult for the researcher to know or identify in each cluster who was criminally victimized in one way or the other since it is not all the crime victims that pronounce or even report their victimization. While some did not report it because they felt it was too common, others did that because of the nature of crime committed against them and so on. There are some crimes that their victims may feel so introvert to uncover their occurrence, they thus, decide to conceal it to themselves.

The understanding of the respondents on the purpose of this research to feel in the questionnaire was also another major problem.

Because of the above problems, it was difficult to get the required number of sample elements from some clusters. This could be due to the fact that those who were victimized chose not to declare their status as being experienced by criminal victimization. Sometimes this problem could be as a result of the nonchalant attitudes of the target population. Perhaps, because of their low literacy level, they might not understand quickly the importance of the study to them and society at large.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

The specific focus of this chapter is to present, analyse and interpret the data collected from the survey. Out of the 120 questionnaire distributed 100 were successfully recovered from the field.

4.1 Socio-Demographic Variables of the Respondents

TABLE 4.1 Sex Distributions of the Respondents

SEX	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
MALE	61	61
FEMALE	39	39
TOTAL	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

The above table clearly indicates that out of the total respondents, 61% were found to be male, while 39% were female out of the 100 respondents. This information reveals that male were more likely to be criminally victimized than their female counterpart. This could probably be due to the fact that male have more contact with the outside world than female therefore are more expose to one criminal tendency or the other.

However, there are certain kinds of crime that female were always the dominant victims like rape, but from the general point of view, male were mostly found to be criminally victimized than female.

Furthermore, in an interview conducted with the divisional crime officer area command Lafia, it was revealed that most of the people reported to have been victimized were men.

TABLE 4.2 Age Distribution of the Respondents

AGE	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Less 25	20	20
25-35	30	30
36-50	39	39
51-above	11	11
Total	100	100

Source: field survey, 2015.

From the table 4.2 above, 20 percent of the respondents constituted those of age below 25 years, 30 percent of them indicate those within the age bracket of between 25 and 35. While 39 percent of them represent those respondents of age between 36 and 50, the remaining 11 percent constitute those who were 51 years and above. By implication, the information above indicates that individuals who were adults were more likely prone to victimization than those who were under aged. This could be due to the fact that adult attained the age of responsibility and therefore could claim ownership of certain worthy materials which serve as elements of attraction to perpetual criminals.

TABLE 4.3 MARITAL STATUSES OF RESPONDENTS

MARITAL STATUS	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Married	29	29

Single	60	60
Others	11	11
Total	100	100

Source: Field survey, 2015

From the above table, 29% of the respondents were found to be married, while 60% of them constituted those who were single. The remaining 11% constituted other categories such as those who have married but at the time of this study either under divorced situation or separated. The information simply reveals that individuals who were single were more prone to certain kinds of victimization than those who were married, divorced or separated. This is due to the fact that single people were more likely to be involved in social life activity than their either married, divorced or separated counterparts.

TABLE 4.4 Employment Statuses of the Respondents

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Worker	28	28
Employee	27	27
Self employed	24	24
Unemployed	11	11
Others	10	10
Total	100	100

Source: Field survey, 2015

The table above reveals that 28% of the total respondents constitute those who were worker, while 27% of them were employee, 24% constitute those who were self-employed, while 11% constitute those who were unemployed and the remaining 10%

were those who are from other categories of employment status such as the pensioners, disabled, under employed etc. The information clearly indicates that individuals who were employed in one form of employment status or the other are most likely to be criminally victimized than those who are not employed. This could be due to the fact that the employed persons have certain commitment which could fetch them certain world resources that can attract the attention of the criminals.

On the demographic characteristics of crime victims in Lafia Local Government area, from the information obtained in the course of the interview with Area Command Police Station Lafia, it revealed that crime victims were mostly found to be male who have attained the age of responsibility. Most of them were also found to be single with at least some sources of income.

4.5 Information on Criminal Victimization of the Respondents

This section presents an analysis of the extent of criminal victimization as experienced by the respondents. In addition, the perception of crime and safety, as well as the treatment of crime victim in the criminal justice system were also analysed in this section.

TABLE 4.6 Number of Criminal Victimization of the Respondents

NUMBERS OF TIMES	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Once	30	30
Twice	39	39
Three or more Times	31	31
Total	100	100

Source: Field survey, 2015

From the above table, 30% of the total respondents are those who were victimized in their lives time only once, while 39% of them were victimized twice. The remaining 31% constitute those respondents who were victimized three or more times. The information simply reveals that majority of the respondents were victimized two or more times with about 70% out of the total respondents. This information can actually go a long way to unveil realities behind the extent and rate of crime and victimization in the society.

TABLE 4.7: The Nature of the Respondents Victimization

NATURE OF CRIME	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Violent crime	31	31
Property crime	42	42
Organized crime	13	13
Others	14	14
Total	100	100

Source: Field survey, 2015

The above table indicates that out of the total respondents, 31% were discovered to be victims of violent crimes, while 42 were victims of property crime, only 13% constituted victims of organized crime, the remaining 14% are those categories of crime not stated in the above table such as corruption, child abuse, drug abuse, human trafficking, etc. The violent crime here involves robbery, murder, arson, assault, rape, burglary, etc. while property crime includes thief of personal property such as car, motorcycle, handset, etc.

The information reveals that there are more cases of property and violent crimes. But property crimes are found to be more common among the various cases of recorded crimes.

According to the Divisional Crime Officers (D.C.O), Lafia Police Division A, and a magistrate, a judge in Lafia magistrate court, property and violent crimes are the most common cases that tend to appear before them as far as crime is concerned. Also common among the criminal cases experienced were theft and stealing, car and motorcycle snatching armed robbery and burglary.

TABLE 4.8 Types of Dwelling of the Respondents

TYPES OF DIVELLING	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Flat	42	42
Single room	58	58
TOTAL	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

The above table indicates that 42% of the respondents represent those who live a flat while 58% of them were those who live in a single room. The information reveals that individuals who live in single rooms are more likely to be criminally victimized than those who live in flat. It means that those who live inside flats can afford more security in terms of victimization than those who live in the single rooms.

TABLE 4.9 Residential Neighbourhoods of Respondents

RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
High socio-economic	34	34
Low socio-economic	66	66
TOTAL	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

The table above clearly shows that 34% of respondents represent those who live in high socio-economic neighbourhood while the remaining 66% constitute those who live in low-socio-economic residential neighbourhood. This indicates that those who live in a low socio-economic residential neighbourhood tend to be more prone to criminal victimization than those from high socio-economic neighbourhood. This information is in line with the Marxist victims theory of crime that was reviewed and adopted in chapter two (2) of this project, which stated that lower class are more prone to victimization than the higher class. This is because the higher class can afford additional security from the state than their lower class counterparts.

4.10 Respondent's Perception of Crime Rate in the Community

CRIME RATE	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Increase	56	56
Decrease	44	44
TOTAL	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

From the above table, 56% of the total respondents agreed that crime trend is on the increase in their respective communities while the remaining 44% constitute those who opined that crime trend is decreasing in their respective communities.

This shows that, the crime trend is on the increase in their respective communities since the percentage of those who agreed that the crime trend is increasing is higher than those who agreed that the crime trend is reducing. By implication, the information reveals that crime victimization is said to be increasing than decreasing in the respective communities of the respondents.

TABLE 4.11 Respondent’s Perception of General Safety in the Community

SAFTY STEPS	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Very safe	17	17
Fairly safe	53	53
Not safe	30	30
Total	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

Table 4.11 above indicates that 17% of the respondents agreed that there is safety in their communities while 53% stated that their communities are fairly safe, 28% of them constitute those who agreed that life in the community is not safe at all. From the information above, it is evident that, the responses of those who said there is fairly safety in the community is greater than the other responses with more than 50% of the total respondents, followed by those respondents who perceived life in the community was not safe with 30%. This implies that, the security forces have to do more in term of ensuring safety in the community.

TABLE 4.12 Times Victimization Mostly Take Place

PERIOD OF VICTIMIZATION	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Morning	13	13
Afternoon	10	10
Evening	30	30
Night	47	47
Total	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

Table 4.12 above indicates that 13% of the total respondents constitute those who admitted that crime and criminal victimization normally take place in their community in the morning, while 10% of them admitted that crime and criminal victimization take place in afternoon, 30% constitute those who advanced that criminal victimization take place in the evening, and 47% constitute those who admitted that criminal victimization mostly take place at night. By implication, the information reveals that most crime and victimization take place in the evening and at night. This could be due to the absence of human activities at dark and that it keeps personality and personal features of the criminal hidden. The above information is in line with the respondents views who said they feel safe working alone in neighbourhood after dark. From their responses, it was revealed that 69% of them submitted that they do feel safe working alone in the neighbourhood after dark.

In another related question concerning whether they feel safe at home at dark, 70% of them submitted that even at home they do not feel safe at dark, while 30% of

them admitted that they only feel fairly safe at home after dark. This information simply reveals that the level of the general insecurity in the community is mostly alarming at dark.

4.13 Respondent’s Views on the Criminal Justice Administration

This section deals with the analysis of the problems and nature of criminal victimization, more particularly the treatment of crime victims by the criminal justice system. The section attempt to analyse the views of respondents towards the criminal justice system in terms of the police performance in crime control, helpfulness to citizens and their pattern or assessment of the general treatment of crime victims in administration of criminal justice.

TABLE 4.14 Police Performance in Crime Control

POLICE PERFORANCE	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Very good	6	6
Fairly good	40	40
Not good	54	54
Total	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

Table 4.14 above indicates that 6% of the respondents admitted that police performance in crime control is very good. While 40% of the total respondent revealed that police performance is fairly good, the remaining 54% of them opined that police performance in crime control is not good at all. The information generally implies that police performance towards crime control is not good.

In another related question, only 8% of the total respondents submitted that police helpfulness to citizen is effective, while 60% of them admitted that their helpfulness to citizens is not effective. The remaining 32% submitted that police helpfulness to citizen is strongly not effective. By assessment, the information reveals that helpfulness of police to citizens is ineffective.

TABLE 4.15 Victims Report of Crime to the Police.

CRIME REPORT	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Reported	41	59
Not Reported	59	41
Total	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

Table 4.15 above indicates that 41% of the total respondents advanced that they reported their cases of victimization to the police, while the remaining 59% constitute those who submitted that they had not reported their case of victimization to the police. Out of those found to have ever reported their case of victimization to the police, majority of them 41% advanced that they needed help from the police, out of those found not to have ever reported their case to police significant number of them 59% opined that police would not do anything about the situation. This information reveals that people have drastically lost confidence in police as their safe guards.

TABLE 4.16 Assessing the Treatment of Crime Victims in Criminal Justice Administration.

TREATMENT OF CRIME VICTIMS	RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE
Highly considerate	5	5
Considerate	20	20
Inconsiderate	34	34
Highly Inconsiderate	41	41
Total	100	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

From the table above, 5% of the respondents admitted that treatment of crime victims is highly considerate while 20% of them submitted that crime victims treatment is considerate, 34% of the respondents opposed that the treatment of crime victims in the criminal justice administration is inconsiderate while the remaining 41% submitted that the treatment is highly inconsiderate. The information implies that there is no considerable treatment received by the crime victims in the criminal justice administration in Nigeria.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMENDATION

This chapter presents the major findings of the study, besides that, conclusion and recommendation were drawn based on the results of the finding for the improvement of criminal victims' situation in the administration of criminal justice system.

5.1 Discussion

This research work analyses the nature, extent and pattern of criminal victimization as well as the perception of criminal justice administration with particular reference to the treatment of crime victims. From the study, it was general found out that male are more likely to be criminally victimized than female. And this is due to the fact that men occupy more committed and active position in the society, hence, they become more in contact with the outside world than their female counter parts which expose them to the criminal victimisation. More so, for the fact that men occupy superior position in the society, they mostly control materials means of livelihood which actually constitute elements of attraction to the criminals. However, it is important to note that there are certain kinds of crime which female are more at danger than their male counterparts for example rape. This assertion is in line with the literature reviewed in the statement of (siegel, 2005).

From the study, it was discovered that single people are more likely to be criminally victimized than those who are married. This is due to the fact that singles engage in social activities in society than their married counterparts. Criminal victimization is also found to be related to people's employment status. It was

discovered that individuals who are employed are more prone to criminal victimization than the unemployed. This could be due to the fact that the employed, have certain world resources that can attract the attention of the criminals. The above discussion is also in line with the literature reviewed in work of (siegel, 2005) in chapter two.

Also from the Data collected and analysed, in respect to the number of criminal victimization in Lafia, it was revealed that majority of the respondents were victimized two or more times with 70% out of the total respondents. This single fact of having most respondents to be criminally victimized for two or more times indicate the level and rate of criminal cases in the society at large.

In addition, the study further revealed that the most types of crime that people were affected with in the area of study are property and violent crimes. Moreover, those who were found to be mostly affected by crime victims were individuals who lived in single rooms. This might be because they could not afford additional security from the state.

In terms of the residential neighbourhood, the study discovered that those who live in a low socio-economic residential neighbourhood tend to be more prone to criminal victimization than those from high socio-economic neighbourhood. This information is in line with the Marxist theory of criminal victimization that was reviewed and adopted in chapter two of this project.

The study further revealed that crime is on the increase in Lafia Local Government Area and that lives of people are not safe especially at night. By implication crime victimization is said to be in the increase.

In terms of the respondents view on the criminal justice administration with reference to the treatment of crime victims, it was discovered that police performance in crime control is not good and in effective. Out of those found to have ever reported their case of victimization to the police, majority of them (61%) advanced that they needed help from the police, out of those found not to have ever reported their cases to police significant number of them 29% opined that police, would not do anything about the situation. This indicates that people have drastically lost confidence in police as their guards. In another related situation in terms of police performance in crime control, table 4.14 revealed that the police were not effective.

Generally the police are assessed to be less effective in crime control and highly inconsiderate in the treatment of crime victims. The study further revealed that the general treatment of crime victim by the criminal justice system is highly inconsiderate. This indicates negative perception of criminal justice system in terms of their treatment of crime victims. This is because from the study in Lafia, no single evidence was found for the existence and practices of victim's service programs as a corresponding measure for the offender's reformatory and rehabilitative philosophy in the Nigerian correction institutions (prisons).

5.2 Summary

This research work examined the general condition and plight of crime victims in the administration of criminal justice in Nigeria. It was devoted to examine the nature, extent and pattern of criminal victimization and the general process of criminal justice administration with particular reference to the treatment of crime victims. The study collected information from 120 respondents through snowball in the area of study. Subsequently questionnaire was administered, out of 120

questionnaire administered, 100 were retrieved successfully with the findings as follows.

In the study, it was found that males are more prone to victimization than female. Male were found to constitute 61% while female 39%. Also the finding reveals that adults are more likely or prone to victimization than those who are under aged. As for the marital status, the individuals who are singles were more prone to victimization with 60% higher than those who are married, divorced or separated with 29% and 11% respectively. In terms of employment status, individuals who are employed are most likely to be criminally victimized than those who are not employed.

Since all the respondents are people who have experienced criminal victimization, over 69% of them were found to have been victimized for two or more times and mostly it was either property or violent crime with 42% and 31% respectively. Out of all the respondents, 58% were confirmed to be living in single rooms and 42% were in flat. In terms of the respondents' perception of general safety in the society, more than 67% of the total respondents said life was fairly or not safe at night than the day time. In another finding those who were of lower socio-economic status were prone to victimization than the higher socio-economic status.

In the study, crime rate is in the increase in Lafia Local Government Area vis a vis the victimization cases with 56% and 100% respectively. In crime reporting 59% of the total respondents do not report their crime to the police simply because police would not do anything about the situation. The study also revealed that police performance in crime control is not good with 54%.

In treatment of crime victims in the criminal justice administration, the study discovered that there is no considerable treatment received by the crime victims. At the end the study revealed that there is weak positive association between the variables in questions.

5.3 Conclusion/Recommendations

As the study revealed that crime victims are not fully given adequate consideration, despite the fact that they are one of the important elements and integral part of any crime and criminality in the administration of criminal justice system, it will be important that attention should be given to them. The crime victims are most found to be relegated to the background with reference to the criminal justice processes, all in the name of being represented by the state, while the state does not in any way, in practice act as a true representative of the crime victims. The victims of crime encounter multiple problems which come both from the angle of criminal justice system and the society such as neglect in the justice processes, harassment and intimidation in the hands of the police and criminal court of justice, physical harm, economic loss psychological trauma and the rest.

Based on the above, this research intends to draw the attention of the criminal justice system as well as the government to look into the plight of the victims as one and integral part of the criminal justice system. The criminal justice system should be made in such a way that crime victims' participation will not be passive but active in the adjudication of cases. The criminal justice system can make more positive response to victims by keeping victims better informed. This will go a long way to reduce the problem faced by the victims.

Moreover, the criminal justice administration should endeavour to introduce some practical service programs to the crime victims to ensure balanced treatment between the offenders and victims by the criminal justice system.

Since offenders receive reformation and rehabilitation training, the victims should be provided with certain compensatory rehabilitative programs. Because in addition to various financial needs, victims of violent crimes for example, may also require immediate or long term medical consideration as well as other forms of assistance. These needs are seriously recognized in paragraph 14 of the “United Nations Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power” the declaration states that “Victims should receive the necessary materials, medical, physiological and social assistance through government, voluntary organizations, community based and indigenous means” paragraph 17 of the same declaration further emphasis that, “In providing services and assistance to victims, attention should be given to those who have special needs because of the nature of the harm inflicted”.

The government should enact laws which will give the victims of crime right to actively participate in the criminal proceeding of their case in court.

In addition, in the area of the study,(Lafia), it was discovered that crime rate is on the increase therefore government should efficiently allocate and recruit adequate resources and well trained personnel to the criminal justice institutions namely the police, prison and court to ensure effective crime prevention and control as well as effective and reliable administration of criminal justice. If the above recommendations are considered, it will go a long way to reduce the plight of the victims and further victimization and so also ensure a true balance between

prosecution, defence and victims interests so that justice should be a reality and reflection of the criminal justice system in Nigeria for all who come before it in respect of one's social position in the society.

REFERENCES

- Adewoye, O. (1977). *The Judicial System in Southern Nigeria, 1854- 1954 Law and Justice in a Dependency*. New Jersey: Atlantic Highlands, Humanities Press
- Akande, J. (1989). "Problems of Victim in the Administration of Justice: Legal Perspective, National Conference on Criminal Justice Restitution, Compensation and Remedies for Victims of Crime.
- Alemika, E.1984. "The public and the criminal justice system in Nigeria", unpublished manuscript.
- Ayorinde, B. and Co. (2014), "A Reformatory Approach to the Criminal Justice System in Nigeria", (posted on January), Internet Sources.
- Bohm, R.B. & Haley, K. N. (2002). *Introduction to Criminal Justice*. 3rd Edition. New York: Mcg Raw Hill.
- Christic, N. (1986). "The Ideal Victim" in Fattah, E, A (ed). *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy: Reorienting the Justice System*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Dambazau, A. B. (1999). *Criminology and Criminal Justice Kaduna: Nigeria Defence Academy Press*.
- Ebbe, O: N.I. (1985). "Power and Criminal Law" *Criminalization of Conduct Norms in a Colonial Regime.*" *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 9.(2) pp. 113-122.
- Elias, O. T. (1964). *Groundwork of Nigeria law*. London: Routeledge &Kegan Parel, ltd.
- Elias, O. T. (1963). *The Nigeria Legal System*. London: Routeledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd
- Elias, O. T. (1967).*The British Commonwealth: The Development of its Law and Constitution-Nigeria*, 4. London: Steve & Sons, Limited
- Elias, O. T. (1964).*The Prison System in Nigeria*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press
- Elias, O. T. (1972). *The Nigeria Magistrate and the Offender: Benin City Ethiope Publishing Company*.
- Fattah, E.A (ed) (1986) *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy: Reorienting the Justice System*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Goldsman, I. G. (1971)" *Crime is Just the Start of Victim Difficulties*" *Washington Post*, June 6, pp. d1, d12.

- Gyong, J. E (1989). "the Victim of Crime and the Criminal Phenomenon" A paper Presented at the Report of Sociology Staff Seminar, ABU, Zaria.
- Gyong, J.E., (1996).The Neglect of victims of common crimes In Nigeria: The case of Kaduna State. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, A.B.U., Zaria.
- Gyong, J.E., (1989).Criminological Theories and their Implications for Crime Prevention and Control. NSPMC LTD, Lagos.
- Goldstein, (1984)" Crime Victim and Criminal Justice Administration" in the World Society of Victimology Newsletter (1983.3)
- Haralambos, M. and Holborn, M. (2000). Sociology: Themes and perspectives (5th Edn). London: Harper Collins pub. Ltd.
- Huang, V. Y. S. (1987). "Secondary Victimization by the Criminal Justice System: Addressing the Problem and their Source" In World Society of Victimology (Newsletter 1986/87)
- Igbo E. M. (2006) Criminology: A Basic Introduction. Enugu: Jock-ken Publisher.
- Iwarimie-Jaja, D., (2003). Criminology: The Study of Crime. Springfield Pub Coy Ltd., Nigeria.
- Maguire, M. (1982), "Burglary in a Dwelling: the Offence, the Offender and the Victim. London: Heinemann.
- McDonald, W. F. (1975). "Criminal Justice and the Victim", 6.p.17.
- Marek, A. E (1984), "Crime Victim and Criminal Justice Administration" In the World Society of Victimology Newsletter (1983/84 vo.3).
- NSWCCL, (2009). Victims of Crime. Sydney Soceth NSW1235
- Nwabueze, B. B. (1963).The Machinery of Justice in Nigeria. London: Butterworths.
- Obilade, A. O. (1969), "Reform of Customary Law Court Systems in Nigeria under the Military Government", Nigeria Law Journal, vol. 3.
- Odekunle, F. (1979). "the Victims of Crime in Developing Countries: A Nigeria study", A Paper Presented at the 2nd International Symposium of Victimology Massachussettes.
- Odekunle, F. (1989) "Compensating Victims of Organised Crime, National Conference on Criminal Justice: Restitution Compensation and Remedies for Victims of Crime (Abuja Nigeria).
- Okonkwo, C. O. and Naish, M. (1964). Criminal Law in Nigeria (Excluding the North). London: Sweet and Maxwell

- Pointing, J. and Maquire, M. (1988). *Victims of Crime: A New Deal?* Milton Keynes OUP.
- Randzinowicz, L. and Wolfgang, M.E.(1971)*The Criminal in Society*. Basic Books Inc.
- Rawls, J. (1971), *A Theory of justice*, Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press.
- Schafer, S., (1977). *Victimology: The Victim and his Criminal Offender*. Virginia: Reston Coy Inc.
- Shapland, J. (1986). *Victims Assistance and the Criminal Justice System: the Victim's Perspective'* In Fattah, E.A (ed) *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy: Reorienting the Justice System*. London
- Siegel, L. R. (2005). *Criminology: the Core*. U.S.A.: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Sparks, et al., (1977) *Surveying Victims of Crime: A Study of the Measurement of Criminal Victimization*. John Wiley and sons.
- Subin, H. I. (1966) *Criminal Justice in Metropolitan Court*. Washington D.C: Office of Criminal Justice, U.S. Dept. of Justice.
- United Nations, (1984) *Report on crime prevention and criminal justice in the context of development. Guidelines for the Measures on Behalf of Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power*. Vienna
- Wikipedia, (2007) *Victimology*. The Free Encyclopedia. Wikimedia Foundation, Wikipedia.
- Wolfgang, M. E. et-al (eds) (1971).*A United States President Commission Study on the 'Victims of Crime' in Crime and Justice Vol. 1* (Basic book Inc. Pub. New York).
- Ziegenhagen, E. (1974) *'Victims of Violent Crime in New York City: An Explanatory Survey of Perceived Needs'* Unpublished Report to the Crime Victims Consultation Project, New York.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Sociology,

Faculty of Social Science,

School of Postgraduate Studies

Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

Dear Respondent,

I am an M.sc student of Nasarawa State University, Keffi from department of sociology. I am currently conducting a research on the ‘‘Crime Victims and Administration of Criminal Justice. A Case Study of Lafia Local Government Area’’.

You are therefore requested to kindly complete the attached questionnaire which is designed with the aim of collecting relevant data that would serve as a guide for the researcher’s analysis and presentation. Please be assured that your responses would be treated with utmost confidentiality and used for the purpose of this research only.

Thank you.

Yours Faithfully,

Anzaku Sylvester Alex

Research Student.

INSTRUCTION: Please respond by kindly ticking the option you consider suitable from the boxes provided below.

SECTION A: SOCIO- DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF RESPONDENTS

1. Sex:(a) Male () (b) Female ()
2. Age:(a) Less than 25 () (b)25-35 () (c)36-50 () (d) 51 and above ()
3. Marital Status: (a) Married () (b) Never married () (c) others ()
4. Education : (a) Less primary () (b) primary () (c) secondary () (d) Tertiary () (e) No response ()
5. Employment status: (a) employed () (b) unemployed () (c) students/ vocational trainees () (d) house wives () (e) others

SECTION B: NATURE AND PATTERN OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION

6. Have you ever been criminally victimized?
(a) Yes () (b) No ()
7. How many times have you been victimized?
(a) Once () (b) Twice () (c) Three or more times ()
8. What is the nature of your victimization?
(a) Violent () (b) Property () (c) Organized () (d) Other ()
9. What is your type of dwelling?
(a) House/duplex/flat () (b) Single room ()
10. What is the nature of your neighborhood?
(a) High socio-economic () (b) Low socio-economic ()
11. What is your own perception of crime trend in your community? (a) Increases ()
(b) Decreases ()
12. What is your own perception of general safety in your community?

(a) Very safe () (b) Fairly safe () (c) Not safe ()

13. At what time does victimization mostly take place?

(a) In the day time () (b) At dark () (c) All the time ()

14. Do you feel safe walking alone in the neighborhood?

(a) Very safe () (b) Fairly safe () (c) Not safe ()

15. Do you feel safe at home after dark?

(a) Very safe () (b) Fairly safe () (c) Not safe ()

**SECTION C: INFORMATION ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE
ADMINISTRATION**

16. How do you rate police performance in crime control?

(a) Very effective () (b) Fairly effective () (c) Not effective ()

17. How do you assess police helpfulness to citizens?

(a) Strongly effective () (b) Effective () (c) Not effective () (d) Strongly not effective ()

18. Have you ever reported your case of victimization to the police?

(a) Yes () (b) No ()

19. If yes to (18) above, why

(a) To recover stolen property (b) To stop it happening (C) To get help from the police (d) Crime is a serious problem that should be reported

20. If “no” to (18) above, why?

(a) Incident not very serious (b) Family solve it (c) No sufficient evidence (d) Police would not do anything

21. Are you Satisfied with police handling of reported crimes?

(a) Yes () (b) No ()

22. If “no” to (21) above, why?

(a) Did not do enough to solve the crime (b) Did not apprehend the offender (c) Did not recover goods (d) did not inform me of the progress in the investigation (e) Impolite to me (f) Slow to respond or arrive

23. How do you generally asses the treatment of crime victims in the administration of criminal justice?

(a) Highly considerate () (b) Considerate () (c) Highly inconsiderate ()
(d) Inconsiderate ()

24. Is there any service programmers provided for you by the criminal justice system?

(a) Yes () (b) No ()

25. Which of the dispute resolution agencies are you mostly satisfied with?

(a) Family () (b) Police () (c) Traditional System () (d) Court ()

26 .State possible way through which the general situation of the crime victims and that of criminal justice administration can be improved

1.....

2.....

3.....

4.....

5.....

APPENDIX B

4.17 SOCIAL STATUS AND CRIME VULNERABILITY

Socio Economic Status

VULNERABILITY TO CRIME	HIGH	LOW	TOTAL
Vulnerable	16	18	34
Not Vulnerable	12	20	32
Others	10	24	34
Total	38	62	100

Sources: Field survey, 2015.

From the table 4.17 above using contingency coefficient as statistical measure to determine the relationship between socio-economic status and crime vulnerability.

Formula for contingency coefficient is given as

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{X^2}}{N + X^2}$$

Where

X^2 = the calculated chi –square value

N = the total number of cases

C = the contingency co-efficient.

To get X^2 , the formula is given as

$$X^2 = \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$$

fe

Where fo = is the observed frequency

fe = is the expected frequency

To get fe, is computed as

$$fe = \frac{RM \times CM}{N}$$

N

Where RM = raw marginal total

CM = column marginal total

$$Fe = \frac{38 \times 34}{100} = \frac{1292}{100} = 12.92$$

$$\frac{38 \times 32}{100} = \frac{1216}{100} = 12.16$$

$$\frac{38 \times 34}{100} = \frac{1292}{100} = 12.92$$

$$\frac{62 \times 34}{100} = \frac{2108}{100} = 21.08$$

$$\frac{62 \times 32}{100} = \frac{1984}{100} = 19.84$$

$$\frac{62 \times 34}{100} = \frac{2108}{100} = 21.08$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(16-12.92)^2}{100} + \frac{(12-12.16)^2}{100} + \frac{(10-12.92)^2}{100} + \frac{(18-21.08)^2}{100} +$$

12-91 12.10 12-92 21.08

$$\frac{(20-19-84)^2}{19-84} + \frac{(24-21.08)^2}{21.08}$$

19-84 21.08

$$X^2 = \frac{(3.08)^2}{12.92} + \frac{(0.16)^2}{12.16} + \frac{(2.92)^2}{12.92} + \frac{(3.08)^2}{21.08} + \frac{(0.16)^2}{19.84} + \frac{(2.92)^2}{21.84}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{9.48}{12.92} + \frac{0.025}{12.16} + \frac{8.52}{12.92} + \frac{9.48}{21.08} + \frac{0.025}{19.84} + \frac{98.52}{21.08}$$

$$X^2 = 0.73 + 0.002 + 0.65 + 0.44 + 0.001 + 0.40$$

$$X^2 = 2.223$$

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{x^2}}{N+x^2}$$

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{2.223}}{100+2.223}$$

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{2.223}}{102.223}$$

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{0.021}}{102.223}$$

$$C = 0.14$$

The obtained contingency co-efficient of 0.14 above indicate a weak positive association between socio-economic status and vulnerability to crime or chances of victimization. This simply implies that people's socio-economic status is related to their chances of being criminally victimized and vice versa.

Table 4.17 above, reveals that out of 34 respondents, who were found to be either from the higher or lower socio-economic status, 16 of them were found to be vulnerable to crime only once, 12 of them were two times vulnerable to crime and 10

of them were three or more time vulnerable to crime. On the other hand, out of those from the lower socio-economic status, 18 of them had chances of criminal victimization once, 20 of them had chances of criminal vulnerability twice, while 24 of the respondents have three or more times of becoming vulnerable to crime and vice versa.

The above information means that people's socio-economic statuses have link with their chance of suffering criminal victimization in life time.