
Crime Management and the Modern Security Correction Measures in Nigeria: Preventive Alternatives to Punitive Response

Yusuf Musa Muhammad

Department of Management Science, Nigeria Police Academy Wudil, Nigeria.

Corresponding Email: yusufumusa45@gmail.com

Abstract

Against the background of rising trends in criminal activities in Nigeria, in recent times, this study seeks to determine whether or not community correction treatment as alternative way of curbing crime and improving public safety has any empirical justification. To achieve this objective, the study utilized secondary data on reported crime incidents in Nigeria. These data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and chi-square test. The results indicate a rejection of the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. It was found that criminal justice process takes an offender through a series of decision points at each agency, from arrest into the courts through re-entry into community. Thus, provides reactive approach to addressing crime. It was becoming readily apparent that this traditional respond on its own was insufficient for the task of reducing crime. The results also indicate that the types and levels of crime that occur are beyond community correction treatment. Community corrections were also ineffective in meeting the goals of deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation punishment ideal; a kind of response that epitomizes treatment-punishment mixture. The study recommended that crime prevention is best viewed as an alternative to those more traditional modes of crime control and widely supported by public over place and time. It is far more socially worthwhile and sustainable to intervene before harm is inflicted on a victim and the offender is under the supervision of the justice system. A combination of the emerging and more promising alternative forms of crime prevention and some of the traditional modes of approach will be more effective in reducing crime.

Keywords: Criminal justice system, community correction, crime prevention, custodial sentence, Nigeria

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of crime is as old as the human race. Crimes are very common to all human societies. Crime is a fact and reality of life; therefore, societies must contend with one form of criminality or the other. However, this does not make crime a desirable act. Pervasiveness of crimes leads to abnormality in the society. Since crime is a reality and a fact of life, its prevention and control are necessary. Therefore, a crime has to be reduced to a reasonable limit. Hence, the tasks of crime detection, prevention, management and control are necessary in order to make a society safe and stable (Radda, 2011).

Nigeria, like all societies of the world experiences crimes that must continually be checked for the peaceful and harmonious co-existence of the nation. As society progresses and changes, so are changes in crime experiences. Hence, the need to regularly update the competences of security personnel to enable them cope with changing trends in criminality, believing that the components that make-up crime have to be understood before crime is properly checked. The task of crime prevention and control are better achieved and served if crimes are promptly detected and properly investigated consequent to prosecution (Duze, 2011).

The rising crime rate in Nigeria, especially violent crimes has dampened public hope of the capacity of security apparatus to ensure the safety of people's lives and properties (Dambazau, 2007). The general assumption is that the police can neither solve the crimes already committed through arrests and successful prosecutions, nor prevent or reduce the incidence of crime in Nigeria. This perception is notwithstanding the fact that the other segments of Criminal Justice System namely; the courts and prison service do contribute to the slow pace or delay in handling criminal cases. In the light of worsening crimes situation and the ineffectiveness of crime control apparatus, Nigeria can be deemed to have a crime problem (Aremu & Yusuf, 2011).

Criminal Justice System consisting of the Police, Prosecutors, Judiciary, Correctional service and the Legal Aid Scheme are inadequate in Nigeria. Despite assurances that it is working to reduce crime, the system is in fact grinding to a halt with staff shortages, lack of accountability and corruption (Eme & Okon, 2009: 166). Programmes and policies designed to reduce crime include; police making arrest as part of the operation to deal with gang problems, a court sanction to a secured correctional facility and in the extreme, death penalty (Aremu & Yusuf, 2011). These measures are more aptly referred to as Crime control, repression or restraint (Brandon & David, 2012).

As observed by Oditia (2006), the Penal Reform System in Nigerian Prisons expected to turn prisoners around and make them good citizens is faulty. As a result, most of those sent to prisons end-up becoming habitual criminals. It was becoming readily apparent among practitioners and public officers alike that criminal justice response on its own was insufficient for the task of reducing crime (Brandon, *et al*, 2012).

The above observation draws attention to Community Corrections as alternative to these more traditional responses to crime. These alternative approaches to addressing

crime sought to re-affirm the role of community in preventing crime and correcting behaviours, operating outside of the purview of the criminal justice system. Much of the history of community penalties is about probation orders (supervised release-requiring an offender to be under the supervision of non-custodial officer), and community service orders (requiring the performance of supervised unpaid work) as a form of reparation/ compensation to the community (Modern Community Correction Measures, 2020).

The modern-day crime prevention is linked with a loss of faith in the criminal justice system that occurred in the wake of the dramatic increase in crime rates in recent times, Curtis 1987 in Brandon, *et al*, 2012). Interestingly, this loss of faith in the criminal justice system was not unique to Nigeria. Similar developments were taking place in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom and other Western Europe countries and for some of the same reasons (Tony and Farmington, 1995, Waller, 1990, and Bannett, 1998). Several other studies were conducted outside Nigeria and they yielded similar results, suggesting that there may be no location differences regarding the ineffectiveness of the criminal justice response.

The Administration of Justice Act (2015) provides for Courts to apply non-custodial measures as part of the sanctions that can be meted out to defendants. Similarly, the Nigerian Correctional Service Act (2019) makes provision for the administration of custodial and non-custodial measures. The non-custodial options in Nigeria as non-formal justice crime control have community correction programmes and rely on moral and social institutions to promote lawful behaviour. Since then, courts in Nigeria have been using some forms of correction treatments. However, there is still much controversy and surprisingly, not much empirical evidence to either support or discredit this community-driven approach to crime prevention. Never-the-less agencies responsible for enforcing the law have

reported compelling results. Now the questions: Where does community correction treatment stand today? and Is community correction treatment truly a viable practical approach to crime prevention?

In view of the above and given the fact that there is paucity of empirical study on the extent to which community correction treatments among other policy measures have impacted on crime reduction and public safety in Nigeria, this study becomes a significant undertaking. Therefore, the major aim of this study is to ascertain whether or not the community correction measures as way of curbing crimes, protecting the public and reduce reoffending has any empirical justification. Therefore, this study is structured into five sections: Section one provides introduction and the background to the study. Section two dwells on conceptual clarifications, literature review, and theoretical discourse. Section three addresses methodology issues and statistical techniques. Section four presents data for the study and analyzes results of the study. Section five concludes the study, presents major findings and makes recommendations.

2. Literature Review

As reported by Radda (2011) in criminology research crime is considered the most independent variable, that is criminology research attempts to find out what causes crime. A crime can generally be defined as an illegal act or gross violation of law for which someone can be punished by the government of the day (Savitz, 1967) Individuals who engage in crimes may be subject to criminal penalties such as imprisonment, probation (supervised release) or community service. Broadly a crime is a socially harmful act or omission that breaches the values protected by a state. It is an act or event prohibited by law, one which can be followed by prosecution in criminal proceedings and thereafter by punishment on conviction (Modern security correction measures, 2020).

According to Reid (1989) crime is legally defined as: An intentional act of commission or omission in violation of the criminal law, committed without defence or justification and sanctioned by the state as felony or misdemeanor. While agreeing with the above definition Savitz (1967) says five conditions are required before an act can be called criminal: an act must take place that involves harm inflicted on someone by the actor; the act must be legally prohibited at the time of commission; the perpetrator must have criminal intent (Mensrea) when he engaged in the act; there must be a causal relations between the voluntary misconduct and the harm that results; and there must be some legally prescribed punishment for anyone convicted of the act.

The legal definition of crime, which is concern of criminal investigators, is the thrust of this study. Therefore, committing crime necessitates establishing cause, extent, pattern and identifying the perpetrators of the action through investigation (ibid). Chukkol (1988) sees difficulty in defining crime because what is defined as crime vary with society, time and space. What exactly constitutes a crime varies from state to state. Hence, law gives behaviour its quality of criminality.

Crime Prevention and Crime Control

Crime prevention is defined as strategies or measures that seek to reduce the risk of crimes occurring and their potential harmful effects on individuals and society including fear of intervening to influence their multiple causes (United Nations, 2020). Similarly, crime control refers to programmes and policies designed to reduce crime, which includes police arrests and court sanctions. Both crime prevention and crime control share a common goal of trying to prevent the occurrence of a future criminal act; but what distinguishes crime prevention from crime control is that prevention takes place outside of the confines of the formal justice system.

A crime is an illegal act that is punishable by the government; an offence that merits community condemnation and punishment,

usually by way of fine or imprisonment (Rachel Payne Gill, 2023). There are three categories of crime – felony, misdemeanor, and violation: a **felony** is most serious of crimes, usually resulting in long periods of prison time and heavy fines; a **misdemeanor** is a less serious crime that usually results in short periods of time in jail and/ or small fines and a **violation** is the least serious offence of breaking the law, usually results in warnings or small fines.

According to McGuire (2004) there are many angles of looking at what constitutes a crime given variations in trends incarceration rates. They include: individual motivation, opportunity, politics, social conventions and context. Odita (2006) submitted that crime is a creation of society either due to bad governance, economic down-turn, greed, inability to control the urge to satisfy want as against need, obsession for wealth or power, bad legislation, selfish, dictatorship, etc. Developmental perspectives on crime prevention postulate that criminal offending in adolescence and adulthood is influenced by behavioural, attitudinal and experiential pattern that have been learned during an individual's development (Tembley & Craig, 1995).

Crime Typologies

According to Conklin (1989), generally crime can be categorized into four major types: conventional crimes, white-collar crimes, organized crimes and victimless crimes.

Conventional crimes seem to be the crimes that affect persons and/or their properties. They are crimes that almost every individual is aware and afraid of due to their direct immediate effect on health, lives, and properties of people (Madaki, 2011). Conventional crimes are divided into two groups: crime of violence or crime against the person and property crimes. Crimes against the person are violent crimes that direct violence or the threat of violence against others. These are usually generalized as acts of violence that cause physical,

emotional or psychological harm to the victim. These types of crimes involve a direct confrontation between offender and victim. Violent personal crimes include murder, manslaughter, aggravated assault, forcible rape, robbery, battery, kidnapping, among others. Property crimes are crimes that affect people's property. They involve damage or destruction of another person's property. They include theft, burglary, vandalism, arson, among others. Most of property crimes are considered misdemeanors, while some of such crime as burglary can be charged as felonies. Therefore, the focus of this study is mainly on conventional crimes, due to their direct and immediate effects on individuals and/or their properties.

Crime Situations in Nigeria

Crime is a universal phenomenon that is threatening the security and well-being of various countries in varying degrees. The causes of crime also vary from one country to another. Even within the same country the causes vary from one region to another. All countries experience crime violence, which may lead to some situations where there seem to be little public-protection and security. The rising crime rate especially violent crimes involving terrorism, banditry, armed robbery, rapes, ritual murders, political assassinations, militancy, ethno-religious violence, and electoral violence among others has dampened public hope of the capacity of the security apparatus to ensure the safety of people's lives and properties (Dambazau, 2007). It is quite certain that crime has its consequences once it occurs. The best way out is to prevent or reduce its occurrence.

Nigeria's long-standing criminality and security challenges continued in 2019 and 2020; and have been described as stemming from militant Islamists Predominantly active in the North-East Region moving into North-Western states. Violence related to armed bandits and criminal violence in the North-West and North-Central regions and street gangs in the South-West region.

Conflict between Farmers and Herders mainly in the Middle Belt, but increasingly moving to Southern states; communal and ethnic clashes in the North-Central region and increasingly in the Southern states; Biafra armed separatists in the South-East region and oil militants and Sea pirates in Southern Nigeria, particularly the Niger Delta (International Crisis Group, 2020). Election-related violence mainly occurred throughout the country (Nigerian Security Situation, 2021).

The Country has been grappling with high incidence of crime. The advent of Boko-haram insurgency in Borno state in 2001 marked the beginning of heightened tensions insecurity in Nigeria. This led to series of violent attacks characterized by bombing of public infrastructure, killings and murder of innocent citizens; and kidnappings of female school children by coordinated criminal gangs. The Boko-haram (literally, Western Education is Blasphemous) terrorists have even engaged in the capture of communities and hoisting of their flags and thereby claiming territories (Usman, 2022). They have also extended their violent activities to other places, attacking various Police and security formations including Force Headquarters and UN building in Abuja (ibid).

Covering the first half of 2019, the UN described the Security situation in Nigeria as 'volatile' (UN Security Council, 2019), with ongoing conflict due to Boko-haram's presence, resulting in a worsening of the existing Humanitarian situation and affecting population displacement and food insecurity. Global Rights described Nigeria's 2019 threshold of violence as 'very high' (Global Rights, 2019). Since then, insecurity has not only become a major challenge, but the order of the day in Nigeria. The fallout is that Nigeria has lost so much in terms of lives, properties and its international respect.

In spite of the fact that authorities have been responding to every incident of these banditry activities, but all the efforts and measures put in place, bandits have

continued to operate almost unabated. Today, the banditry industry seems to be more lucrative business as ransom demands by bandits runs into hundreds of millions of Naira leading to persistent increase in kidnapping.

Crime prevention strategy in Nigeria is the criminal justice system, which usually starts from reports or complaints at the police stations leading to arrests, investigation, arraignment and prosecution of offender in courts of competent jurisdiction (Oditia, 2006). In this process, the courts are an important arm of the criminal justice system. Punishment imposed automatically provides the deterrent, thus making it an invaluable crime prevention strategy (ibid). Criminal Justice Prevention refers to traditional deterrent, incapacitated and rehabilitative strategies operated by law-enforcement and agencies of the criminal justice system.

Criminal Justice System is an organized collection of agencies responsible for protecting the public, maintaining order, enforcing the law, identifying transgressors, bringing the guilt to justice and treating criminal behaviour. It is a system comprising law-enforcement, adjudication and correction that is directly involved in the arrest, prosecution, custody, and rehabilitation of those charge with criminal offences. The criminal justice system is designed to protect potential victims of crime and that the justice agencies share a common goal, which is crime reduction. The effectiveness of the criminal justice system is measured by its ability to meet the goals of deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation. The realization of these goals depends on the level of collaboration among the various law enforcement agencies. Criminal Justice may be divided into three (3) main components: Law enforcement agencies (police), which investigate crime and apprehend suspects; the court system (Judiciary and Prosecution) which charges, indicts, tries and sentences offenders; and the correctional system (custodial and non-custodial) which supports the court system,

supervises, rehabilitates offenders in the community and in custody (Modern Security Correction Measures, 2020:10).

The Criminal Justice process takes an offender through a series of decision points at each agency, from arrest into the courts through re-entry into community. Thus, Criminal justice provides a reactive approach to addressing crime. At early stage of a crime, if the police make an arrest, the arrestee becomes a “suspect. If eventually the suspect is arraigned in courts, he or she becomes an “accused”. The accused remains innocent until the court proves otherwise. If the accused is not discharged and acquitted after trial and is sentenced, his or her title changes to a “convict”. The sentence may involve fines, probation, or incarceration (confinement), Ikoh (2011). At this level, the prison takes him or her in as an “inmate”. Imprisonment thus becomes an act of legally restricting or confining a person (ibid). As observed by Dambazau (1999) imprisonment is one of the widely used criminal justice disposal methods in Nigeria.

As observed by Oditia (2006), the panel reform system in Nigerian prisons expected to turn prisoners around and make them good citizens is faulty. As a result, most of those sent to prisons end-up becoming habitual criminals. It was becoming readily apparent among practitioners and public officers alike that criminal justice response on its own was insufficient for the task of reducing crime. The above observations draw attention to community corrections as alternative to these more traditional responses to crime.

The New Modern Security Correction Measures

The traditional role of prison facility was confined to ‘administering punishment’ as prescribed by the courts, serving the order and the time as prescribed. In modern times, correctional functions have evolved and now are able to accord each convict individualized sentences including providing assessment that determines the

holding regime as well as the kind of correctional rehabilitation that needs to be employed (Modern Security Correction Measures, 2020).

The Nigerian Correctional Service Act (2019) makes provision for the administration of custodial and non-custodial measures. The non-custodial options in Nigeria as non- formal justice crime control have community correction programmes and rely on moral and social institutions to promote lawful behaviour. These alternative approaches to addressing crime sought to re-affirm the role of community in preventing crime and correcting behaviours operating outside of the purview of the criminal justice system. Individuals who sought redress from those who wronged them allow the community to determine the type of punishment commensurable with the offence. The non-custodial paradigm has expanded to include community service orders and restorative justice.

Community correction refers to programmes for rehabilitation where a non-custodial officer provides supervision using various case work intervention and often include, working with the offender’s family. Community correction should not only control offenders, but it should also help them to re-adjust in the community (ibid). The principal purposes of the community correction services are to protect the public, reduce re-offending and secure proper supervision and rehabilitation of offenders.

Principles of Community Correction Practice

- i Most crimes are a community problem that should best be addressed in and with the community involvement.
- ii There is greater likelihood for the offender to change when rehabilitated in the community as opposed to imprisonment.
- iii Individual offenders have the ability to change if given professional assistance.

- iv Informal social controls and family/community involvement are most effective in offender rehabilitation and in reducing crime.
- v. Coordination and networking within the criminal justice system and non-state actors provide the much-needed multi-dimensional approach.

Community correction has evolved over the years and has different features in jurisdictions. Community correction and non-custodial options in Nigeria are still evolving, but learning from other jurisdictions. Non-custodial options in Nigeria have community correction programmes being spelt out by the court and that supervision order involves both correctional services and the courts. The Purposes of community service are: reduce congestion in prisons; rehabilitate offenders by making them to undertake productive community work and prevent convicts who commit simple offences from mixing with hardened criminals.

Benefits of Non-Custodial Sentences

Reparation - payback to the community by the offenders through the performance of unpaid public work in the case of community service orders; reduction in social stigma and hardening associated with imprisonment and which impede the re-integration of ex-offender; reduced number of inmates enabling better management of the facilities and programmes for inmates; and ensure character change by enabling offender to serve his/her sentence in the community.

Non-Custodial Punishment and its justification

The traditional role of correctional facility was confined to administering punishments as prescribed by courts of competent jurisdiction. As postulated by Jeremy Betham (1990) the consequentialist theories of crime has three justifications of punishment: Deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation. These are directly derived from both classical and positivist approaches to crime.

Firstly, deterrence is rarely seen as applicable to community correction works much as the perceived consequences of breach of community service orders may keep the offender on supervision away from re-offending (Rex, 1997). However, an element of it may be associated with community service work. The purpose of state intervention is to deter persons from wrongdoings rather than to punish them.

Secondly, incapacitation cannot be realized with community penalties (Rex, 2003), given that the offenders on community service are not restrained while in the community.

Thirdly, rehabilitation through help and treatment is one of the main justifications for community sentences. This fits within the positivist's recognition of personal weaknesses that may propel one to commit crime. The community correction adage of 'advise, assist and befriend stem from rehabilitation as a preventive measure of punishment.

Empirical Review

In more recent times, crime prevention has emerged as increasingly important component of an overall strategy on crime reduction and public safety. Crime prevention therefore, has become an important strategy to reduce crime, and widely supported by the public over place and time. One reason for this is the widely held view of the need to strike a balance between **preventive** and **punitive** measures (Waller, 2006). Another reason has to do with a growing body of scientific evidence showing that many different types of crime prevention programmes are effective (Welsh and Farrington, 2006), and many of these programmes save money. Not surprisingly, the economic argument for prevention has attracted a great deal of interest from policy makers and political leaders.

History of Crime Prevention

The modern-day history of crime prevention is closely linked with a loss of faith in the criminal justice system that occurred in the

wake of the dramatic increase in crime rates in recent times. This loss of faith was caused by a **confluence of factors**, including declining public support for the criminal justice system, increasing levels of fear of crime, and criminological researches that demonstrate many of the traditional modes of crime control were ineffective and inefficient in reducing crime and improving safety of communities (Curtis, 1987 in Brandon *et al*, 2012).

Interestingly, this loss of faith in the Criminal Justice System was not unique to Nigeria. As reported by Tony and Farrington, 1995; Waller, 1990; Bennett, 1998), similar developments were taking place in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom and other Western European Countries and for some of the same reasons. There has been the agitation for the reforming of the CJS to be more effective and responsive.

The observation of the American Urban Scholar Paul Lavrakas (1985) perhaps best captures this need to move beyond the sole reliance on the Criminal Justice System;

“Until we change the emphasis of our public policies away from considering the police, courts and prisons to be the primary mechanism for reducing crime, I believe that we will continue to experience the tragic levels of victimization with which our citizens now live. The Criminal Justice Agencies are our means of reacting to crime-they should not be expected to protect it by themselves”.

It should be noted here, that all the empirical evidences discussed above were experiences not only in Nigeria. Several other studies were conducted outside Nigeria and they yielded similar results, suggesting that there may be no location differences regarding the

ineffectiveness of the criminal justice response. As a result of the apparent failure of the Criminal Justice System to prevent reoffending, decongest our prisons and prevent first-time offenders from mixing with hardened criminals, there was the need for Nigerian government to consider an effective means of managing crime. Hence, there was the agitation for paradigm shift from what appeared to be reactive to more proactive modes of crime control.

In the never-ending search for ways to combat crime more effectively, one thing is clear – the ideal situation is to prevent crimes from occurring in the first place. An important aspect of effective crime management is crime prevention, which refers to efforts to prevent crime or criminal offending in the first instance before the act has actually been committed.

In one of the first scholarly attempts to differentiate crime prevention from crime control, Peter Lejins (1967:2) espoused the following:

“If societal action is motivated by an offence that has already taken place, we are dealing with control. If the offence is only anticipated, we are dealing with prevention”.

As reported by Welsh and Pfeifer (2011), what Lejins was trying to indicate was the notion of “Pure Preventive”; a view that long existed in the scholarship and practice of American criminology. Both forms of crime reduction share a common goal of trying to prevent the occurrence of a future criminal act, but what further distinguishes crime prevention from crime control is that prevention takes place outside of the confines of the formal Justice System. In this respect, prevention is considered the fourth pillar of crime reduction alongside the institutions of police, court and corrections, first proposed by Waller 2006, as cited in Brandon, 2015). This distinction

draws attention to crime prevention as an alternative approach to those more traditional responses to crime.

The concept of prevention is grounded in the notion that crime and victimization are derived by casual or underlying factors (United Nations, 2020). . These are the results of a wide range of factors and circumstances that influence the lives of individuals and families as they grow up, and the situations and opportunities that facilitate victimization and offending. Determining what factors are associated with different types of crime can lead to development of a set of strategies and programmes to change those factors and prevent or reduce the incidence of those crimes.

Crime prevention is best view as an alternative approach to reducing crime, operating outside of the purview of criminal justice system. Developmental, community and situational strategies define its scope. The shared focus of the three strategies is on addressing the underlying causes or motivations that lead to a criminal event or life of a crime. Importantly, each strategy operates outside of the formal justice system, representing an alternative, perhaps even a socially progressive way to reducing crime.

These forms of crime prevention aim to prevent the occurrence of a future criminal act in the first place, before the act has actually been committed. It is far more socially worthwhile and as well as sustainable to intervene before harm is inflicted on a victim and the offender is under the supervision of the Justice System. However, it is important to recognize that it is not always possible; prevention programmes are by no means foolproof or reliable as to leave no opportunity for error or failure.

It should be noted here, that no one prevention approach is inherently better than the others. All of them have advantages and disadvantages. Some social development approaches can be long-term and require commitment and investment continuing over

a number of years. Community-based approaches can require considerable amount of patience with the difficulties of engaging citizens in positive ways or maintain the momentum of projects. Situational prevention has often been criticized for focusing too much on opportunistic crime and target hardening techniques or surveillance, because it can displace crime and disorder to other areas.

This study recognizes the importance of both formal and informal control in reducing crimes in Nigeria. Formal crime control relies on the law and official government agencies to curb criminal actions. Informal crime control relies on moral and social institutions such as family, mosques, churches, town councils, etc., to promote lawful behaviour.

3. Methodology

The study utilizes primary and secondary data. Crime, perceived re-offending and victimization is considered as the dependent variable, while the independent variables are community correction treatment (measured using dummy variable) and custodial penalties. Data on these variables were obtained from the Criminal Justice Agencies comprising law-enforcement, Judiciary and correctional service, as well as voluntary organizations and private security organizations. Primary sources were also used to supplement data collection, mainly through the administration of sets of questionnaire checklist (as attached in the appendix), on employees of relevant government agencies, moral and social institutions, prison inmates and the general public. The data were presented in cross tabular forms using simple frequency of response and descriptive statistics to illustrate the results of the study.

Earlier, the following research questions were raised: Where does community correction treatment stand today? Is community correction treatment truly a viable practical approach to crime prevention? These research questions were resolved by inspecting the thrust of the

answers of the respondents to the questionnaire inquiry. The questionnaire responses were categorized using the rule of mutual exclusivity.

To empirically assess how the modern security correction measures among other crime control mechanisms have impacted on crime reduction and public safety. The study employed Chi-square test and T-test. Two

The models are specified using the formulae:

$$\chi^2\alpha, (r - 1)(c - 1)$$

$$\chi^2_{0.01}, (6 - 1)(2 - 1),$$

Hypothesis:

H₀₁: There is no relationship between

criminal justice system and increasing crime rate

$$\chi^2\alpha, (r - 1)(c - 1)$$

$$\chi^2_{0.01}, (6 - 1)(2 - 1)$$

$$\chi^2_{0.01}, (5)(1) \therefore \chi^2_{0.01,5} = 11.070$$

Criteria: Reject H₀ if $\chi^2 > \chi^2\alpha, (r - 1)(c - 1)$ otherwise accepts H₀. We reject H₀.

Since $\chi^2 < \chi^2\alpha, (r - 1)(c - 1)$ i.e. 83.449 < 11.070

Since the computed value of chi – square lies outside the region to left of the 11.070. The null hypothesis is now rejected at the 0.05 level of significance. We conclude that there is significant relationship between the inefficiencies in criminal justice system and increasing crime rate. This shows that custodial punishment is not reducing the crime incidence.

Hypothesis:

H₀₂: there is no relationship between community correction treatment and increasing crime rates

$$\chi^2\alpha, (r - 1)(c - 1)$$

$$\chi^2_{0.01}, (6 - 1)(2 - 1)$$

$$\chi^2_{0.01}, (5)(1) \therefore \chi^2_{0.01,5} = 11.070$$

Criteria: Reject H₀ if $\chi^2 > \chi^2\alpha, (r - 1)(c - 1)$ otherwise accepts H₀. We do reject H₀. Since $\chi^2 < \chi^2\alpha, (r - 1)(c - 1)$ i.e. 674.600 < 11.070

models were employed in order to validate the impact of modern security correction measures on crime reduction and on public safety. The first model tests the relationship between community correction treatment and crime reduction, while the second assesses whether there are location differences regarding trends in occurrences of criminal activities across regional boundaries.

Since the computed value of chi – square lies outside the region to left of the 11.070. The null hypothesis is now rejected at the 0.05 level of significance. We conclude that there is a significant relationship between correctional treatments and crime incidence.

H₀₃: There is no difference between custodial punishment and non- custodial punishment

The test statistic is $t_c = 72.237$ $t_{0.05,\infty} = 1.645$, and it indicates a rejection of H₀ and then we conclude that there is a significance difference between custodial punishment and non-custodial punishment. It can be observed that the mean crime incidence occurrence is higher after the introduction of non-custodial punishment.

4. Results and Discussion

This section discusses the results of statistical analyses on crime incident from January to April, 2023. The summary statistics of the incident type for each region are presented in the appendix.

Juxtaposing the results in Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, it can be noted that:

- i Even when custodial (imprisonment) penalties were fully applied repeat offenders still abound.
- ii The mean crime incidence occurrence is higher after the introduction of non-custodial punishment.
- iii. Criminal justice agencies do contribute to the slow pace or delay in handling criminal cases.

iv. Crime incident has no boundary in Nigeria. It cuts across regional boundaries, suggesting that there may be no location differences regarding the ineffectiveness of the criminal justice system.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

In spite of the vigor with which community correction policy was implemented, the outcomes have not met with the expectations of policy makers and the public alike. This study assessed the impact of the policy on crime reduction and public safety in Nigeria. The literature indicates that criminal justice response that is the embodiment of punishment-treatment mixture, without a set of complementary preventive policies to prevent the occurrence of future crime by reducing the opportunities and increasing the risks and difficulties of offending, rather than providing reactive service cannot protect the potential victims of crime.

Similarly, the study found that the traditional modes of approach impacted crime reduction only minimally during the period under review. The criminal justice process contributes to the slow pace or delays in handling criminal cases, which the system was not able to meet up with the principle of 'quick dispensation of justice', and hence the little positive gain on crime reduction was offset by the soaring crime incidents. The little gain recorded was not commensurable with the huge amount of money spent to achieve it.

Following from the results of statistical analysis, the following findings were made:

1. The results show that custodial punishment is not reducing the crime incidence in Nigeria. This finding is supported by Brandon, who asserts that criminal justice system on its own was insufficient for the task of reducing crime.
2. The results show that the mean crime incidence occurrence is higher after the introduction of non-custodial treatment. This is also supported of

Curtis, who demonstrates that many of the traditional modes of crime control were ineffective and inefficient in reducing crime and improving public safety.

3. Community correction measures were also found to be ineffective in meeting the goals of deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation punishment ideals, as observed by Rex (1997). This indicates that the levels and types of crime that occur are beyond community correction response.
4. While deterrence and incapacitation cannot be realized with community penalties much as the offender on community service is not restrained while in the community, rehabilitation is rarely seen as applicable to community correction as also submitted by Rex (2003).
5. Traditional and economic-based opinion polls consistently show that public support government spending on crime prevention rather than on punitive response. This is supportive of Cullent's argument that public spending be directed towards crime prevention rather than on crime control.

On the basis of the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The need for the reformation of the Criminal Justice System to be more effective and responsive.
2. Delays and inefficiencies in judicial system should be appropriately checked as they contribute to a culture of impunity.
3. Tackling poverty through job creation and economic empowerment programmes can reduce the incentive for individuals to engage in criminal activities.
4. Community engagement through building of trust between communities and law enforcement and facilitate sharing of information

and promote a collaborative approach to crime prevention.

5. Corruption within law enforcement and other justice agencies undermines efforts to combat crime; it should also be promptly checked.
6. Legislative reforms to update and enforce laws to address emerging forms of crime, such as cybercrime, is crucial for an effective legal framework.
7. A combination of some of the more traditional response to crime and these emerging and promising alternatives forms of crime prevention matters.

References

- Abuchi, U. K. (2015), An Aetiological study of Criminal Recidivism in Nigeria: Maximum Security Prison, Jos, Plateau state. *Journal for studies in Management and Planning: 1(11)*, Dec. 2015. Available online at <http://internationaljournalofresearch.org/index.php/JSMaP>.
- Ahmed, A.M. and Ahmad, A.H. (2015), *prisons, Stigma, Discrimination and Personality as predictors of criminal recidivism*. in U. K. Abuchi, an aetiological study of Criminal Recidivism in Nigeria. *Journal for studies in Management and Planning: 1(11)*. Dec. 2015.
- Alemika, E.E. and Chukwuma, I.O. (2001), Juvenile Justice Administration in Nigeria, in M.U. Ikoh (2011) The Nigerian Prison system and the failure of rehabilitation: an examination of incarceration alternatives. *The Nigerian Academic forum: 20(1)*, pp 1-8. Apr. 2011.
- Aremu, M.A. and Yusuf, A.A. (2011) An Investigative Security and Crime Management in Developing Society: Implications for Nigeria Democratic Setup. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences:1(3)*.
- Beacon Consulting Nigeria (2023), *Beacon Consulting Incident Database: 2023 Dashboard*.
- Becker, R.F.(2005) Criminal Investigation, 2nd edition. Jones and Berilett Publishers, Canada.
- Brandon, C.W. (2015), *Crime Prevention and Public Policy*, in C.W. Brandon and P.F David (eds.). The Oxford Handbook on Criminal prevention, Criminology and Criminal Justice. Crime Prevention, Online Publication.
- Clarke, H, (2010), *Crime Prevention and Public Policy*, in C.W. Brandon and P.F. David (eds.). The Oxford Handbook on Criminal prevention, Criminology and Criminal Justice. Crime Prevention, Online Publication.
- Dambazau, A.B. (2007), *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- DuruminIya, A.B. (2020), Manual on the New Modern Security Correction Measure. *Unpublished lecture notas*.
- Eme, O.I., Okoh, C.L. and Okeke, M. (2009), the Police and Criminal Justice System in Africa: Agenda for Reform. *International Journal of Development and Management Review: 4(7)*, June.
- Farrinton, D.F. and Welsh, E. (2010), *Crime Prevention and Public Policy*, in C.W. Brandon and P.F David (eds.). The Oxford Handbook on Criminal prevention, Criminology and Criminal



- Justice. Crime Prevention, Online Publication.
- Gelsthorp, L. (2003), *Moving Community Service Forward: Evidence, Arguments and Practice*, in H. Chui and M. Nellis (eds.), Pearson and Longman.
- Hopkinson, J. and Rex, S. (2003), *Essential Skills in Working with offenders*, in H. Chui and M. Nills (eds.) *Moving Probation Forward: Evidence, Arguments and Practice*. Pearson and Longman.
- Ikoh, M.U. (2011), *The Nigeria Prison system and the failure of Rehabilitation: An examination of Incarceration Alternatives. The Nigerian Academic Forum: 20(1)*, Apr.2011.
- Madaki, M. (2011), *Strategies for Investigating Violent Crimes, Murder, Rape and Armed Robbery*, in S.I. Radda and R.S. Shatsari (eds.) *Criminal Investigation in Nigeria: Principles and Practice*, Ahmadu University Press, Zaria.
- Master, A. (2003), *A resiliency Framework for Research, Policy and Practice*, in A. Master and J. Powell (eds.) *Resilience and Vulnerability adaptation in the Context of Childhood adversities*. Cambridge University Press
- National Bureau of Statistics (2016), *inmate population and recidivism*. Crime Statistics, Nigerian Prisons, April, 2016.
- Odita, F.A. (2016), *the Role of Security Agencies in Ensuring Peaceful Conduct of Elections*. Paper presented at a Workshop Organized by the Independent National Electoral Commission. Sheraton Hotel and Tower,s Abuja. August, 2006.
- Radda, S.I. (2011), *Crime: A Conceptual and Theoretical Discourse*, in S.I. Radda and R.S. Shatsari (eds.) *Criminal Investigation in Nigeria: Principles and Practice*: Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited, Zaria.
- Rex, S. (2003), *what works in theories of punishment*, in w. Chui and M. Nills (eds.) *Moving Probation forward: Evidence, Arguments and Practice*: Pearson Longman.
- Rex, S. (1997), *Perceptions of Probation in the Context of Just deserts*. Cambridge Institute of Criminology.
- Tony, M. and Farrington, D. (1995), *Building Safer Society* in E. W. Brandon and P.F. David (eds.) *Strategic Approach to Crime Prevention*.
- United Nations (2020), *Crime Prevention Guideline: Making them work*. Criminal Justice Handbook series. United Nations Office on drug and Crime. Vienna: United Nations Publication, Aug. 2020.
- Yusuf, U.A. (2014), *the Imperatives for Community Policing in Nigeria*. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*: 3(4): 12- 16