International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Suffered but neglected: Public perception of the victims of crime neglect in Enugu urban, Nigeria

Emerho Godstime Emerson [1], Ugwu Ikenga Patrick [2], Obinna J Eze [3], Oguejiofo CP Ezeanya [4*]
[1] Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria
[2, 3] Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria
[4] Department of Religion and Cultural Studies, Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

* Corresponding Author: **Oguejiofo CP Ezeanya**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 03
Issue: 01
January-February 2022
Received: 28-12-2021
Accepted: 14-01-2022
Page No: 243-252

Abstract
Population of crime victims neglect is on the increase, however, developed societies are making considerable effort to understand the menace and address it. Unfortunately, this has not been the case for developing countries like Nigeria. Nigeria has not yet recognized the complex origins or the profound consequences of neglecting victims of crime. This paper discusses the perception of the victims of crime neglect. Using quantitative approach and cross-sectional survey research design, a sample of 604 respondents was drawn from Enugu urban. Multi-stage and purposive sampling techniques were used to reach the respondents. A questionnaire instrument was used to generate data. Following descriptive statistics, data were analyzed, interpreted and organized in tables and frequencies. The stated hypotheses were tested using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (Spearman rho) and T-test. We found that most crime victims in Enugu urban are neglected and public perception of police efforts towards crime control in Enugu urban is discouraging. The study calls for a Non-Governmental Investigation Agency (NGIA) to be set up. This agency shall be driven by human right groups under the police but will be funded in partnership with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) so as to curtail unlawful extortion of crime victims.

Keywords: Crime control, Criminal justice system, Horror, Public perception, Victims of crime neglect

Introduction
One of the major components of criminology is the victims of crime. Nevertheless, they have really never been accorded that due recognition (Ajah, Uwakwe, Nwokeoma, Ugwuoke & Nnnamani, 2020; Ajah, 2019; Nwune, Ajah, Egbegi, & Onyejegbu, 2019; Ajah, 2018a; Yusuf & Yahaya, 2014) [3, 5, 34, 4, 47]. Gyong (2010) [25] noted that the study and analysis of criminal phenomena particularly in developing societies has been reduced to basically two approaches. One of these concentrates on the analysis of criminal offender. For this approach, crime is explained essentially in terms of physically identified features of the individual offender (Ajah, 2018b; Ukwayi & Okpa, 2017; Gyong, 1989) [4, 10]. The second approach concentrates on the circumstances outside the individual offender that precipitated the commission of the crime. This approach often points to the pattern of socialization, the socio-cultural process, the nature and extent of the distribution of political power, the type of development strategy adopted by a polity, etc. Consequently, on the basis of these two approaches, whenever there is a crime problem, intellectuals and policy makers are quick to ask what can be done to the criminals and/or the circumstantial events that precipitated such criminality; very few ever ponder over what can be done about the victim and/or his/her circumstances (Ukwayi & Okpa, 2017; Gyong, 2010) [12, 45].

The passive role accorded to the crime victims and understanding of criminal phenomena is further reinforced by the Criminal Justice System (CJS). A remarkable consensus of opinion demonstrates that contemporary justice administration both in the developed and developing worlds are doing badly with crime victims (Marek, 1984) [30]. Gyong (1996) argues that right from the gate-way of the criminal justice system; the police through the courts and thereafter, the victims are subjected to a near total neglect. The victim is shouldered with the task of playing a distinctively secondary role of mainly reporting crime. While police is required by law to treat the accused as innocent until proved guilty beyond all reasonable doubt by a court of law with competent jurisdiction, these legal rights are denied the victim. The victim is completely at the merciful discretion of the law enforcement agents. In cases where the police decide not to effect an arrest, and prosecute or even to allow the offender to plea bargain, the victim's rights to legal recourse are limited (Ajah, Nnam, Ajah, Idemili-Aronu, Chukwuemeka & Agboti, 2021; Ajah, Ajah & Obasi, 2020; Siegel, 1992) [34, 40, 4].

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 decisions making process of the police, the structures of the court system and how judges reach decisions; and the intricacies of penal institutions (Ajah, Dinne & Salami, 2020; Ajah & Onyejegbu, 2019; Dambazzau, 2007) [12, 15, 40]. Thus, Yusuf and Yahaya (2014) [6] noted that 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, and probably decide whether to either initiate a criminal proceeding or dismiss the case; the courts decides guilt or innocence, and sentence those who are convicted or those who plead guilty; the prisons or corrections carry out the sentence of the courts and rehabilitate criminals.

However, while the police are required by law to treat the accused as innocent until proved otherwise beyond reasonable doubt (1999 Constitution FRN), these same legal rights are denied the victims of crime (Gyong, 2010) [12]. According to Ajah (2018) [6] and Ani (2011) [40], The Administration of the Criminal Justice (ACJ) Bill 2005 broadened the powers of the criminal court to award costs, compensation and damages in deserving cases, especially to victims of crime. The Bill adopted and improved on the provisions of section 78 of the Penal Code, sections 365-366 of the CPC and section 255 of the CPA. These are now sections 292 and 293 of the Bill. Ani furthers that,

> By the provisions of section 292 of the ACJ Bill 2005, a criminal court may within the proceedings or when passing judgment, order that the convicted person shall pay a sum of money as compensation to any person injured by the offence, irrespective of any other fine or other punishment that may be imposed or that is imposed on the defendant, where substantial compensation is in the opinion of the court recoverable by civil suit. The court may order the defendant to pay a sum of money to defray expenses incurred in the prosecution. The court may also order the convicted person to pay some money to compensate an innocent purchaser of any property in respect of which the offence has been committed who has been compelled to give it up. The court may also order the convicted person to pay some money in defraying expenses incurred in medical treatment of any person injured by the convicted person in connection with the offence. Section 345 (2) of the ACJL Lagos 2007 also provides that the court can order an offender to pay such damages for injury or compensation for loss. Besides these provisions on compensation for victims of crime, the Criminal Justice Victim's Remedies (CJVR) Bill, 2006 is fully devoted to addressing the problems of crime victims. (Ani, 2011:89-90) [40].

However, Ani (2011) [40] went further to state that a search of our statute books reveals that there are scanty provisions dotted in some statutes dealing with victims remedies. Very little and indeed less than marginal emphasis is placed on victim participation. He further added that both the victim and the offender are two parties in any crime and therefore a realistic understanding of crime cannot be complete without due consideration being given to both.

Many scholars have studied crime and the criminal justice system in Nigeria and made valid contributions on impacts and viable rectification measures (see, for example, Ugwuoke, 2008; Yusuf & Yahaya, 2014; Gyong, 1996; Ani, 2011; Anthony, Obasi, Obi, Ajah, Okpan, Onyejegbu, Obiwulu & Onwuama, 2021; Areh, Onwuama & Ajah, 2020; Ukwayi & Okpa, 2017; Ajah, 2018; Adelani, 2018; Nwune, Chikwelu, Ajah, & Obiefuna, 2018; Ajah, 2019) [6, 10, 12, 15, 20, 23, 31, 14, 10]. These studies are important, since they contribute significantly in understanding the problems and challenges of the criminal justice system and their way out. What however has not been achieved is a detailed study of crime victims and how it affects crime control. This gap is what this paper intends to fill

Conceptual Clarifications

Crime victims: There are several conceptions regarding a victim. Related fields of endeavour that consider the victim have several perspectives on whom a victim is. From the legal viewpoint, the Black Law Dictionary (6th Ed: 1567) in Nyiyongo (2006) [17] looks at a victim as the person who is the object of a crime or tort as the victim of robbery is the person robbed. Person who court determines has suffered pecuniary damages as a result of defendant activities, that person may be individual, public or private-corporation, government partnership or incorporated association (Nyiyongo, 2006) [17].

In another light, victimologists consider a victim in the broad sense as "one who suffers unjustly". It would be noted that there are two characteristic traits of the victim expressed here; suffering and injustice. Within this view, a victim must have suffered and the suffering was unjust but not necessarily illegal. Also within this view, a victim is a being placed in the position of one who suffers as a result of the crime (in a broad sense of an act which causes suffering) committed against him by an individual, a group, an institution or even the state (Eze, Obi & Ajah, 2020; Stanciu, 1976) [12, 16, 40]. Similarly, in a more criminological view, a victim of crime is conceived as a person or persons who has or have been tricked, attacked, injured or killed as a result of a crime (Eze, Ajah, Nwonovo & Atama, 2021; Adoko, 2005) [36, 12]. This view situates the victim as the one who bears the actual pains of a crime.

Victims of crime in Nigeria are generally deemed to

encounter multiple suffering – first at the hands of criminals and secondly in the face of law enforcement. Crime victims actually face difficulties as a result of their contact with the police and the court. The problems they face stem from the practices of the system regarding arrest, investigation and prosecution of offenders. The responsibilities of victims at this stage are to report crimes, and assist the police in carrying out preliminary investigations. They also have a responsibility of assisting the courts in prosecuting offenders (Ugwuoke, Ajah & Onyejegbu, 2020; Nnam, Ajah, Arua, Okechukwu & Okorie, 2019; Gyong, 1994; Nyiyongo, 2006) [6, 17, 18, 29].

It is worthy of note that the obligations of victims of crime to the operators of the criminal justice system in assisting to report, investigate and prosecute offences and offenders are quite fundamental to the successful performance of the system in its task of prevention and control of crime in the society. But regrettably, in spite of their immense contribution in this regards, victims are not given the desired attention, rather they are often subjected to difficulties and unfair treatment by the criminal justice system (Gyong, 1994:8). Thus, Odekunle (1989 in Gyong, 1994) [17] notes that, from statutory provision through procedural laws and penal sanctions, modern criminal justice systems appear to emphasize the safeguarding of the rights and interests of offenders, but utterly neglectful of the rights and interests of victims.

Also, noteworthy is the fact that as soon as the victims perform the roles expected of them by the police and courts, the interest of the system in them wanes and is shifted to the offender while they become virtually forgotten. To reiterate the view, Christie (2006) [19] asserts if an offender is arrested, the case is conducted as a matter between the state and the accused; in effect, the state 'steals' the conflict from the victim to render the crime committed as one against the state. The victim is often merely a witness to proceedings and is commonly regarded as an 'item of evidence' or 'non-person'. On the whole, most criminal justice systems neglect the rights and interests of victims. Emphatically, Akande (1989) [12] notes that the criminal justice system in Nigeria appears to regard the victim as nonexistent individual; in the same light as the above, Ajah (2019) [20] observes that:

> Public orientation and basis of initiative in criminal law and criminal justice have led to attitudes which have now entrenched only the state and offender as virtually the only parties in criminal justice administration, with no involvement of the victim beyond his role as a mere witness (Ajah, 2019).

As has noted earlier, the neglect of the interests and rights of victims of crime by the criminal justice systems starts at the level of the police. Gyong (1994) [17] notes that the problem at this stage usually begins from the moment a crime is reported to or discovered by the police. This is more so in Nigeria where the responsibility of reporting a substantial proportion of crime lies with the victim. At this initial contact with the police, it is expected that the police neutralizes the agonies of crime borne by the victim through 'psychological first aid', which is expected to be given to the victims to help them recover strength lost in the crime process. But on the contrary, the Nigeria police often adopt unsympathetic attitude to the plight of victims. Instead, they often subject them to insensitive and unethical interrogation with demeaning and derogatory remarks without due regards for procedures (Nnam, Effiong, Iloma, Terfa & Ajah, 2021; Akande, 1989; Gambo, 1989: Odekunle, 1989: Gyong, 1994) [12, 23, 31, 45, 9].

Furthermore, in some rather sensitive cases like armed robbery and rape, victims are subjected to insensitive questioning; they are sometimes viewed with distrust, contempt and suspicion and in some cases even accused of complicity. Within the ambit of a victim's contact with police, it has been noted that the police often ask victims to pay some certain amount of money for stationeries with which their cases will be documented (Nnamani, Ilo, Onyejegbu, Ajah, Onwuama, Obiwulu & Nzeakor, 2021; Ubwa, 2003) [25, 36]. It should be noted that these are already provided for by the appropriate authority, yet demand is made on the victims for them. In the same vein, victims have to pay for the transport fare and feeding of police officers assigned to them in order to arrest a suspect (Ubwa, 2003) [16]. However, the candid reality remains that as soon as the victim has succeeded in aiding the police to arrest the offender and also supplied the relevant information regarding the circumstance of the event, they are relegated to the background and interest becomes focused on the suspect.

Supporting this point, Camerer (1996) [18, 19] notes that, as the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system, the police play an important role in shaping the crime victims' initial experiences; although police depends on the victims to report crimes and to cooperate with them throughout the investigation, the attitudes of the police towards victims have been found wanting throughout the world.

Literature Review

In keeping with the main purpose of this study, the literature review is premised on the criminal justice system and victims of crime.

Alemika (2011) [13] conducted a study on criminal victimization and public perceptions of safety and policing. He analyzed and interpreted data on the experience of victims with a view to explaining the patterns and trends of crime and victimization in society or community. This was a national survey conducted in all the thirty six states of Nigeria and the Federal Capital Territory covering household victimization from 2007 to 2009 and personal victimization, perceptions of corruption and victimization trend, road safety and accidents and perception of the law enforcement agencies. A total of 10,228 respondents were covered in the survey, and it was found that respondents who reported criminal incidence to the police were asked if they were satisfied with the handling of their complaints by the police, less than a half (42.8%) were satisfied; 13.1% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; the rest 44% were dissatisfied. When asked why they were dissatisfied, the respondents responded as follows: Police did not do enough to apprehend the offender – 36.2%; Police did not do enough to recover property – 21.6%, Police were slow to respond to call for help – 9.3%; Police did not keep me properly informed of development about their actions – 8.0%; Police did not treat me with respect – 5.8%; Police asked me for money (bribe) – 13.2%; and Police colluded with suspects – 3.9%. A careful analysis of the reasons indicates that the dissatisfaction derived from three principal factors: capability and effectiveness of the police (67.1%); police treatment of complainants (13.8%) and integrity or lack of it, corruption – (17.1%).

A study conducted by Adoko (2010), "An assessment of the

criminal justice system and victims of crime in Benue state, Nigeria" with a target population of two hundred and one and respondents of one hundred and sixty five, showed that 42.24% of the study population are dissatisfied with the treatment they received from the criminal justice agencies. However, those who are satisfied are those who earns above average and are 82.8% of the 165 respondents. The study further revealed that victims were exploited by the criminal justice agents, and that out of the 165 respondents studied, a greater portion of the victims (52.12% or 86) has been victimized more than once. This study having found that victims in the underprivileged group face more difficulties within the criminal justice system than their counterparts in the privileged group, suggests that; the police and courts (i.e., the CJS), in training officers for their various jobs, should try to give them good orientation aimed at offering selfless services to the victims. In addition to this, the system needs performance indicators with regard to victims' satisfaction and officers should be penalized if they do not perform.

Soyombo and Adisa (2011) [39] on their study on public perception of criminal justice agencies in Nigeria, analyzed the public perceptions of the criminal justice agencies in Nigeria using data from three criminal victimization surveys conducted by CLEEN in 2005, 2006 and 2010, which covers a total of 10,030, 11,161, and 10,228 respondents respectively. Their study included discussions of the challenge of crime in Nigeria; the reporting of criminal victimization; satisfaction with police action on reports of criminal victimization; corruption in the criminal justice agencies; and perceptions about the performance of the criminal justice agencies.

According to Soyombo and Adisa (2011) [39] in order to avoid falling victim of crime, many communities resort to self-help by erecting street barriers to limit access to their residential areas, in an effort to ward off criminals. At the individual and household levels, people invest money in additional security measures including the installation of electronic security devices, employment of private security guards, erection of high fences around their homes, and various forms of access control measures. Many also curtail their freedom by embarking on various forms of avoidance behaviors, including avoiding night outings.

They furthered that despite these various steps, crime has remained a major problem of contemporary Nigeria. Thus, Soyombo and Adisa (2011) [39] reported that, when respondents were asked if they are afraid of becoming victims of any type of crime, 83.9% of the respondents in the 2005 survey answered in the affirmative (46.9% "very fearful", 21.8% "quite fearful" and 15.2% "a little fearful"), with only 15.3% not expressing any fear at all. This indicates a relatively high level of fear of criminal victimization. Similarly, 83.2% of the respondents in the 2006 survey were fearful of becoming victims of crime (52.2% "very fearful", 20.4% "quite fearful" and 10.6% "a little fearful"), with only 15.4% not expressing any fear at all. In the 2010 survey, 86.6% of the respondents were fearful of becoming victims of crime ((38.9% "very fearful" and 32.7% "quite fearful" and 15% "a little fearful").

On satisfaction with police actions and performance; only 41.6% of the victims in the 2005 survey said they were satisfied (with only 14.5% being "very satisfied" and 27.1% just "satisfied"). In the 2006 survey, only 43.8% were satisfied (16.8% "very satisfied" and 26.9% "satisfied"). Similarly, only 42.8% of the victims of crime in the 2010 survey who reported their victimization experiences to the police said they were satisfied with the way the police handled the cases (11% "very satisfied" and 31.8% "satisfied"). Generally, the largest proportion of respondents who expressed dissatisfaction with the police handling of the cases attributed their dissatisfaction to their belief that the police did not do enough to apprehend the offenders, followed by views that the police did not do enough to recover the properties that were stolen.

Overall less than half (43.4%) of the respondents thought the police were doing a good job in their states (5.8% "very good job" and 37.6% "good job"), while 49.4% thought the Director of Public Prosecution in their states was doing a good job (5.3% "very good job" and 44.1% "good job"); 56.1% thought the courts were doing a good job (7.7% "very good job" and 48.4% "good job"); and 52.6% thought the prisons were doing a good job (6.4% "very good job" and 46.2% "good job").

The study also reports that, in spite of various opinions about the performance of the police, that all the other criminal justice agencies were said to be doing a good job, except the Police Service Commission- it remains the most popular/most preferred agency/institution to which most of the respondents would report criminal victimization. Majority of the respondents in the three surveys (68.1% in 2005, 72.7% in 2006 and 65.1% in 2010) would report serious crimes known to them to the police.

Methodology

Study design and location

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design. This design is considered appropriate for this study because it has the capacity to accurately gather necessary information within a limited timeframe on large sample. The design is economical and focuses on studying large and small populations with emphasis on relative incidence, distribution and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables (Ugwuoke, Ajah & Onyejegbu, 2020; Isangedeghi, Joshua, Asim & Ekuri, 2014) [6, 28]. The study was conducted in Enugu urban which includes Enugu north (Coal camp, Ogui, Asata, Okpara avenue, Independence lay-out, and New haven), Enugu east (Abakpa) and Enugu south urban (Amechi-Uwani), located in Enugu State, Nigeria,

Participants and procedures

The target population for this study is 389,158, who were the adult residents aged 18 years and above in the study area (NPC, 2010). Using Alien Taro Yamane (1967) method of sample size determination, with a 95% confidence level and level of maximum variability (P = 0.04), a sample of 624 was computed—out of which—604 respondents were finally used after data collation, gleaning, cleansing and analysis.

The multi-stage sampling technique that involves successive random sampling was adopted in the selection of respondents from the Local Government Areas (LGAs), towns, streets and households. Multi-stage method is relevant to this study because the population is made up of several clusters: local government areas, towns and streets. The researchers clustered Enugu state into its 17 LGAs which were further grouped into urban and rural LGAs. From this categorization, three LGAs were purposively selected. In this light, Engu North, Enugu South and Enugu South were purposively selected from the urban LGAs.

Data Collection and Procedures

This study adopted mixed methods of scientific enquiries, following quantitative and qualitative approaches in its data collection. The instruments for data collection were structured questionnaire and unstructured 'In-Depth Interview (IDI).' The research instruments were self-administered by two researchers. Participation in the research was risk-free, anonymous, voluntary, confidential and based on informed consent of all participants. Ethical clearance was obtained from Enugu North, Enugu East and Enugu South local government authorities. Of the 624 questionnaires distributed, 621 were returned with 7 not properly completed and thus were rejected while 3 were not returned and thereby leaving us with a total of 604 copies for analysis. In order to complement data generated through questionnaire instrument, in-depth interviews were conducted on four police officers and three prison officers and court officials, respectively-totally 10 interviewees. Each respondent's interview lasted between 35 and 90 minutes. The interviewees disapproved of our attempts to record their responses in audiotape, so only handwritten notes were taken.

Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative components of the data collected were subjected to scrutiny before cleansing, coding and analysis. The quantitative data analysis was performed using International Business Machine (IBM) Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Utilizing descriptive statistics, the results of IBM SPSS were further analyzed, interpreted and organized using tables, frequencies and charts. The qualitative data were analyzed using manual thematic method, where the responses were transcribed with some catchy phrases retained in their original versions and contexts in the form of extracts or excerpts (see the result section for details). The stated hypotheses were tested using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (Spearman rho) and T-test.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by categories of crime they have been Victims of

Responses	Frequency	Percentages (%)
None	49	8.1
Armed Robbery	176	29.1
Fraud/419	151	25.0
Burglary	32	5.3
Sexual Assault	99	16.4
False Imprisonment/Illegal Arrest	97	16.1
Total	**604**	**100.0**

***Source*:** Field Survey, 2019

Table 1 above presents the distribution of respondents on crimes they have been victims of. Its shows that 29.1% of the respondents have been victims of armed robbery, 25% have been victims of fraud/419, 5.3% have been victims of burglary, 16.4% have been victims of sexual assault, 16.1% have been victims of false imprisonment/Illegal arrest while 8.1% have not been victim of any crime. The implication is that majority of the respondents (91.9%) have been victim of one form of crime or another with armed robbery and fraud as the highest at 29.1% and 25% respectively. It also follow that the respondents were appropriate for the study given that they have had experience of what it feels like being a victim of crime in Enugu state and thus can supply the required data from their bank of experience.

Information obtained from the In-depth interview was used to ascertain if crime victims are neglected in Enugu State in relation to the categories of crime listed on table 1. Data obtained demonstrates level of discrepancies on the actual neglect. For example while personnel of certain criminal justice system like police and judicial officials perceive neglect, personnel of prison services do not (this might be because the prison officers' duty are to keep custodian of the offender, but rarely come in contact with the crime victim). Responding to the question on awareness on crime victim neglect, one of the respondents said;

> Yes I am aware of the incident of crime victim neglect in Enugu. But the thing is that there are certain thing we cannot do as personnel of the justice system, not because the law prevents one from doing such, but because it does not make the provision for the either. So as a result, one is bond to keep to constitutional duty and obligation as an officer, which can translate into neglect of the victim especially for those who can produce evidence for his or her case (IDI, 34 years, Male, Police Officer, June 2019).

When probed further, on whether victims of crime often experience a similar fate with victims of other mishap like flood disaster, he responded by saying;

> It is not always so, because at times, individuals, government or corporate bodies do pay them visit or condolence like they do with victims of some mishaps. In some occasions, the visits are official by the government like the recent incidence in Uzo-uwani L.G.A which I was also there for an official duty with the State Governor. But those who experience crime, say, personal crime often have no one coming to visit them, which often may translate to an attitude of indifference feeling towards their mishap (IDI, 34 years, Male, Police Officer, June 2019).

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents on the number of times they have experienced such crime

Number of Times	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Once	212	35.1
Twice	175	29.0
Three Times	24	4.0
Four Times	24	4.0
More than Four times	120	19.9
Never	49	8.1
Total	**604**	**100.0**

***Source*:** Field Survey, 2019

The information presented in Table 2 above shows that 35.1% of the respondents have experience at least one of the following crimes identified in Table 1 above once, 29% have experienced crime twice, 4% of the respondents each have experienced crime three and four times respectively while 19.9% have experienced crime for more than four times. The implication of this is that more than 50% of the respondents have been victims of one crime or another on more than one occasion as a result; their experience with the criminal justice system on such occasion will contribute more on the quality of data generated from them.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents on their rating of Police efforts in detecting and controlling of crime

Responses	Frequency	Percentages (%)
Encouraging	104	17.2
Discouraging	372	61.6
Don't Know	128	21.2
Total	**604**	**100.0**

***Source*:** Field Survey, 2019

The information contained in Table 3 above shows that 17.2% of the respondent's rates Police efforts towards crime control in Enugu to be encouraging, 61.6% rate it to be discouraging while 21.2% have no idea of police efforts in detecting and controlling of crime. This shows that majority of the respondents (61.6%) are disappointed at the way police detects and control crime in their area, thus they perceives it to be discouraging. The implication thus is that most residents in Enugu urban do not perceive police as effective in detecting and control of crime.

Table 4: Distribution of respondent's perception of Criminal Justice system and Victims of crime (Percentages are Parenthesis)

Perception	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
The police and court can help me get justice if I become a victim of arm robbery attack, sexual assault, burglary, car or phone snatching.	195 (32.3)	249 (41.2)	57 (9.4)	103 (17.1)	0 (0)	**604 (100)**
The court assists individual whose property was stolen to ensure that he gets it back.	203 (33.6)	200 (33.1)	74 (12.3)	127 (21)	0 (0)	**604 (100)**
I will report to the police if I lost any of my belonging or gets physically abused because they will help me recover my items and take care of me.	31 (5.1)	32 (5.3)	169 (28)	1 (0.2)	371 (61.4)	**604 (100)**
I feel safe knowing that the police and court will come to my rescue if anything happens to me.	104 (17.2)	0 (0)	74 (12.3)	242 (40.1)	184 (30.5)	**604 (100)**
I don't trust the police and court because they don't care about the person that has been attacked by arm robber, property stolen or raped.	48 (7.9)	74 (12.3)	266 (44)	174 (28.8)	42 (7)	**604 (100)**
Those who are victims of sexual assault, false imprisonment, kidnapping and battery will be given more attention by police officers and Court officials than those who are victims of arm robbery attack, burglary, car or phone snatching and fraud/419	0 (0)	248 (41.5)	275 (45.5)	81 (13.4)	0 (0)	**604 (100)**
Police does not attend to or take care of those who have been sexually abused, robbed of their belonging, kidnapped etc.	25 (4.1)	25 (4.1)	129 (21.4)	123 (20.4)	123 (20.4)	**604 (100)**
Police officers are always rude to people who have either been robbed, relation kidnapped, sexually abused or defrauded.	175 (29)	121 (20)	26 (4.3)	204 (33.8)	78 (12.9)	**604 (100)**
The way police takes care of people who were attacked by arm robber, sexually abused, defrauded or imprison falsely is good.	54 (8.9)	121 (20)	80 (13.2)	152 (25.2)	197 (32.6)	**604 (100)**
Those who have been robbed of their belonging, battered or sexually assault should be compensated by Court, police and other government agencies.	273 (45.2)	179 (29.6)	98 (16.2)	54 (8.9)	0 (0)	**604 (100)**
The way victims are treated by the police when they report cases are very unpleasant	261 (43.2)	292 (48.3)	51 (8.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	**604 (100)**
I don't like the police at all	104 (17.2)	26 (4.4)	153 (25.3)	127 (21)	194 (32.1)	**604 (100)**

***Source*:** Field Survey, 2016

Table 4 above presents information on respondent's perception of criminal justice system and victims of crime. Row 1 shows the respondent's opinion of whether criminal justice system will help ensure he or she gets justice if the person becomes a victim of property crime. The responses shows that 32.3% of the respondents strongly agreed, 41.2% agreed while 17.1% disagreed. This shows that majority of the respondents were of the opinion that court and police and criminal justice institution can help them get justice if they become victim of property crime.

Table 4, row 2 shows that 33.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that court assist persons whose property was stolen to ensure he gets it back, 33.1% agreed while 21% disagreed. The implication is that majority of the respondents were of the opinion that court as an aspect of the criminal justice system can help individuals whose property was stolen to ensure he gets it back.

Table 4, row 3 shows that 28% of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that they will report to the police if they lost their belongings knowing that they will help them get it back, 5.1% strongly agreed, 5.3% agreed, 0.2% disagreed while 61.4% strongly disagreed. This shows that majority of the respondents disagreed with the notion of reporting lost items to police with a confidence that they will bring it back. The implication of this is that majority of Enugu urban residents will not report issues of stolen properties to the police because they don't believe the police will help them recover it and take care of them.

Table 4, row 4 shows that 17.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that they feel safe knowing that police and court will come to their rescue if anything happens to them, 12.3% neither agreed nor disagree, 40.1% disagreed while 30.5% disagreed. This shows that majority of the respondents (70.6%) disagreed with the notion that they feel safe knowing that police and court will come to their rescue if anything happens. The implication of this to the study is that majority of the respondents (70.6%) have no confidence in the police system.

Table 4, row 5 shows the distribution of respondents on the statement "I don't trust the police and court because they don't care about the person that has been attacked by armed robber, property stolen or raped". The responses shows that 7.9% of the respondents strongly agreed to the statement above, 12.3% agreed, 44% neither agreed nor disagreed, 28.8% disagreed with the statement while 7% strongly disagreed. This shows that there is disparity in the level of trust the respondents have on criminal justice system's capacity to care for them if they become a victim of any

crime. For example, while 20.2% of the respondents where assertive that they don't trust the criminal justice system on caring for crime victims, 35.8% trust the criminal justice system, while 44% which constitute slight majority are neutral on the issue.

Table 4, row 6 above shows the distribution of respondents on the statement "Those who are victims of sexual assault, false imprisonment, kidnapping and battery will be given more attention by police officers and court officials than those who are victims of arm robbery attack, burglary, car or phone snatching and fraud/419". The finding shows that 41.5% of the respondents agreed with the statement, 45.5% neither agreed nor disagreed while 13.4% disagreed. The implication is that whereas slight majority of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, a greater percentage of those who took a definite stand on the issue were of the view that victims of personal crime are likely to be given more attention by personnel of criminal justice system than victims of property crime.

Table 4, row 7 shows the distribution of respondents on the on the statement "Police does not attend to or take care of those who have been sexually abused, robbed of their belonging or kidnapped". The findings show that 40.8%% of the respondents disagreed with such statement while 8.2% agreed to it. This implies that a slight majority of the respondents were of the opinion that police do attend to or take care of those who have been victims of sexual abuse, armed robbery or kidnapping.

Table 4, row 8 shows the distribution of respondents on the statement "Police officers are usually rude to people who have either been robbed, relation kidnapped, sexually abused or defrauded". The findings show that 29% of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 20% agreed, 4.3% neither agreed nor disagreed, 33.8% disagreed while 12.9% strongly disagreed. The implication is that there is a slight difference in the percentage of people that think police are usually rude to crime victims (49%) as against the category that disagreed with such (46.7%).

Table 4, row 9 shows the distribution of respondents on the statement "the way police takes care of people who were attacked by armed robber, sexually abused, defrauded or imprison falsely is good". It shows that 8.9% of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 20% agreed, 13.2% neither agreed nor disagreed, 25.2% disagreed while 32.6% strongly disagreed. The implication of this is that majority of the respondents (57.8%) disapproves of the way police takes care of victims of property crimes.

Table 4, row 10 shows the distribution of respondents on the statement "those who have been robbed of their belonging, battered or sexually assault should be compensated by court, police and other government agencies". The findings show that 45.2% of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 29.6% agreed, 16.2% neither agreed nor disagreed while 8.9% disagreed. It follows that majority of the respondents (74.8%) were of the opinion that crime victims should be compensated by the criminal justice system. This implies that most people in Enugu urban will appreciate it if the criminal justice system will focus more on crime victim's compensation.

Table 4, row 11 shows the distribution of respondents on the statement "the way victims are treated by the police when they report cases is very unpleasant". The findings show that 43.2% of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 48.3% agreed while 8.4% neither agreed nor disagreed. It shows that majority of the respondents (91.5%) disapproves of the way the victims of crimes are treated by the police when they reports such cases to them, noting it to be unpleasant.

Table 4, row 12 shows the distribution of respondents on the statement "I don't like the police at all". The findings shows that 17.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that they don't like the police at all, 4.4% agreed, 25.3% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, 21% disagreed while 32.1% strongly disagreed with the statement. It follows thus, that majority of the respondents do not hate the police despite their disapproval of the way they treat victims of crime. The implication of this is that, whereas majority of the residents in Enugu urban do not approve of the way police and other criminal justice system treats crime victims, they still like them.

Test of hypotheses

Hypothesis one: Victims of personal crime will be perceived as more neglected by personnel's of criminal justice system than victims of property crime.

Null Hypothesis

H_o: There is no significant difference in the rate at which personnel of criminal justice system neglect victims of personal crime from the rate at which they neglect victims of property crime.

Substantive Hypothesis

H_1: There is a significant difference in the rate at which personnel of criminal justice system neglect victims of personal crime from the rate at which they neglect victims of property crime.

Significance Level (α)

In testing the above hypothesis, the data presented in Table 22, Row 6 was analyzed using One Sample Independent test at 0.05 significance level, being the most used α level in social science.

Table 5a: One Sample Statistics of the difference in the rate at which Police neglects Victims of personal crime as against Victims of property crime

	Test-Statistics				
	Statistics	Bias	Std. Error	.00	
				-0.002	Upper
N	604				
Mean	1.50	.00	.06	1.40	1.62
Std. Deviation	1.409	.010	.010	1.428	1.428
Std. Error Mean	.057				

Table 5b: T-test Table of the mean difference of the rate at which Police neglects Victims of personal crime as against Victims of property crime

Neglect of Victims of Personal Crime/ Victims of Property Crime	Test Value					
	T	Df	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
	21.165	603	.000	1.500	1.39	1.61

Rejection Region/Decision Rule

Given that the hypothesis above is non-directional, the rejection region will be at both end of the tail and the null

hypothesis (H_o) will be rejected if the P-value (α) is greater or equal to 0.05.

Decision

Table 5a and 5b above present T-test calculation of the mean differences of the rate at which police neglects victims of personal crime as against victims of property crime. It shows that the obtained P-value at both end of the tailed test is .000 and given that it is less than the significance level 0.05, the study concludes that there is a significant difference in the rate at which police responds and cares for victims of personal crime compared to the rate at which they care and responds to victims of property crime. The implication is that most victims of personal crime will see the criminal justice system as capable of attending to crime victims more than victims of property crimes. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis two The more frequent one experiences crime in Enugu urban, the lesser his or her confidence in the criminal justice system.

Null Hypothesis

H_o: There is no significant correlation between the number of times one experienced crime and the person's confidence in the criminal justice system.

Substantive Hypothesis

H_1: There is a positive correlation between the number of times one experienced crime and the person's confidence in the criminal justice system.

Table 6: Spearman Correlation Table of Number of times the respondents have witness crime and their rate of confidence in Criminal Justice System

	Spearman rho	Number of Exposure to Crime		Confidence in Criminal Justice System
Number of Exposure to Crime	Correlation Coefficient		1.000	.307
	Sig (1-tailed)		.	.000
	N		604	604
	Bootstrap[a]	Bias	.000	-.001
		Std Error	.000	.053
	95% Confidence Interval	Lower	1.000	.197
		Upper	1.000	.411
Confidence in Criminal Justice System	Correlation Coefficient		-.307	1.000
	Sig (1-tailed)		.000	.
	N		604	604
	Bootstrap[a]	Bias	.001	.000
		Std Error	.053	.000
	95% Confidence Interval	Lower	.197	1.000
		Upper	.411	1.000

Rejection Region/Decision Rule

The above test is a directional hypothesis that predicts a positive correlation between the number of times an individual experience crime and his or her confidence level in the Criminal Justice System. As a result, the rejection region will be at one end of the tail and the null hypothesis (H_o) will be rejected if the P-value (α) is greater than 0.05.

Decision

Table 6 above presents a Spearman correlation table that examined if there is a correlation between the number of times one experienced crime and the persons confidence in the criminal justice system. The correlation coefficient .307 indicates that there is a positive correlation between the number of times one experienced crime and the person's confidence in the criminal justice system. Also given that the P-value .000 is less than the significance level 0.05, the null hypothesis is thus rejected. The study thus concludes that there is a significant positive correlation between the number of times one experienced crime and the person's confidence in the criminal justice system. The implication is that being a victim of crime makes (one to either appreciate the effort of the criminal justice system in caring for crime victims or exposes one to witness the negligence of criminal justice system towards crime victims.

Discussion

Empirical evidence showed that the population of crime victims is on the increase, and number time they experienced incidences of crime varies. On the average scale, more (29.1%) of all the 604 respondents were victims of armed robbery and (29.0%) had twice experienced crime incidences. This is in line with Ugwuoke (2005 cited in Ugwuoke, 2010) [44, 45] who asserts that if criminals have any debt to pay, it is not a debt to society (by incarceration or even condemnation to death) but rather to the victims of their offenses. Despite that there has been a growing awareness of the plight of crime victims and the need to redress the wrong and to repair the harm committed against them (Ugwuoke, 2005) [45], the criminal justice system appears to forget or ignore crime victims (Ajah, 2018a; Ajah, 2018b; Igbo, 2007) [4, 6], and up till now, according to National Open University (2010) Criminal Procedure Laws of Enugu state have not made any adequate provisions for the compensations of victims of crimes, as distinct from restitution. Ani (2011) [14] went further to state that a search of our statute books reveals that there are scanty provisions dotted in some statutes dealing with victims remedies.

On the rating of the Nigerian Police force and the entire criminal justice system, evidence showed that the rating of the Nigerian police (61.6%) is majorly discouraging and (40.1%) disagreed that they feel safe knowing that the police and court will come to their rescue if anything happens to them.. However, while there seem to be an increasing awareness of crime victim compensation in most western countries, the situation is not same in African countries (Nwune Ajah, Egbegi, & Onyejegbu, 2019; Naude, 1997) [34, 29]. Nsereko (1992) [33] noted that pre-colonial African

societies mostly focused on the victim of crime rather than the offender and reconciliation and restitution was regarded as important to restore the harm caused by crime. However, the acceptance of European law which largely repressed the customary laws resulted in victims being neglected and alienated from the criminal justice process with the result that many Africans regard the criminal justice system with suspicion resulting in few benefits for the victim. This negative perception is prevalent in South Africa with apartheid history of discrimination, oppression and unjust laws (Naude, 1997) [29] and the colonial heritage of the Nigerian Police (Ukwayi, Okpa, & Dike, 2018; Danbazzau, 2007) [46]. Gyong (1996) [26] argues that right from the gate-way of the criminal justice system; the police through the courts and thereafter, the victims are subjected to a near total neglect. The victim is shouldered with the task of playing a distinctively secondary role of mainly reporting crime. While police is required by law to treat the accused as innocent until proved guilty beyond all reasonable doubt by a court of law with competent jurisdiction, these legal rights are denied the victim. The victim is completely at the merciful discretion of the law enforcement agents. In cases where the police decide not to effect an arrest, and prosecute or even to allow the offender to plea bargain, the victim's rights to legal recourse are limited (Siegel, 1992) [38].

Conclusion and Policy Implications

Facts have proven that the victims of crime in Nigeria, particularly in Enugu state, is neglected thereby causing much pains to the victims. Nigerian citizens are losing faith in the justice system. The failure results from bureaucratic institutional processes which lead to unnecessary delays in criminal investigation and trial, absence of state-of-the-art facilities for proper reformation and rehabilitation, criminalization, and victimization of inmates. In view of this, this study advocates the need for a Non-Governmental Investigation Agency (NGIA) to be set up. This agency shall be driven by human right groups under the police but will be funded in partnership with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) so as to curtail unlawful extortion of crime victims. Similarly, while passing judgment on criminal cases which the of course is an offence against the state, the judge shall also deem it fit to consider the civil aspect of the case so that the victim do not loose on two folds but at least get compensated for his/her loss. Thus, with time the decided cases shall form judicial precedents upon which future cases of similar nature can be decided, thereby leading to careful evolvement of operational law.

References

1. Adoko OE. The effects of crime on victims in Nigeria-A study of Makurdi town-ship. *Unpublished B.Sc Project* Submitted to the Sociology Department, Benue state university, Makurdi, 2005.
2. Adoko OE. An assessment of the criminal justice system and victims of crime in Benue state. M.sc Dissertation, Benue state university, Markurdi, 2010.
3. Ajah BO, Uwakwe EE, Nwokeoma BN, Ugwuoke CO, Nnnamani RG. Ameliorating the plight of awaiting-trial inmates in Ebonyi State, Nigeria through reasonable bail condition. Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities. 2020; 28(4):2897-2911.
4. Ajah BO. Educational training of inmates in Awka and Abakaliki Prisons, Nigeria Journal International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences. 2018; 13(2):299-305
5. Ajah BO, Okpa JT. Digitization as a solution to the problem of awaiting-trial inmates in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences. 2019; 14(2):199-207.
6. Ajah BO, Ugwuoke CO. Juvenile Justice Administration and Child Prisoners in Nigeria. International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences. 2018; 13(2):438-446.
7. Ajah BO, Nnam MU, Ajah IA, Idemili-Aronu N, Chukwuemeka OD, Agboti CI. Investigating the awareness of virtual and augmented realities as a criminal justice response to the plight of awaiting-trial inmates in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. Crime, 2021. Law and Social Change, DOI:10.1007/s10611-021-09988-5.
8. Ajah BO, Nwokeoma BN, Okpan SO. Socio-economic implication of kidnapping and hostage taking in Southern Nigeria. Journal of Law and Judicial System. 2017; 6(2):51-59.
9. Ajah BO, Ajah AI, Obasi CO. Application of Virtual Reality (VR) and Augmented Reality (AR) in the Investigation and Trial of Herdsmen Terrorism in Nigeria. International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences. 2020; 15(1):1-20.
10. Ajah BO, Dinne CE, Salami KK. Terrorism in Contemporary Nigerian Society: Conquest of Boko-Haram, Myth or Reality. International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences. 2020; 15(1):312-324.
11. Ajah OB, Onyejegbu DC. Neo-Economy and Militating Effects of Africa's Profile on Cybercrime. International Journal of Cyber Criminology. 2019; 13 (2):326-342.
12. Akande. in Gyong J.E (1994) Victims of Common crimes in Kaduna state. Unpublished PhD thesis submitted to sociology Department. ABU Zaria, 1989.
13. Alemika EEO. Criminal victimization and public perceptions of safety and policing. Crime victimization, safety and policing in Nigeria. Monograph Series. Lagos: CLEEN Foundation, 2011; 9:23-35.
14. Ani CC. Reforms in the Nigerian Criminal Procedure Laws. NIALS Journal on Criminal Law and Justice. 2011; 1:53-90.
15. Anthony EO, Obasi CO, Obi DO, Ajah BO, Okpan OS, Onyejegbu CD, *et al*. Exploring the reasons for perennial attacks on churches in Nigeria through the victims' perspective. HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies. 2021; 77(1):a6207.
16. Areh CE, Onwuama EM, Ajah BO. Social consequences of wife-battering in Ogbaru and Onitsha north local government areas of Anambra State, Nigeria. FWU Journal of Social Sciences. 2020; 14 (4):80-92.
17. Black's Law Dictionary in Nyiyongo. A Journal of the Nigeria Sociology and Anthropology Students Association, Benue State University, Makurdi. Cited in the Social Analyst, 2006, 5(1).
18. Camerer L. Victims and Criminal Justice in South Africa. Published in Monograph No.7: Putting Victims on the Agenda, November 1996. Retrieved, 1996, 7. from www.issafrica.org
19. Christie N. Conflicts as Property in Camerer, L (1996) Victims and Criminal Justice in South Africa: Published on Monograph No. 7: Putting Victims on the Agenda, 2006, Retrieved February 6, 2015 from www.issafrica.org
20. Dambazau AB. Criminology and Criminal Justice Kaduna: Nigerian Defence Academy Press, 2007.

21. Eze OJ, Obi DO, Ajah BO. Nigerian criminal justice system and victims of crime neglect in Enugu Urban. FWU Journal of Social Sciences. 2020; 14(3):41-53.
22. Eze OJ, Ajah BO, Nwonovo OS, Atama CS. Health sector corruption and COVID-19 outbreak: evidence from Anambra and Enugu States, Nigeria. Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 2021. DOI:10.1080/02589001.2021.192112.
23. Gyong JE. ictims of common crimes in Kaduna state. Unpublished Ph.D thesis Submitted to Sociology Department, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaira, 1994.
24. Gyong JE. The Victim of Crime and the Criminal Phenomenon, a paper presented at the Report of Sociology Staff Seminar, ABU, Zaria, 1989.
25. Gyong JE. Criminal victimization and the reporting of crime in kaduna state: towards integrating the victim of crime into criminological discourse. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences. 2010; 2(5):288-295.
26. Gyong JE. The Neglect of victims of common crimes In Nigeria: The case of Kaduna State. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, A.B.U., Zaria, 1996.
27. Isangedighi AJ, Joshua MT, Asim AE, Ekuri EE. Fundamental of research and statistics in education and social science. Calabar: University of Calabar Press, 2006.
28. Marek AE. Crime Victim and Criminal Justice Administration, The World Society of Victiminology Newsletter, 1983/84, 3.
29. Naude B. Dealing with the victims of crime-the role of the legal profession. Consultus. 1997; 10(1):57-59.
30. Nnam MU, Ajah BO, Arua CC, Okechukwu G, Okorie CO. The War must be Sustained: An Integrated Theoretical Perspective of the Cyberspace-Boko Haram Terrorism Nexus in Nigeria. International Journal of Cyber Criminology. 2019; 13 (2):379-395.
31. Nnam MU, Effiong JE, Iloma DO, Terfa IM, Ajah BO. Hazardous drinking and the dark triad: an antidote for manipulative behaviour among students. Current Psychology. 2021; 40(4):1-7.
32. Nnamani GR, Ilo KO, Onyejegbu DC, Ajah BO, Onwuama ME, *et al*. Use of Noncustodial Measure and Independent Monitoring Body as Panacea to Awaiting-Trial Problems in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences. 2021; 16(1):51-63.
33. Nsereko N. Victims of crime and their rights. Criminology in Africa edited by Mushanga M, Rome: UNICRI, 1992.
34. Nwune EC, Ajah BO, Egbegi FR, Onyejegbu DC. Across the Wall: the Perception of Rehabilitation, Reformation and Reintegration Programmes in Anambra State Prison Command. Journal of Law and Judicial System. 2019; 2(2):13-22.
35. Nwune FR, Chikwelu E, Ajah BO, Obiefuna CE. Correctional Programmes within the Prison Community: The Views and Perception of Inmates and Staff in Anambra State Prisons, Nigeria. Developing Country Studies. 2018; 8(6):1-7.
36. Nyiyongo. A Journal of the Nigeria Sociology and Anthropology Students Association, Benue State University, Makurdi, Cited in the Social Analyst. 2006; 5:1.
37. Odekunle F. Compensating of Organized Crime''. Cited in Gyong, (1994) Victims of Common Crimes in Kaduna State. (Unpublished Ph.D thesis) Submitted to Sociology department, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaira, 1989.
38. Siegel LR. Criminology: The Core. U.S.A.: Thomson Wadsworth, 1992.
39. Soyombo O, Adisa WB. Public perception of criminal justice agencies in Nigeria. Crime victimization, safety and policing in Nigeria. Monograph Series, No. 9, 116-145.Lagos: CLEEN Foundation, 2011.
40. Stanciu VV. Victims Producing Civilization and Situation. Viano E.C (Ed) Victims and Society. Washington, DC Press, 1976.
41. Ubwa HA. Introduction to Criminology. Being an Undergraduate Lecture Delivered at BSU, Makurdi. Unpublished. Ekumankama in Nyiyongo, 2006.
42. Ugwoke CU. The Plight of Victims in Nigeria: A Study of Public Perception in Enugu State, Nigeria. Journal of the Institute of African Studies. 2008; 8(1&2)69-76.
43. Ugwoke CU. Criminology: Explaining crime in the Nigerian context. Nsukka:Great AP Express LTD, 2010.
44. Ugwuoke CO, Ajah BO, Onyejegbu CD. Developing patterns of violent crimes in Nigerian democratic transitions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2020; 53:1-8.
45. Ugwuoke CU. Restitution of crime victims in Nigeria: A study of public perception in Enugu state. *Ph.D thesis*, Dept. of Sociology/Anthropology University of Nigeria, 2005.
46. Ukwayi JK, JT Okpa. Critical assessment of Nigeria Criminal Justice System and the Perennial Problem of awaiting trial in Port Harcourt Maximum prison, Rivers State. Global Journal of Social Sciences. 2017; 16:17-25.
47. Yusuf UA, Yahaya SS. Crime victims and criminal justice criminal administration in Nigeria. Global journal of interdisciplinary social sciences. GJISS. 2014; 3(5)48-52.
48. Dr. Emily Johnson, Dr. Chen Wei, Dr. Peter Müller. Soil-Plant-Microbe Interactions under Drought Stress: A Comparative Study. Journal of Soil Future Research. 2021;2(1):15-19.