

CRIME VICTIMS' PERCEPTION OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN DEKINA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, KOGI STATE, NIGERIA

***Thaddeus, Umoru**

umoru.t@ksu.edu.ng, 07063548780.

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Kogi State University,
Anyigba, Nigeria.

Benjamin O. Omolayo

oluomolayo@gmail.com, 08033898781.

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria

Julie O. E. Orshi

enewaorshi@gmail.com, 07030193903.

Department of General and Applied Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Jos, Nigeria

Oke Oluwamayowa Joshua

09030252327

Executive Secretary, Federal Nigeria Society for the Blind,
Cappa Oshodi, Lagos

Ocheme Sunday Joseph;

ocheme.sj@ksu.edu.ng, 08111905973

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Kogi State University, Anyigba, Nigeria.

* Correspondence Author

Abstract

Victims of crime encounter multiple problems which come both from the angle of criminal justice system and the angle of society at large. The study investigates victims' perception of administration of criminal justice in Dekina Local Government area, Kogi State with emphasis on perceived victim participation in criminal justice administration, perceived rate of reparation victims get from offenders as enforced by the criminal justice administration; perceived determinants of victim satisfaction with the criminal administrative justice, perceived confidence of victims on the effectiveness of criminal justice systems, and perceived likelihood of victims calling police to report crime incidents that was witnessed in Dekina local government. Lifestyle and Routine Activities Theory was the theoretical framework adopted for the study. Using cross sectional survey design the study adopted the quantitative method. Data obtained was analyzed descriptively using frequency distribution tables. Findings amongst others shows that; crime victimization is very high and the safety of the residents is not guaranteed as they perceived the role of Criminal Justice Administration System to be very ineffective. The study recommends amongst others that the criminal justice system should be made in such a way that crime victims participate actively, not passively, in the adjudication of their cases. For this will give them sense of belonging and reduce their level of frustration as well as other social, psychological and health implications.

Keywords: Administration, Criminal, Justice, System, Perception, Victim

INTRODUCTION

Much has been written on discretion and attrition in the judicial process, yet we seldom consider how these decisions affect the injured party. We know comparatively little about how crime victims view the judicial process, though their cooperation is central to its operation. Once a victim reports a crime to the police, the state-police, prosecutors, and judges-takes over. What actually happened to the victim frequently seems to matter only insofar as it guides law enforcement officials in determining how much attention to give

the complaint and how to classify the offense. For the most part, victims of crime often feel marginalised and dissatisfied with the treatment they receive from criminal justice authorities. Either participation or exclusion have consequences which may be physical, economical as well as psychological to the victim. Victims are not only unhappy with the lack of information they receive and their general exclusion from the criminal justice process (Pazzona, 2020; Shapland *et al.*, 1985). Victims' opinions are rarely solicited; personal costs and inconveniences incurred by the victims are considered irrelevant or neglected, rate of reparations are mostly are not duly considered and enforced. These most often and not leaves victim highly unsatisfied with criminal justice administration.

According to Dambazau (1999), criminal justice a machinery which a criminals or suspects are processed and subsequently disposed. The criminal justice system is responsible for the regulation and control of criminal behaviour. Criminal justice is an instrument of social control that persuades people, through subtle and non-subtle means to abide by the dominant value of the society (Bohm& Haley, 2002). 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. Thus, although courteous behaviour is desired of all citizens, rude behaviour is of no concern to criminal justice, unless it violates the criminal law. Secondly, criminal justice is generally the society's "last line of defense" against people who refuse to abide by dominant social values and commit crimes. Usually, society turns to criminal justice only after other institutions of social control have failed to restore the hope and right of victims or a common man.

Studies suggest that victims were not necessarily uncooperative; more often they were confused. Such confusion is understandable. For many people affected by family violence and sexual violence or other types of victimization, these kind of low expectations of the criminal justice system are a barrier to them seeking help (Wilson et al 2019). Upholding the trust and confidence of victims is therefore critical for the criminal justice system to be able to provide access to justice and support to individuals, families, and communities affected by crime. In turn, the public are more likely to trust and have confidence in a criminal justice system that promotes an effective, safe and fair administration. Trust and confidence in the criminal justice system are driven by perceptions that it is effective (Gravitas, 2016) and that it is fair (Tyler & Fagan 2008). In an attempt to alleviate these problems, the study tends examine crime victim's perception of criminal justice administration in Dekina Local Government, Kogi State, Nigeria.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Victims report of victimization to the criminal justice usually starts up well until administration of justice start to take its toe on all the people involved, be it police, the offenders, pre-court phase (diversion), court-based programs and post-sentencing programs. It is then that it comes to the cognizance of the victims how little their opinions matter and how rarely their interests are considered. They soon find that, as Griffiths (1999, p.9) observed "Their role is like an expectant father in the delivery room-necessary for things to have gotten underway in the past but at the moment rather superfluous and mildly bothersome." Most cases victims bear the brunt of criminal which they have suffered and at the administrative level may also suffer negligence and some psychological trauma as they are denied of the information on the case and police became inconsiderate of their feelings. The feeling of excluded may likely leave victims dissatisfied and regretting to have ever reported the crime. Sometime, victims may be subjected to reckless statement by the police and other involved criminal justice administration members such as "That's what you get for living in the city" or "You should have known better than to go out alone" leave victim either questioning or regretting their action of reporting victimizations. Victim experience other areas of inconveniences and consequences as a result of the highhandedness of the administration of criminal justice ranging from irrelevant and incessant postponements which is particularly difficult to tolerate. Due to the aforementioned problems, the study examined victims' perception of criminal justice administration in Dekina Local Government of Kogi State.

1.3. Research Questions

The following questions was addressed.

1. What is the perceived victim participation in criminal justice administration?
2. What is criminal justice administration inconvenience/consequence as perceived by crime victims?
3. What is the perceived rate of reparation victims get from offenders as enforced by the criminal justice administration?
4. What is the perceived confidence of victims on the effectiveness of criminal justice systems?
5. What is the perceived determinants of victim satisfaction with the criminal justice administration process?

6. What is the perceived likelihood of victims calling police to report crime incidents that was witnessed?

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The study aimed at investigating crime victim's perception criminal justice administration in Dekina local government area, Kogi State. The specific objectives are to;

1. Ascertain the perceived victim participation in criminal justice administration.
2. Discover criminal justice administration inconvenience as perceived by crime victims.
3. Examine the perceived rate of reparation victims get from offenders as enforced by the criminal justice administration.
4. Evaluate the perceived confidence of victims on the effectiveness of criminal justice systems.
5. Analyse the perceived determinants of victim satisfaction with the criminal administrative justice.
6. Discover the likelihood of victims calling police to report crime incidents that was witnessed.

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 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 behaviours. Formally, the agency concern with such responsibility is the criminal justice system. Students interested in pursuing professional carriers within the criminal justice focus on subject on the concentration on either law enforcement, corrections, or legal studies. The criminal justice system is responsible for the regulation and control of criminal behaviour. Dambazau (1999) maintained that criminal justice system is said to be valuable in two ways. First, that the system is an instrument of practical purposes, accountable for the sufficient and effective reduction of crime largely through distinct mechanisms, deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation. Secondly, the system is also an instrument of justice, as means of holding criminals accountable for their crimes, and simultaneously protecting their constitutional rights.

Victim Participation in Criminal Justice System Administration

Victims of crime pass through various phases following their victimization. Immediately following the crime, victims often experience anger and fear. Later, most victims pass through a phase of searching for an explanation as to why the crime occurred. Consequently, Reeves (1989) as well as Wemmers and Canuto (2003) argued that victims participation are divided into three groups based on the stage in the criminal justice process namely; pre-court phase (diversion), court-based programmes and post-sentencing programmes.

Diversion is a programme used in restorative justice practices in order to divert offenders out of the traditional criminal justice system such as court hearing and sentencing. The victims would be talked into the acceptance of settlement of the case by the parties involved (Wemmers & Canuto, 2003). It involves mediation, family group conference. Court-based programmes can take place at various stages in the criminal justice process; either before entering a guilty plea, after a guilty plea but before sentencing. The court facilitates and organises efforts that brings together victims and offenders through direct or indirect mediation, reconciliation and restitution (Stuart, 1996).

Post-Sentencing Programs are limited number of programmes which are valuable to victims and are meant to largely address their psychological needs; allowing victims and offenders to come to terms with the offence and to put it behind them. These programs typically deal with serious offences and for victims of crime to be restored and integrated back to society and a confident social, economic and psychological self. In summary, victims of crime often feel marginalized and dissatisfied with the treatment they receive from criminal justice authorities especially with the lack of information they receive and their general exclusion from the criminal justice process (Wemmers, 1996; Resick, 1987; Shapland *et al.*, 1985).

Victims Perceived Inconvenience of Criminal Justice Administrative Process

Studies which focused almost exclusively on the administrative inconvenience created as victims run-around-especially incurring loss of time (delay, waiting, postponements) and monetary concerns (missed pay, transportation, babysitting) (Milwaukee, 1976). Although these problems occur, such studies mask more fundamental problems victims experience with law enforcement as most services provided are relatively unimportant to victims, while other more important needs are overlooked such as their wishes and efforts for greater participation (Gravitas, 2016). He maintained that the denial of which usually ends up eliciting frustration. Victims usually experience delay, intimidation, or financial loss therefore consequently compounding the desire to regain autonomy and self-esteem.

Perceptions of Restorative Justice

Restorative justice approaches crime from the point of paying for injury or wrong done to victims of crime which often covers material, psychological and physical damage. Accordingly, it is also about negotiation and discussion between victims and offenders on reparation. Inherent in restorative justice programs is victim notification of offender(s) been caught. Restorative justice offers both parties, victims and offenders, decision-making power. If, however, the police do solve the case, many victims are interested in securing reparation from the offender which most of the time fall short. For example, Baurmann and Schadler (1991) reported that 72.5% of all victims in their study, which included 169 victims of violent crimes and property crimes, expressed an interest in restitution which is not limited to material alone but also holding the offender accountable, through remorseful apology for their behaviour (Bazemore, 1999).

Victims' Perceived Effectiveness of Criminal Justice System Administration Process

For victims to be willing to assist the Police and prosecutors, they must have confidence in the overall justice system and a sense of trust in the professionals who are part of it (Hohl et al., 2010). However, a large proportion of crime is not dealt with in the criminal justice system due to lack of efficiency. Victims of crime have lower trust and confidence in criminal justice system than non-victims (Pazzona, 2020; Singer et al., 2019). Berthelot et al. (2018) made a distinction between violent and non-violent victimization. Surprisingly, they found a negative effect of non-violent victimization on trust and confidence but little to no effect of violent victimisation.

Perceived Determinants of Victim Satisfaction

Irrespective of the increase domestic the reasons for victim dissatisfaction on the enforcement of arrest and prosecution may happen contrary to the desire of the victim. The mandatory arrest contests the basic tenet that arrest and subsequent prosecution of domestic violence offenders is beneficial for victims but it certainly restricts victim autonomy (Ministry of Justice, 2021). Therefore victim dissatisfaction may be due in part to the lack of victim control over case processing as well the outcome of the CJA process. This has made it difficult for change of on the CJA proceedings (Bradford & Myhill, 2015).

Criminal Victimization and Report to the Police

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 (Reid, 2000). Studies indicate that a large proportion of crimes were not reported to the police by their victims due it several reasons: nature and type of victimization, nature of police-public relation; "seriousness or extent of losses, police effectiveness in bringing the offenders to justice, cost in terms of time, money and emotional stress that may be incurred in reporting to the police; requirement of issuance of re-issuance of official documents etc. (Alemika & Chuckwuma, 2006). Barkworth and Murphy (2016) found that victims of sexual assault and physical assault were less likely to perceive the Police as procedurally fair as victims of burglary or vehicle theft while victims of physical assault were less willing to report crime to the Police than victims of burglary or vehicle theft.

Theoretical Framework

Life Style Theory

Lifestyle theory was as originally outlined by Hindelang et al. (1978) (for a revised model, see Garofalo, 1987), demographic characteristics are the foundation from which role expectations (e.g., cultural norms) and structural constraints (e.g., economic, familial etc.) develop. Structural constraints limit behavioral choices and affect role expectations and vice versa, in turn leading to individual and subcultural adaptations, which generate variations in lifestyles. Differences in lifestyles account for variations in criminogenic exposure, both in terms of direct exposure to criminogenic circumstances and in terms of exposure to individuals with similar lifestyles (e.g., risky lifestyles). It hinges its central assumption on the argument that the risks of an individual becoming a crime victim can either increase or decrease, depending on certain lifestyle he/she displays. It also argues that the risks of victimization are theoretically increased due to association with people more or less likely to commit crimes, as well as by exposure to places and times with varied risk factor. For example, those who choose high-risk lifestyle, which include taking drug, drinking, going out late at night, associating with younger men participating in criminal activities run a much higher risk of becoming victims. Ironically, those who commit crimes increase their chance of becoming victims of crime as well (Siegel, 2005). While a number of human lifestyle are *occupation-driven and therefore obligatory*, a bulk of our lifestyle is a *self-evolved way of life and, therefore, discretionary*. Therefore the activities that people undertake or fail to perform determine their lifestyle.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design. This study adopted the descriptive cross-sectional survey research design. This type of design usually involves collecting large data across participant with predetermined defined sub-sets. The choice of this design basically is informed by its ability to elicit information from a large population of varied interest and also to generate certain primary information from their original sources.

Description of Study Area. This study was conducted in in Dekina Local Government Area (LGA) of Kogi State, Nigeria. It headquarter is in the town of Dekina on the 233km highway in the north of the area at $7^{\circ}41'41''\text{N}$ $7^{\circ}01'20''\text{E}$. The north-easterly line of equal latitude and longitude passes through the southeast of the Iga. It has an area of $2,461 \text{ km}^2$ (950 sq mi). The local government area is the biggest in Nigeria in terms of land mask. It has three major districts namely; Biraidu, Okura and Dekina, with twelve (12) council wards which are Dekina, Iyale, Odu i, Odu ii, OganeInigu, Emenwe, Abocho, Ogbabede, Egume, Anyigba, Ojipadala and Okura Olafia. The local government is inhabited mainly by the Igala speaking tribes and minor tribes such as Ebiras, Bassa. Other ethnic groups found inhabiting with the Igala include the Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa, Fulani, Edo, Calabar, Idoma, Tiv etc. The local government has eight functional markets located at Anyigba, Dekina, Egume, Abocho, Iyale, Okura, Elubi and Ewune. Dekina Local Government Area had an estimated population of 260,312 as at the 2006 census, [NPC, 2006]. Based on the growth rate of 2.5%, the population of the town was estimated at 270, 725 in 2010. However, adopting the geometric progression formula by Artmann and Benno (1999) which is based on the 2.5%, increase ratio, the current estimated population of Dekina Local Government Area in 2022 is 346,550.

Population of the Study. Since this research work is basically on the crime victims' perception of administration of criminal justice in Dekina local government area, the target population are the resident and victims in Dekina Local Government who may have been a victim or have experience with any of the criminal justice administrator (Police, Court, correctional centres).

Sample Size and Sampling Technique. The study adopts the Yamane formula of sample size determination to arrive at 210 sample size drawn from the entire target population in Dekina Local Government. This study therefore adopted the arithmetic formular for determining sample size by Yamane.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

N = sample size

N = population size

1 = constant

E = error term $(0.00)^2$

Therefore, substituting the values below in the formulae gives;

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

$$\therefore n = \frac{346,550}{1 + 346,550 (0.007)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{346,550}{1+2426.86}$$

$$n = \frac{346550}{2426.85}$$

$$n = 210.2$$

$$n=210$$

n = N sample size of 210

Sampling Techniques. The sampling technique used was the multi-stage sampling technique. The first step would be to draw a cluster of wards in the study area. Then random sampling technique would be used in second step to select five (50%) council ward from the 10 wards of the LGA. In the third stage, odd number method was used to select the council wards. Proportionate sampling technique would be used to select 29 participants from each of the five selected wards for the study.

Method of Data Collection. The study would use quantitative method of data collection. Primary source of data which involves administration of questionnaire was used to generate first-hand information from respondents. A questionnaire with close and open ended questions purposively designed for this study was used to elicit information on socio-demographic characteristics of respondents as well as the crime victims and perception of administration of criminal justice in Dekina Local Government, Area, Nigeria.

Methods of Data Analysis. Demographic variables and the research questions raised were analysed using descriptive statistics and presented using frequencies, percentages and Mean scores. The average mean

of 2.5 was set for decision making. The average mean was arrived at as $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10/4 = 2.5$. Any mean that was equal to 2.5 and above was accepted while any mean below 2.5 was rejected.

Data Presentation and Analysis

A total of 215 (100%) structured (close ended) copies of questionnaire were administered to respondents and 210 (97.7%) copies questionnaire were retrieved and used for analysis. The result of which is presented in tables below:

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Attributes of Respondents

Variables	Respondents	Frequency (N=210)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	104	49.5
	Female	106	50.5
Age range	20-25	142	67.6
	26-30	37	17.6
	31-35	19	9.0
	36 above	12	5.7
Marital status	Married	55	26.2
	Single	151	71.9
	Separated	4	1.9
Educational Attainment	WAEC/NECO	88	41.9
	ND/NCE	36	17.1
	HND/B.SC	73	34.8
	M.SC. AND ABOVE	13	6.2
Employment Status	Employed	64	30.5
	Unemployed	99	47.1
	Student/Vocational trainees	42	20.0
	Others	5	2.4
Type of Dwelling	House/Duplex/Flat	64	30.5
	Single	146	69.5
Nature of Neighbourhood	Slum Area	91	43.3
	Highbrow Area	119	56.7

Source: Field survey, 2022

Table 1 revealed that constituted 50.5% of the respondents, while 49.5% were male; also majority 67.6% falls within the age range of 20-25, 26-30 years (17.6%), 31-35 years (9.0%), 36 years and above (5.7%). This shows that majority of study participants were within the age range of 20-25 years. On marital status, single (71.9%), married (26.2%) and separated (1.9%); on educational qualification, WAEC/NECO (41.9%), HND/BSc (34.8%) ND/NCE (17.1%), MSc and above (6.2%). This shows that majority of the respondents were WAEC/NECO holders. On employment status, unemployed (47.1%), employed (30.5%) vocational trainees (20.0%), others (2.4%). The study also revealed that 69.5% of the respondents live in single rooms while 30.5% (house/duplex/flat), 56.7% (highbrow area) and 43.3% (slum areas).

Table 2. Mean Score Showing Perceived Participation in Criminal Justice Administration

S/N	Items	SD	D	A	SA	F _x	\bar{x}
		1	2	3	4		
	<u>Why do you think Participating in Criminal justice Administration Process in Necessary?</u>						
1	Know what kind of person the offender is	179	146	57	14	698	3.32*
2	Be able to get anger, grief and disgust off their chests by telling the offender what they think	107	171	99	19	822	3.91*
3	Teach the offender a lesson, by holding them accountable and sensitizing the person to the consequences of his or her actions	68	120	151	57	761	3.62*
4	Know why and get information on why the offender committed the crime	59	131	142	62	813	3.87*
5	Recover their losses by ensuring restitution and reparation	48	103	149	96	1085	5.17*
6	Put an end to the conflict and avoid further escalation	152	150	71	23	757	3.60*
	<u>Why do you think participation in the criminal justice administration process is not necessary?</u>						
7	Victims fear they would be seen as foolish	97	169	95	35	860	4.10*
8	Victim wanted the case to be decided by a judge	67	110	161	56	994	4.73*
9	The loss did not merit the perceived hassle of involvement	78	130	138	50	652	4.53*
10	Victims prefer to work out a settlement out of CJA process	78	120	151	57	999	4.76*
11	Victims are usually afraid of meeting the offender	49	131	142	62	985	4.69*

Source: Field survey, 2022.

* = Significant

Table 2 shows that victims participates in criminal justice administration process to recover their losses by ensuring restitution and reparation ($x=5.17$); be able to get anger, grief and disgust off their chests by telling the offender what they think ($x=3.91$); Know why and get information on why the offender committed the crime ($x=3.87$); teach the offender a lesson, by holding them accountable and sensitizing the person to the consequences of his or her actions ($x=3.62$); put an end to the conflict and avoid further escalation ($x=3.60$); and know what kind of person is the offender ($x=3.52$). On the contrary, the study also revealed that failure to participate in CJA process is because, victims prefer to work out a settlement out of CJA process ($x=4.76$); victim wanted the case to be decided by a judge ($x=4.73$); victims are usually afraid of meeting the offender ($x=4.69$); the loss did not merit the perceived hassle of involvement ($x=4.53$); and victims fear they would be seen as foolish ($x=4.10$).

Table 3. Mean Scores Showing Rate of the Perceived Inconveniences of Criminal Justice Administration

S/N	Items	SD	D	A	SA	F _x	\bar{x}
		1	2	3	4		
1	Frustration from postponements and adjournments of cases	179	146	57	14	698	2.76*
2	Recurrent traumatic experience of victimization	107	171	99	19	822	3.08*
3	Amount of money spent on fuelling and transportation and other monetary expenses	68	120	151	57	989	2.56*
4	Putting other family members in jeopardy	59	131	142	62	995	4.01*
5	Feeling of being dumped or abandoned in the middle of cases	48	103	149	96	1085	4.14*
6	General delay in criminal justice administration process	152	150	71	23	757	3.01*
7	Number of hours sitting in wait for offenders	97	169	95	35	860	2.60*

	to be arraigned						
8	Anxiety and threat of meeting offenders in police station/court	67	110	161	56	991	3.02*
9	Missed opportunities as a result of pursuing a case of victimization	78	130	138	50	928	2.84*

Source: Field survey, 2022.

* = Significant

Table 3 revealed that the most significant perceived inconvenience experienced by victims as a result of participating in criminal justice administration are feeling of being dumped or abandoned in the middle of cases ($x=4.14$); putting other family members in jeopardy ($x=4.01$); recurrent traumatic experience of victimization ($x=3.08$); anxiety and threat of meeting offenders in police station/court ($x=3.02$); general delay in criminal justice administration process ($x=3.01$); missed opportunities as a result of pursuing a case of victimization ($x=2.84$); frustration from postponements and adjournments of cases ($x=2.76$); number of hours sitting in wait for offenders to be arraigned ($x=2.60$); and the least significant inconvenience is the amount of money spent on fuelling and transportation and other monetary expenses ($x=2.56$).

Table 4. Mean Scores Showing Perceived Reparation of Victims by Offenders

S/N	Items	SD	D	A	SA	Fx	\bar{x}
		1	2	3	4		
1	Victims usually want to receive significant compensation from the offenders	43	26	272	77	2.24	2.73*
2	What is your most preferred manner of compensation?						
i.	Material restitution	157	153	47	34	3.13	2.59*
ii.	Financial restitution	173	122	40	57	3.07	2.92*
iii.	Victims taking responsibility/being accountable for their offence	271	90	9	17	3.57	2.94*
iv.	Paying all damages (emotional, economic, social and physical)	176	176	12	24	3.29	2.95*
v.	Sincere remorse and apology for injuries inflicted (especially for spouses)	330	21	18	19	3.70	2.88*
vi.	Sentencing offenders to jail terms	195	178	6	10	3.44	2.70*
vii.	Death penalty depending on the severity of victimization	300	66	14	8	3.69	2.63*

Source: Field survey, 2022.

* = Significant

Table 4 revealed that victims usually want to receive significant compensation from the offenders ($x=2.73$). The most preferred manner of compensation include paying all damages which include emotional, economic, social and physical ($x=2.95$); victims taking responsibility/being accountable for their offence ($x=2.94$); financial restitution ($x=2.92$); sincere remorse and apology for injuries inflicted ($x=2.88$); sentencing offenders to jail terms ($x=2.70$); death penalty depending on the severity of victimization ($x=2.62$); and material restitution ($x=2.59$).

Table 5. Perception of Administration of Criminal Justice System Effectiveness

Variables	Responses	Frequency (N=210)	Percentage (%)
1. How do you rate the performance of criminal justice system in crime control?	Very effective	20	9.5
	Fairly effective	86	41.0
	Not effective	104	49.5
2. How do you access police assistance to crime victims?	Strongly effective	11	5.2
	Effective	37	17.6
	not effective	112	53.3
	strongly not effective	50	23.8
3. How has criminal justice administration system been handling crime victims' cases?	Did not do enough to solve the crime	35	16.7
	Police usually show cold feet in apprehending offenders	26	12.4
	Did not recover goods		
	Did not inform me of the progress in the investigation	17 26	8.1 13.4
	Impolite to me		
	Slow to respond	37	17.6
			69
4. Are you satisfied with the current rate of the effectiveness of the CJAS in handling victimization?	No	160	76.2
	Yes	50	23.3

Source: field survey, 2020

Table 5 presents information on perception of effectiveness criminal justice system. Findings show that performance of criminal justice system in crime control is not effective (49.5%); on the evaluation of police assistance to crime victims, it was also reported ineffective (57.6%). When asked the way and manner criminal justice administration (CJA) been handling crime victims' cases, respondents reported that CJA are slow to respond (32.9%); has shown to be impolite (17.6%); CJAS are not doing enough (16.7%); usually not inform victims on the progress in the investigation (13.4%); police usually show cold feet in apprehending offenders (12.4%). Finally, 76% are not satisfied with the current rate of the effectiveness of the CJA in handling victimization.

Table 6. Perceived Determinants of Satisfaction in Criminal Justice Administration Process

S/N	Items	LS				MS	Fx	\bar{x}
		1	2	3	4			
1	Opportunity to meet the offender and thereby obtain a better understanding of the crime and the offender's situation	88	156	70	55	830	3.95*	
2	The opportunity to receive restitution for loss	121	123	84	60	1078	5.13*	
3	The care and concern of the mediator	156	88	70	55	762	3.63*	
4	the rate at which CJAS allowed victims to followed-up the case	140	114	41	75	791	3.77*	
5	Pressure on the offender to fulfil the agreed contract	40	102	88	141	1022	4.87*	
6	Time required to participate and lag between the crime and resolution	18	36	146	115	788	3.71*	
7	Amount of damages incurred by the victim and amount repaid	14	28	123	107	767	3.13*	
8	The rate at which Police did everything victim expected	14	188	61	89	662	3.15*	
9	The rate at which prosecutor and court gave victim a sense of control	17	12	121	160	1044	4.97*	
10	Scary threats and criminal charges fielded against the offender	15	88	70	50	710	3.53*	
11	The actual court outcome from the victimization case.	40	99	150	148	1280	6.10*	

Source: Field survey, 2022.

LS= Least satisfying; MS = Most Satisfying, * = Significant

Table 6 shows that actual court outcome from victimization case ($x=6.10$) is the most significant determinant of victim satisfaction with CJA, followed by the opportunity to receive restitution for loss ($x=5.13$); the rate at which prosecutor and court gave victim a sense of control ($x=4.97$); pressure on the offender to fulfil the agreed contract ($x=4.87$); Opportunity to meet the offender and thereby obtain a better understanding of the crime and the offender's situation ($x=3.95$); the rate at which CJA allowed victims to follow-up the case ($x=3.77$); time required to participate and lag between the crime and resolution (3.71); the care and concern of the mediator ($x=3.63$); scary threats and criminal charges fielded against the offender ($x=3.53$); the rate at which Police did everything victim expected ($x=3.15$); and amount of damages incurred by the victim and amount repaid ($x=3.13$).

Table 7. Perceived Likelihood of Victims Calling Police to Report Crime Incidents

S/N	Items	Responses	Frequency (N=210)	Percentage (%)
1.	Have you ever reported a case of victimization to police?	Yes	121	57.6
		No	89	42.4
2.	To what purpose do you think you should report crime victimization?	To recover stolen property	28	13.3
		To stop it happening again	120	57.1
		To get help from the police	62	29.5
3.	Why would you normally not report incidents of victimization to police?	Incident not very serious	35	16.7
		Family solved it	18	8.6
		No sufficient evidence	66	31.4
		CJA would not do anything	91	43.3

Source: Field survey, 2022.

Table 7 presents information on perceived likelihood of victims reporting the act of victimization to the police. The study revealed that 57.6% have reported the act of victimization. On the purpose of why victimization should be reported, it was revealed that people mostly report victimization in order to stop it from happening again (57.5%); to get help from the police (29.5%); and finally to recover stolen property (13.3%). It was revealed that the reason why people don't normally report the victimization is because they believe the CJA would most likely do nothing about it (43.3%); no sufficient evidence (31.4%); others think that the incidents are not very serious (16.7%) while only maintain that they would leave the family to handle the case (8.6%).

Discussion of Findings

The study investigated victims' perception of administration of criminal justice in Dekina Local Government area, Kogi State. Based on the finding, supportive empirical and theoretical literature is presented thus:

On victim participation, it was discovered that victims participate in criminal justice administration process to recover their losses by ensuring restitution and reparation, be able to get anger, grief and disgust off their chests by telling the offender what they think, get information on why the offender committed the crime, teach the offender a lesson, by holding them accountable and sensitizing the person to the consequences of his or her actions, avoid further escalation. This result is consistent with studies (Wemmers, 1996; Resick, 1987; Shapland *et al.*, 1985) who in their separate studies discovered that victims are unhappy with the lack of information they receive and their general exclusion from the criminal justice process would desire to be fully involved irrespective of the inconveniences.

On perceived inconvenience of participating in criminal justice administration it was revealed that most significant feeling of being dumped or abandoned in the middle of cases, putting other family members in jeopardy, recurrent traumatic experience of victimization, anxiety and threat of meeting offenders, general delay in criminal justice administration process, missed opportunities as a result of pursuing a case of victimization, frustration from postponements and adjournments of cases, number of hours sitting in wait for offenders to be arraigned, and the least significant inconvenience is the amount of money spent on fuelling and transportation and other monetary expenses. This is in tandem with Milwaukee (1976) and Gravitas (2016) who insisted that frustration incurred in the process of participation in criminal justice administration outweighs the material and monetary costs.

On perceived reparative justice, it was discovered that victims usually want to receive significant compensation from the offenders which includes, paying all damages which include emotional, economic, social and physical; financial restitution; remorse and apology for injuries inflicted; sentencing offenders to jail terms; death penalty depending on the severity of victimization; and material restitution. This supports Baumann and Schadler (1991) who reported that nearly two thirds (72.5%) of all victims in their study included 169 victims of violent crimes and property crimes, expressed an interest in restitution of all sorts.

On the perception of effectiveness criminal justice system, it was revealed that their crime control strategies is not effective as they are usually slow respond, show impolite, not putting enough efforts, ignores victims on the progress in the investigation, usually show cold feet in apprehending offender. This result confirms studies (Berthelot et al 2018; Pazzona 2020; Singer et al 2019) who in their respective studies affirmed that victims and non-victims had lower trust and confidence in criminal justice system because large proportion of crime is not dealt with in the criminal justice system due to lack of efficiency.

The study also discovered that the following are the determinants of victim satisfaction with criminal justice administration; actual court outcome from victimization case, opportunity to receive restitution, sense of control, pressure on the offender to fulfil the agreed contract, allowing victims to follow-up the case, scary threats and criminal charges fielded against the offender and amount of damages incurred by the victim and amount repaid. This is almost not in tandem with previous studies who maintained that victim satisfaction is significantly correlated with autonomy and victim control over case processing and disposition (Bradford & Myhill, 2015; Ministry of Justice, 2021).

The study revealed that significant number of participants have reported the act of victimization for the purpose of having it stopped, get help from the police and recover stolen property; the reason why people don't normally report the victimization is because they believe the CJA would most likely do nothing about it, no sufficient evidence especially of the victims of rape, fear of stigmatization. This findings supports Alemika and Chuckwuma (2005) in their studies on criminal victimization and fear of crime in Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria. They maintained that the nature of crime such as murder, automobile robbery and automobile theft were the widely reported crimes while sexual offences in particular have low rate as fear and family intervention prevents reportage. Other reason for reporting crime victimization include recovering property lost to the criminals; desire to obtain help from the police, to secure apprehension of the offender.

Conclusion

The study investigated victims' perception of administration of criminal justice in Dekina Local Government area, Kogi State. Based on the finding, the following conclusions were drawn:

Victims participates in criminal justice administration process to recover their losses, by ensure restitution and reparation, be able to get anger, grief and disgust off their chests by telling the offender what they think. Victims also participates in order to get information on why the offender committed the crime, teach the offender a lesson and finally to hold offenders accountable to the consequences their actions. Inconvenience of participating in criminal justice administration include feeling of being dumped or abandoned in the middle of cases, putting other family members in jeopardy, recurrent traumatic experience of victimization, anxiety and threat of meeting offenders, general delay and missed opportunities as a result of pursuing a case of victimization, frustration from postponements and adjournments of cases, long waiting period before offenders are arraigned. As reparation and compensation, victims usually want to receive significant compensation from the offenders which includes, paying all damages which include emotional, economic, social and physical; financial restitution; remorse and apology for injuries inflicted; sentencing offenders to jail terms; death penalty depending on the severity of victimization; and material restitution. The perception of effectiveness criminal justice system is rated low because of slow respond, show of impoliteness, insufficient efforts, lack of information on the progress of the investigation and cold feet in apprehending offender. The determinants of victim satisfaction with criminal justice administration are actual court outcome from victimization case, opportunity to receive restitution, sense of control, pressure on the offender to fulfil the agreed contract, allowing victims to follow-up the case, scary threats and criminal charges fielded against the offender and amount of damages incurred by the victim and amount repaid. The reason for reporting the act of victimization include to have it stopped, get help from the police and recover stolen property why on the reverse, lack of reportage include lack of trust on the CJA, most times victims do not have sufficient evidence especially of the victims of rape, and fear of stigmatization.

Recommendations

The study investigates victims' perception of administration of criminal justice in Dekina Local Government area, Kogi State. Based on the finding, the following recommendations were made:

1. Therefore, the criminal justice system should be made in such a way that crime victims participate actively, not passively, in the adjudication of their cases. For this will give them sense of belonging and reduce their level of frustration.
2. Moreover, the criminal justice administration should endeavour to introduce some practical service programmes to the crime victims to ensure balance of treatment between the offender and the victim, by the criminal justice system.
3. Since offenders receive reformation and rehabilitation training, the victims should be provided with certain compensatory rehabilitative programmes. Because in addition to various financial needs, victims of violent crime, for example, may also require immediate or even long-term medical consideration as well as other forms of assistance.
4. In addition, in the area of the study, it was discovered that crime rate is on the increase, therefore government should efficiently allocate adequate resources to the criminal justice agencies (especially the police and the court), to ensure effective crime prevention and control as well as effective and reliable administration of criminal justice in this area.

REFERENCES

- Alemika, E. O. and Chukwuma, I. C. (2006). *Criminal Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria*. Monograph Series, Lagos, Cleen Foundation.
- Barkworth, J. & Murphy, K. (2016). System contact and procedural justice policing: Improving quality of life outcomes for victims of crime. *International Review of Victimology*, 22, 105-122.
- Baurmann M., & Schadler, W. (1991). Victims of reported crime - their expectations, needs and perspectives. An inquiry of crime victims concerning victim protection, victim support and mediation. In G. Kaiser, H. Kury, & H.-J Albrecht (Eds.), *Victims and Criminal Justice*. Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Penal Law, 52(1), 3-27.
- Bazemore, G. (1999). Crime victims, restorative justice and the juvenile court: Exploring victim needs and involvement in the response to youth crime. *International Review of Victimology*, 6, 295-320.
- Berthelot, E. R., McNeal, B. A., & Baldwin, J. M. (2018). Relationships between agency-specific contact, victimization type, and trust and confidence in the police and courts. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-018-9434-x>
- Bradford, B & Myhill, A. (2015). Triggers of change to public confidence in the police and criminal justice system: Findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales panel experiment. *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 15(1): 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895814521825>
- Danbazau, A.B. (1999). *Criminology and Criminal Justice* Kaduna: Nigeria Defiance Academy Press.
- Garofalo, J. (1987). Reassessing the lifestyle model of criminal victimization. In M. R. Gottfredson & T. Hirschi (Eds.), *Positive criminology*, (pp. 23–42). SAGE, cop.
- Gravitas, G. (2016). *Developing understanding of the drivers of trust and confidence in the police*. Unpublished report commissioned by New Zealand Police.
- Griffiths, C. (1999). The victims of crime and restorative justice: The Canadian experience. *International Review of Victimology*, 6, 279-294.
- Hindelang, M. J., Gottfredson, M. R., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*. Ballinger Publication Company.
- Hohl, K., Bradford, B., & Stanko, E. A. (2010). Influencing trust and confidence in the London metropolitan police: Results from an experiment testing the effect of leaflet drops on public opinion. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 50(3), 491–513.
- Milwaukee. M. (1976). United States Department of Communication, **Bureau of the Census**, the Milwaukee Crime Follow-Up Survey, Final Survey Report. USA, Washington, DC.
- Ministry of Justice. (2021). *Victims' trust and confidence in the criminal justice system. New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey. May 2021. Results drawn from Cycle 2 (2018/19) of the New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice. <https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Publications/NZCVS-topical-report-Victims-trust-and-confidence-in-the-criminal-justice-system.pdf>
- Pazzona, M. (2020). Do victims of crime trust less but participate more in social organizations? *Economics of Governance*, 21:49–73 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10101-019-00227-1>
- Reeves, H. (1989). The victim support perspective. In M. Wright, & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Mediation and criminal justice: Victims, offenders and community* (pp. 44-55). London: Sage Publications.
- Resick, P. (1987). Psychological effects of victimization: Implications for the criminal justice system. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33(4), 468-478.
- Rosenbaum, D P, Schuck, A M, Costello, S K, Hawkins, D F & Ring, M K. (2005). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. *Police Quarterly* 8(3): 343-365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611104271085>.
- Shapland, J., Wilmore, J., & Duff, P. (1985). *Victims in the criminal justice system*. Aldershot, Eng.: Gower Publishing Company.

- Siegel, L.R. (2005). *Criminology: The Core*. U.S.A.: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Singer, A, Chouhy, C, Lehmann, J, Walzak, M & Biglin, S. (2019). Victimization, fear of crime, and trust in criminal justice institutions: A cross-national analysis. *Crime & Delinquency* 65(6): 822-844.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128718787513>.
- Stuart, B. (1996). Circle sentencing: Turning swords into ploughshares. In B. Galaway, & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Restorative justice: International perspectives* (pp. 193-201). New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Tyler, T R & Fagan, J. 2008. Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 6: 231-276.
https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/osjcl6&div=11&g_sent=1&casa_token=&collecton=journals
- Wemmers, J. & Canuto, M. (2003). Victims' experiences with, expectations and perceptions of restorative justice: a critical review of the literature. Department of Justice Canada, 1- 47.
- Wemmers, J-A. (1996). *Victims in the criminal justice system*. Amsterdam: Kugler Publications.
- Wilson, D, Mikahere-Hall, A, Sherwood, J, Cootes, K & Jackson, D. (2019). *E Tū Wāhine, E Tū Whānau: Wāhine Māori keeping safe in unsafe relationships*. Auckland: Taupua Waiora Māori Research Centre.
https://niphmhr.aut.ac.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/330302/REPORT_E-Tu-Wahine,-E-Tu-Whanau-Wahine-Maori-keeping-safe-in-unsafe-relationships.pdf