

## **A CRITICAL LOOK AT FACTORS AFFECTING CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES IN NIGERIA: A CASE OF DETERRENT PROGRAMS OR MEASURES IN CROSS RIVER STATE**

**\*CHUKWUDI C. EZIKEUDU**

*\*Department of Sociology, University of Calabar, P.M.B 1115 Calabar, Cross River State.  
Email:ezikeuduchukwudi@gmail.com*

### **ABSTRACT**

*This work was set to examine mainly crime prevention measures in Nigeria with specific focus on examining the efficiency of deterrent measures. This is because; the upsurge in both violent and non-violent crimes in Nigeria amidst deterrent measures of crime prevention remains much to be desired. Accidental non probability sampling technique was used to elicit response from 120 respondents. This work is guided by four objectives and four research questions. Data were collected using structured interview from selected members of University of Calabar community. Data obtained from the research questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The study revealed that socio-structural factors militate against deterrent measures of crime prevention owing to the inefficacy of crime preventions measures adopted .The paper proffered that there is an urgent need for a synergy between deterrent measures and other crime prevention approaches, notable programs that changes the structural bottlenecks that otherwise predispose people to crime.*

**Keywords:** *Crime, Crime Prevention, Crime Prevention Measures, deterrent, deterrent Measures.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Nigeria is among the developing countries of the world, and she is experiencing prevalence of rising crime waves, criminal behaviours and varying degree of delinquencies. Nigeria has been on the global crime map since 1980s (Adebayo, 2013). The nature of these crimes is evidenced in armed robbery, assassination, ransom- driving kidnapping, human trafficking, during trafficking, burglary, corruption and the Fulani herdsmen attack among others.

Dambazzau (2007) defined crime prevention as a pattern of attitudes and behaviours directed both at reducing the threat of crime and enhancing the sense of safety and security to positively influence the quality of life and to develop environments where crime cannot thrive. Furthermore,. Crime prevention are strategies and measures that seeks to reduce to the barest minimum the risk of crimes occurring and their potential harmful effects on individuals and society, including fear of crime, by intervening to influence their multiple causes (UNODC, 2010). Crime prevention involves the community, government as well as individuals. Therefore crime prevention is everybody business.

Model of crime prevention vary across countries, but Robert (2003) identified three perspectives of crimes prevention adopted by criminology and criminologist to include;

- (a) Primary crime prevention: this attempt to change environmental conditions that provide opportunities for or precipitate occurrence of criminal acts.
- (b) Secondary crime prevention: This involves engagement in the early identification of potential offender and/or offenders seeking to intervene to prevent criminal behaviour from developing.
- (c) Tertiary crime prevention: this measures deal with actual offender and interventions aimed at preventing further criminal acts In Nigeria, the tertiary crime prevention is adopted as a deterrent measures to prevent crime as evidenced in the strategies adopted by our security agencies and other apparatus of the criminal justice system as stated by the respondents to include; surveillance/patrol, intelligent gathering, incapacitation, (prison sentence) stop and search, investigation and a special plain cloth squad.

As far back as the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, Durkheim posited that the “pain of punishment” would deter offenders from repeating their behaviour especially when the punishment is swift, certain and severe (Sherman & Berk 1984).Durkheim as cited in Dambazzau (2007) noted that punishment of offenders serves to clarify and reinforce the collective consciousness of society in non-offenders. The aim is not merely to punish the offenders, but to instruct others in the do and don'ts of society.

The deterrence measures of crime prevention in whatever form it takes, whether through preventive patrol by police officers or hard prison sentences for violent offenders and death penalties for corruption and drug related offences seeks to create some kind of fear in the mind of others by providing adequate penalty and exemplary punishment to offender which keeps them away from criminality and antisocial behaviour. Thus, the rigours of penal discipline act as a sufficient warning to offenders and indeed the non offenders. Therefore, one can vehemently say that deterrence is undoubtedly one of the effective policies which almost every penal system

accepts and utilize. One major problem with deterrence theory is that it assumes that all human beings are rational actors who consider the consequences of their behaviour before deciding to engage in crime; often times this is not always obtainable.

Despite the deterrence measures and program in place, Nigeria has one of the alarming crime rates in the world (Uche, 2008 and Financial, 2011). Nigeria is currently caught in the web of crime dilemma, manifesting in the convulsive upsurge of both violent and non-violent crimes which are constantly reported in our national dailies and spreading a climate of fear and anxieties about public safety as compared to more advanced countries of the world. Nevertheless, the inevitability of deterrence principles to deter crime must not mean that crime should be allowed to reach an epidemic stage as to become unbearable in our society Therefore, the study is set to examine crime prevention strategies adopted by the Nigerian police, to examine what factor militate against deterrence measures of crime prevention among others.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Deterrence measure is repeatedly at the heart of the preventive aspiration of criminal justice (Kennedy, 2008). Deterrence, whether through preventive or reactive patrol by police officers or hard prison sentences for violent offenders, or the execution of drug convicts and hardened criminals in some countries, is the principal mechanism through which the central feature of criminal justice, the exercise of state authority works. The aim of deterrent programme is to reduce or demolish offending and enhance public safety. However well we think deterrence works, it clearly often does not work nearly as we would like it to owing the factors that work against it and its very high cost. The non workability of deterrent programme is evidenced from the fact that quite a large number of criminals return from prison turning into recidivist. Criminals still operate when police are on preventive or reactive patrol. Thus, the objective or objectives underlying deterrent punishment is unquestionably defeated. This view also finds support from the fact that when capital punishment was being publicly carried out by hanging the person or executing the person to death in public places, person or persons committed crimes of pick-pocketing, theft, assault, kidnapping and even murder in those public gatherings (Paranjape, 2011).

But despite the extreme deterrence of losing life people still commit crimes. Notably on early Wednesday morning four Nigerians alongside seven others were executed by Indonesian authorities over drug related offences (NDLEA, 2015). The high rate of violent and non-violent crimes in Nigeria as identified earlier, shows that deterrence principle of crime prevention is not highly effective. Against this backdrop, the paper seeks to examine what factors militate against deterrence of crime prevention among others.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To investigate the crime prevention strategies adopted by the Nigeria police,
- To examine what factors militate against deterrence measures crime prevention.
- To examine whether community mode of crime control produces more deterrent than legal authorities (law enforcement).
- To make policy recommendations towards a sustainable crime prevention and control

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study contributes to knowledge on factors that account for people engaging in violent and non-violent crimes amidst deterrence principles of crimes prevention. This study will significantly break grounds in terms of broadening scientific understanding on why and how deterrence measure as a preventive aspiration of criminal justice may not work.

The findings made are demanding instrument of law making, policies, programmes and decisions aimed at promoting security and safety in the society. The findings are also relevant for effective and efficient planning operations and administration by the police, prosecutors, judges and prison officials.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What strategies are adopted by the Nigeria police force in the crime prevention?
2. What factors militate against deterrent measures of crime prevention?
3. Does community mode of crime control produce more deterrence than urban legal authority's mode of crime control?
4. What recommendation could be proffered for a sustainable crime prevention and control?

## CONTEXTUALIZING THE CONTEXT

### i. Deterrence Principles of Crime Prevention

What is of supreme importance in deterrence is that punishment prevents the occurrence of crimes and anti social behaviour. Bentham (as cited in Dambazau, 2007) posited that punishment may prevent the occurrence of crimes either by making it impossible or difficult for an offender to breach the law again, or destroying both offenders and others or providing an opportunity for the reform of offenders. This utilitarian argument was based

on the notion of free will, the idea that each individual weighs the consequences of his actions before deciding on what to do, and Bentham noted that every person;

Conducts himself, albeit unknowingly, according to a well or ill-made calculus of pleasures and pains, should he foresee that a pain would be the consequence of an act which pleased him, this would act with a certain force so as to divert him from that action. If the total value of the pleasure, the repulsive force would be greater, the act would not occur.

Corroborating the above assertion, Johnson (as cited in Paranjape, 2011) noted that deterrence discourages offender by terror or naked fear from repeating his crime and at the same time preventing others from following his path.

Durkheim (as cited in Dambazau 2007) noted that punishment of offenders serves to clarify and reinforce the collective sentiments of society in non-offenders. The aim is not merely to punish the offender, but to instruct others on the do and don'ts of society. This is a form of general deterrence, where non-criminals are warned from becoming criminals.

Drawing on a wide-range of scholarly literatures and real world experience, Kennedy (2008) argued that we should reframe the ways in which we think about what produce deterrence. Kennedy argued that many of the ways in which crime is deterred predispose individual to commit offence.

## ii. The Concept of Crime

There is no single, generally acceptable definition of the concepts crime. The search by scholars in the field of law, criminology, sociology, anthropology, social sciences among others to find a universal acceptable definition of the concept has proved a herculean task.

So many reasons are cited for this, Alderson (1979) argued that crime is a relative concept, that is, what constitutes crime in one society many be an acceptable behaviour in another society. Therefore, defining crime to win universal acceptability is not an attainable venture. Quinney (1974) argued that the criminal law is imposed by the group in power, so that the law is a series of general command based by conceived threat. The other is a weapon to maintain the domination and subjugation while perpetuating the privileges of a few over the many.

This therefore makes it very difficult to define crime in a way that will be generally acceptable According to Curzon (1973) “crime is any act or omission resulting from human conduct which is considered in itself or in its outcome to be harmful and which the state wishes to prevent, which renders the person or persons responsible liable for some kind of punishment as the result of the proceedings and which are designed to ascertain the nature, extent and the legal consequences of that persons responsibility”.

In his own contribution, Tappan (1960) defined crime as “an intentional act or omission in violation of criminal law, committed without defence or justification and sanctioned by the state as a felony or misdemeanor”. William (1982) opined that crime is an “act or commission prohibited by law for the protection of the public, the violation of which is prosecuted by the state in its own name.. Any behaviour that violates the penal or legal code of a particular society is considered as crime. Hall (1960) delineated seven interrelated and overlapping conditions which can make an act a crime. These conditions, referred to as the seven differentiae of crime, were summarized by Sutherland and Cressey (1978) thus:

- i. There must be harm or injury inflicted on some other persons by the act.
- ii. The act must be prohibited by the criminal law as at the time it was committed.
- iii. There must be intentional or reckless conduct which courses the harm or injury directly or indirectly (actus reus).
- iv. There must be mens rea or criminal intent on the part of the act.
- v. There must be coincidence of actus reus and mens rea.
- vi. There must be causal relationship between the outlawed harm and the voluntary misconduct.
- vii. There must be legally prescribed punishment for the outlawed conduct.

### iii. Crime Prevention Approaches

Crime prevention refers to the range of strategies that are implemented by individuals, communities, businesses, non-governmental organizations and all level of government to target the various social and environmental factors that increase the risk of crime, disorder and victimization (Van Dijk & De Waard, 1991). Understanding the different approaches for crime prevention is crucial, as there are implications for determining the appropriate institutional and management arrangements necessary to support specific crime prevention services and programme for interventions (Weatherburn, 2004).

- **Environmental crime prevention:** The environmental approach seeks to change the specific characteristics of the environment that may predispose individual to criminal acts. This includes both

situational approaches to crime prevention and broader planning initiatives that aims to reduce crime by designing and/or modifying the environment to reduce the opportunity and/or opportunities for crime to occur (Sulton, Cherrey & White, 2008).

- **Situational Crime Prevention:** This Situational crime prevention is based upon the premise that crime is often opportunistic and aims to change the contextual factors to reduce the opportunities and/or opportunities for offenders to engage in criminal behaviour (Tonry & Farrington 1995). Situational prevention comprises a range of measures that highlight the importance of targeting very specific form of crime in certain circumstances (Clarke, 1977). This involves identifying, manipulating and controlling the situational or environmental factors associated with certain types of crime. Situational crime prevention interventions include activities such as improved security through strengthening locks and improved surveillance.
- **Social Crime Prevention:** Rather than focusing on the physical environment, social crime prevention is most commonly directed at trying to influence the underlying social and economic causes of crime as well as what motivate the offender. The approach tends to include crime prevention measures that take some time to produce results. This may include action and/or actions to improve housing, health and educational achievement as well as improved community cohesion through community development measures and programmes.
- **Developmental Crime Prevention:** Developmental crime prevention approach is of the view that intervening early in a young person's development can produce significant long-term social and economic benefits. While there is evidence of the importance of intervening early in life, the focus of developmental crime prevention is on intervening early at any of a number of critical transition points in a person's development to lead them on a pathway to prevent future offending.
- **Community crime prevention strategy:** This crime prevention programs or strategies target changes in community infrastructure, culture, or the physical environment in order to reduce crime. The diversity of approaches here includes neighborhood watch, community policing, urban or physical design and comprehensive or multi-disciplinary efforts. These strategies may seek to engage residents, community and faith-based organizations, and local government agencies in addressing the factors that contribute to the community's crime, delinquency and disorder.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is theoretically anchored on the neutralization theory of deviants/criminal behaviour. This theory traces its origin to Gresham Sykes and David Matza. This theory explains how deviants and criminals



justify their deviant and criminal behaviours by providing alternative definitions of their actions and by providing explanations, to themselves and others, for the lack of guilt for their actions in particular situation.

According to this study, five major types of neutralization are evidenced, viz:-

1. Denial of responsibility: here the deviants or criminal believes he/she was helpless when performing that very act of deviance and asserts that under the same circumstance, any other person or persons would have resorted to similar action or actions.
2. Denial of injury: the deviant/the criminal here believes that the action caused no harm to other individuals in the society and thus, the deviance is not morally wrong
3. Denial of victim, the deviants and/or the criminal believes that individuals on the receiving end of the deviance were deserving of the result due to their lack of virtue or morals. In fact the victim were deserving of the action or actions
4. Condemnation of the condemners, the deviants/criminal believes that law enforcement figures or victims have the tendency to be equally corrupt or otherwise deviant, and as a result are morally wrong to stand against them and enforce the law.
5. Appeal to higher loyalties, the deviant/criminal believes that there are loyalties, appeals and values that go beyond the confines of the law; morality, friendships, income, or traditions may be more important to the deviant/criminal than legal boundaries.

The semblance of this theory to the present study is that deterrence as a principal of crime prevention, no matter how firm it is preached may not work as a result of the offender's ability to neutralize their criminal deviance behaviour by not seeing themselves as criminals.

The implications of this theory to the present study are summarised as follows;

1. the model is particularly useful in understanding how offenders neutralizes their criminal behaviour thereby making their crime and anti social behaviour look less trivial and much eager to commit crime again despite deterrence measures.
2. This theory puts the issue of upsurge in crime amidst deterrence in proper perspective, thus making sustainable interventions and initiative possible.



## METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The study focuses on the knowledge of selected members of the University of Calabar Community which include the tutorial, non-tutorial and the students. It attempts to examine how Nigerians feel towards the upsurge of violent and non-violent crimes amidst deterrence principles of crime prevention.

The study employed survey research design. A structured interview guide was used to elicit responses from selected members of the public. The structured interview guide was pre-tested on a sample of 20 respondents consisting of 14 students, 3 academic and 3 non-tutorial staff of the University of Calabar Community.

The study involved 120 respondents 60 males and 60 females targeted from convenience from members of the University of Calabar Community. The research public was chosen using accidental sampling technique. This involves sampling of respondent from targeted convenience. The structured interview guide consists of two parts. Part one relates to personal data and part two deals with items from the research question. Descriptive statistics were used for the analysis of the research questions.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

**Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents**

Characteristics	Male (n=60)	%	Female (n=60)	%	Total (n=120)	%
<b>Age</b>						
18-27	9	15	10	16.7	19	15.8
28-37	20	33.3	16	26.7	36	30
38-47	14	23.3	18	30	32	26.7
48-57	10	16.7	8	13.1	18	15
58-above	7	11.7	8	13.3	15	12.5
<b>Education Level</b>						
No formal education	-	-	-	-	-	-
Primary	8	13.3	13	21.6	21	17.5
Secondary	20	33.3	22	36.6	42	35
Tertiary	32	53.3	26	41.6	57	47.5
<b>Marital Status</b>						
Married	34	56.6	38	63.3	72	60
Unmarried	24	40	19	31.7	43	35.8
Divorced	1	1.6	1	1.7	2	1.6
Widow	-	-	2	3.3	2	1.6

Widower	1	1.6	-	-	1	0.83
<b>Occupation</b>						
House wives	-	-	-	-		
Farming	-	-	-	-		
Traders		10	13	21.6	19	15.8
Civil servants	30	0	24	40	54	45
Students	20	33.3	22	36.	42	35
Others	4	6.6	1	1.6	5	4.1
<b>Religious affiliation</b>						
Catholics	39	65	34	56.6	73	60.8
Protestants	18	30	26	43.3	44	36.6
Traditional	3	5	-		3	2.5

Source: Field data(2015)

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents as regards to age, educational attainment, religious affiliation, marital status and occupation.

With respect to age, the respondents have an average age of 24 years. The modal age category for both males and females is 27 to 30 years. To be precise, this age group comprises 30% of the respondents. The respondents were old enough to furnish information on the subject of interests.

The educational profile of the respondents shows that the majority of the respondents had formal education. Respondents with primary, secondary and tertiary education level formed the majority with 100%, of the respondents with primary level (17.5%), secondary education level (3.5%), and tertiary education level (47.5%).

Data on marital status of the respondents show that married persons constituted the single largest group of respondents. Most of the study participants were currently married (60%). The unmarried constituted the second largest group of respondents (35.8%). Divorced, widowed and widower formed (1.6%), (1.6%) and (0.83) of the respondents respectively.

With respect to occupational level the majority of the respondents were civil servants (45%). The second largest of the respondents were students (35%).

The religious profile of the respondents shows, that Catholics were the majority comprising males (65%) and female (56.6%). That is they formed (60.8%) of the sample population. The Protestants and traditional formed 39.1% of the respondents, that is Protestants (36.6) and traditional (2.5%).

### ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

**Table 2: Respondents’ view on the strategies adopted by the Nigerian police especially in Cross River State command**

Strategies identified by the respondents	Number of respondents					
	Male (n=60)	%	Female (n=60)	%	Total (n=120)	%
Intelligence gathering	10	16.7	10	16.7	20	16.7
Stop and search	10	16.7	11	18.3	21	17.5
Investigating	8	13.3	7	11.7	15	12.5
Imprisonment	2	3.3	1	1.7	3	2.5
Surveillance/patrol	20	33.3	20	33.3	40	33.3
Plain cloth	10	16.7	11	18.3	21	17.5
Total	60	100	60	100	120	100

Source: Field data(2015).

The table shows the strategy adopted by Nigerian police especially the Cross River Command as identified by the respondent. It involves the use of intelligent gathering, 16.7%. Stop and search 17.5%, investigating 12.5%, imprisonment 2.5%, surveillance/patrol 17.5% plain cloth 17.5%. Plain clothes connote the use of special squads who operate out of uniform and carry out work in a crimogenic areas or area that exhibit anti-social behaviour.

When the respondents are asked on the efficiency and the efficacy of the strategies identified in preventing crime. Over ninety (90%) of the respondents maintained that the strategies have not been effective in preventing crime. This is evidenced in the high crime rate reported in our local dailies.

**Table 3: Respondents' views on whether group rules rather than societal rules militate against deterrence principle of crime prevention**

View	Male (n=60)	%	Female (n=60)	%	Total (n=120)	%
Yes	60	100	60	100	120	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Field data(2015)

The computed result as summarized in Table 3 shows that 100% of the respondents agreed that commitment to group rules rather than societal rules militate against deterrence principle of crime prevention. The respondents' identified commitment to group rule rather than the societal rule as a factor that militate against deterrence of crime prevention. The respondents' maintained that criminals often than not operate in groups. Criminal identifies with norms of the group they belong as a means of identification and acceptance. As a result the group norms become more important to the criminal than legal boundaries (deterrence). This single factor militate any deterrence principle that may be put in place. One elderly respondent drove home this point by saying.

*Criminals operate in group and to them group norms and rules are more important than any other norms and rules.* (Female respondent)

This finding corroborates Kennedy (2008) who ascertained that groups, rather than individual offenders, should be the focus of deterrence.

**Table 4: Respondents' views on whether offenders' ego defence mechanism neutralized deterrence effects of crime prevention**

View	Male (n=60)	%	Female (n=60)	%	Total (n=120)	%
Yes	60	100	60	100	120	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Field data (2015)

The respondents identified offender’s egodefence mechanism as a factor that militates against deterrence. Criminals put up plausible excuses that tend to neutralize their actions to themselves and others. One respondent also drove home this point thus:

*the men of the underworld don’t see themselves as criminals rather they see themselves as businessmen very eager to succeed.(Male respondent)*

**Table 5: Respondents’ views on whether get rich-quick syndrome work against deterrence of crime prevention**

<b>View</b>	<b>Male (n=60)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Female (n=60)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total (n=120)</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	60	100	60	100	120	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don’t know	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Field data(2015)

The summarized result in table 5 shows that 100% of the respondents agree that get rich-quick syndrome work against deterrence of crime prevention.

The respondents’ identified the “get-rich-quick syndrome as factor that militate deterrence principle of crime prevention. This corroborates Ezikeudu (2010) who observed that men, women and children are getting involved in the scramble for money and material wealth at all costs. This also corroborates Igbo (1999) who observed that the Machiavellian principle of end justifies the means is very much applicable to contemporary Nigeria. Parents and elder no longer ask questions about the source of a young man’s sudden wealth before deciding whether or not to accept gifts and favour from him. Instead, people compete for the crumbs and fall outs from the table and even defend the indefensible. Almost everywhere, those who have become rich are honoured with traditional titles and Knighthood of the church, often regardless of how they made their wealth. The implication of this finding is that communities should condemn the practice of according honour and respect to criminals and other irresponsible people on the basics of wealth questionably acquired the study submitted.

**Table 6: Respondents’ views on whether the structure of the Nigerian society work against deterrence principle of crime prevention**

View	Male (n=60)	%	Female (n=60)	%	Total (n=120)	%
Yes	60	100	60	100	120	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don’t know	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Field data(2015)

The computed result shows that 100% of respondents agreed that the structured of the Nigerian society work against deterrence principle of crime prevention. The respondents’ maintained that the structure of the Nigerian society work against deterrence crime prevention. They respondents’ observed that the widening gap between the rich and the poor is no longer bearable and as such people scramble on how to survive, as result serious illegality is the nearest option. The implication of this finding is that government should adopt policies and programmes that will restructure the Nigeria socio-political and economic system to reduce the level of pressure individuals experience from the society-such policy should be aimed at improving the employment status of citizen, and also establish workable social welfare programmes that will provide necessary resources for both children and young person, and adults to prevent them from experiencing social problems which may result from unmet needs.

**Table 7: Respondents’ views on whether Community mode of crime control produces more deterrence than legal authorities**

View	Male (n=60)	%	Female (n=60)	%	Total (n=120)	%
Yes	60	100	60	100	120	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don’t know	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Field data (2015)

The computed result as summarized in table 8 shows that 100% of the respondents’ agreed that community mode of crime control produce more deterrence than legal authorities.

The respondents observed that community mode of crime control produce more deterrence than legal authorities. The respondents observed that, measures such as ostracism, banishment, oath taking among others are strong deterrence principles more than legal authorities. The respondents also observed that in spite of the huge

investment on modern crime control the traditional system of crime control are still relevant and practiced. This corroborates Kennedy (2008) which observed that communities may be far more effective than legal authorities in deterring crime. The implication of this finding is that there should be synergy between the traditional and modern crime control strategies for a sustainable crime control and prevention.

## CONCLUSION/POLICY IMPLICATION

Based upon the findings of this study, deterrence as a crime prevention strategy may not work in isolation of other preventive strategies. The observed multiplicity of the factors that militates deterrence is an important challenge. The policy implication of the above is that there should be a synergy in recent intervention for reducing crime through the courts and corrections. Initiate programs and services that changes the structural bottlenecks that predispose people to crime (Job creation opportunities and educational skills) among others.

Understanding the different approaches to crime prevention is very important, as there are implications for determining the appropriate institutional and management arrangement necessary to support specific crime prevention interventions. (Weatherburn, 2004). This is because an understanding of the different approaches of crime prevention available and their underlying rationale and theory is also crucial to developing effective crime prevention programs, services and projects (Eck, 2005, Homel 2009).

## REFERENCES

1. Adebayo, A. A. (2013). Social factors affecting effective crime prevention and control in Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Sociology*, Vol. 3(4): Pp 71-75.
2. Alderson, R. (1979), *crime and Criminology*. London: McGraw Hills.
3. Braga, A. A., Weisbud, D G. (2012). *The effects of "pulling levers" focused deterrence strategies on crime*.
4. Clark, R. (1977). *Fundamentals of Criminal justice Research*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
5. Curzon, L. B. (1973). *Criminal laws*. London: Mac Donald and Evans.
6. Dambazau, A. B. (2007). *Criminology and criminal justice*. Ibadan: spectrum Books Limited.
7. Ezikeudu, C. C. (2010). *Gender Differences and crime in Igbo land of South Eastern Nigeria*. A case study of Orlu L. G. A. Imo State: An unpublished M.Sc. dissertation University of Uyo, Nigeria.
8. Financial (2011). *Financial Times*. 7/11/2011.
9. Hope, T. (1995). "Community Crime Prevention". In building a safe society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention (ed.) by Michael Tonry and David P. Farrington. Vol. 9 edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.



10. Igbo, E. U. M. (1999). *Introduction to criminology*. Nsukka: Afro-Orbis publication Ltd.
11. Kennedy, D. M. (1977). Practice focused deterrence strategies. Retrieved from [www.crimesolutions.gov/practice](http://www.crimesolutions.gov/practice) data on 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2015.
12. Kennedy, D. M. (2008). *Deterrence and crime prevention reconsidering the prospects of sanction*. New York: Rutledge.
13. Kennedy, D. M. (July, 2009). *The High point drug market intervention strategy*. Washington, D. C.; U. S. Department of justice office of community oriented policing services.
14. National bureau of statistics Nigeria. (2014). *Open data for Nigeria*. Retrieved from <http://nigeria.org>. Open data for Africa.org.
15. Nigerian Police Watch.(2008 & 2009).*Crime Data-an increase in crime surge*. Retrieved from [www.nigeriapolicewatch.com/resource](http://www.nigeriapolicewatch.com/resource) on 6th April, 2015.
16. Paranjape, N. V. (2011). *Criminology and penology with victimology*. India: Central law publications.
17. Sherman, L. W. & Berk, R. A. (1984). The specific deterrence effects of arrest for domestic assault. *American Sociological Review*; 49, 261-272.
18. Sutherland, E. H. and Cressey, D. R. (1978). *Criminology* 10<sup>th</sup> ed., New York: Lippincott.
19. Sutton, A; Cherney, A. & White, R. (2008). *Crime preventions: principles, perspectives and practices*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
20. Tonry, M. and Farrington, D. (eds). 1995. Building a safe society strategic approach to crime prevention, *Crime and Justice* vol. 19 Chicago IR.
21. Tappam, P. W. (1960), *crime, justice and correction*. New York: McGraw Hill.
22. Uche, O. (2008). *Nigeria prison Robbed by criminals*. Retrieved from <http://www.whichwayNigeria.net/nigerianprison-robbed-criminals> on 9<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.
23. Van Dijk, J. J. M., and Jaap de Waard (1991). "A Two-Dimensional Typology of Crime Prevention Projects; with a Bibliography," *Criminal Justice Abstracts* 23:483-503.
24. Quinney, R. (1974). *The Social reality of crime*. Boston: Tittle Brown.
25. Williams, H. J. E. (1982). *Criminology and criminal justice*. London: Butterworth publishers.