

African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues

Volume 10 Numbers 1 & 2, April and September, 2007 Edition

Founding Editor-in-Chief: Professor Denis C.E. Ugwuegbu,
(Retired Professor of Department of Psychology,
University of Ibadan.)

Editor-in-Chief: Professor Shyngle K. Balogun,
Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan.

Associate Editor: Dr. Benjamin O. Ehigie
Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan.

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Professor S.N. Madu	University of South Africa
Professor S.E. Idemudia	University of South Africa
Professor Tope Akinnawo	Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria
Professor C.O. Ajila	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria
Professor O.O. Olowu	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria
Dr. P.N. Ibeagha	University of Ibadan, Nigeria
Dr. A.M. Sunmola	University of Ibadan, Nigeria
Dr. O.J. Osiki	University of Ibadan, Nigeria
Dr. K.O. Taiwo	University of Ibadan, Nigeria
Dr. D.O. Adebayo	University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Journal of the African Society for THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF
SOCIAL ISSUES % Dept of Psychology, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

AFRICAN JOURNAL FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SOCIAL
ISSUES VO. 10 (1)

AKERELE ADEBAYO

CONTENTS

PAGE

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 1. | WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT MODEL:
APPLICATION OF ARYEE'S MODEL
<i>Akerele, A., Osamwonyi, I. and Amah, O E.</i> | 3 |
| 2. | YOUNG FEMALE OFFENDERS: A QUALITATIVE
STUDY OF REASONS FOR OFFENDING AND
EXPERIENCES AT REHABILITATION
<i>Uma Bhowon* and H D Komal Boodhun</i> | 17 |
| 3. | PSYCHOSOCIAL ANALYSIS OF FEAR OF CORRUPT
PRACTICES AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS:
A CASE STUDY OF OLABISI ONABANJO UNIVERSITY.
<i>Ojo, S., Sodeinde, O.O. and Okhakhume, A.S.</i> | 29 |
| 4. | INDIGENOUS METHODS OF MALARIA CONTROL BY
THE OSOORO PEOPLE OF ONDO STATE OF NIGERIA
<i>Osunwole A.</i> | 53 |
| 5. | CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE OF PSYCHOPATHOLOGY
AND PSYCHOTHERAPY AMONG THE YORUBAS
<i>Oladipo, S. E.</i> | 64 |
| 6. | EMOTIONAL REGULATION, PERCEIVED SOCIAL
ALIENATION AND WELL-BEING OF STUDENTS IN
A NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY: IMPLICATIONS FOR
ASSESSMENT AND COACHING OF EMOTIONAL
REGULATION
<i>Ojedokun, A.O.</i> | 76 |
| 7. | PERCEIVING ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND GETTING
SATISFIED OR DISSATISFIED WITH JOB
<i>Shenge, N.A.</i> | 91 |
| 8. | EFFECT OF A CREATIVITY TRAINING TECHNIQUE IN
THE REDUCTION OF REBELLIOUS BEHAVIOURS AMONG
MEMBERS OF THE NURTW IN IBADAN METROPOLIS
<i>Anmashaun, R.A.</i> | 102 |
| 9. | A CROSS-ETHNIC STUDY OF THE ATTITUDE OF MARRIED
WOMEN IN NIGERIA TOWARDS FEMALE GENITAL
MUTILATION
<i>Esere, M.O.</i> | 114 |
| 10. | BREAKING BAD NEWS: EDUCATION AND COUPLES'
DISCLOSURE OF HIV STATUS IN IBADAN, NIGERIA.
<i>Jegade, A.S.</i> | 126 |
| 11. | EFFECTIVENESS OF ACCELERATION AND ABILITY GROUPING
IN ENHANCING PERFORMANCE OF HIGH ACHIEVING STUDENTS
IN SOME SELECTED SCHOOLS IN IBADAN METROPOLIS.
<i>Fakolade, O.A. & Adeoye, Hammed</i> | 143 |

**PSYCHOSOCIAL ANALYSIS OF FEAR OF CORRUPT PRACTICES
AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY OF OLABISI
ONABANJO UNIVERSITY**

**OJO SOLOMON¹, SODEINDE OLAKUNLE OLUFEMI²,
OKHAKHUME AIDE SYLVESTER³**

¹Department of Psychology,
Olabisi Onabanjo University,
Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State
e-mail: soloojoe2004@yahoo.com

²Department of Sociology,
Olabisi Onabanjo University,
Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State.
e-mail: phemmylak@yahoo.com

³Department of Psychology,
University of Ibadan,
Ibadan, Oyo State.
e-mail: okhasly2004@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The study investigated psycho-social analysis of fear of corrupt practices among students of Olabisi Onabanjo University. The study was a cross-sectional research which specifically adopted Ex-post facto design. Questionnaire format was utilized for data collection. The questionnaire included the Big-five personality inventory, fear of corrupt practices and personal data scales. Four (4) hypotheses were stated and tested using multiple regression analysis.

The result showed that personality characteristics of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, openness to experience and conscientiousness significantly and co-jointly predicted fear of corrupt practices $\{F(5,244) = 4.48, P < .05, R^2 = .08\}$. However, only personality traits of extraversion $[\hat{\alpha} = -.17, t = 2.42, P < .05]$ and openness to experience $[\hat{\alpha} = .23, t = 3.04, P < .05]$ had significant independent influence on fear of corrupt practices respectively. The results showed also that males and females were not significant different on fear of corrupt practices $[t = -1.69, df = 248, P > .05]$; student within the age group 18 – 30 years reported more fear of corrupt practices than students with the age group 31-45 years. The results showed further that students who had prior criminal victimization experience reported more fear of corrupt practices than student who had no prior criminal victimization $[t = 2.94, df = 248, P < .01]$; ordinary students were not significantly different on fear of corrupt practices, $[t = -.056, df = 248,$

P > .05]. Female and male who were political office holder were not significantly different on fear of corrupt practices [$t = -1.15, df = 91, P > .05$].

The study was concluded by establishing that some personality characteristic, specifically extraversion and openness to experience were found to have significant independent influence on fear of corrupt practices. Similarly, all the considered personality characteristics had significant co-joint influence on fear of corrupt practices. Age and prior victimization experience were found also to significantly influence fear of corrupt practices.

Keyword: Psychosocial, fear, corrupt practices students, university.

INTRODUCTION

One of the social ills that affect a country seriously is the problem of corruption. Corruption has been seen in every facet of life, either in the games of politics, or in normal administrative tasks. Accordingly, Gire (1999) notes that corruption will likely appear on everyone's list of factors obstructing Nigeria's path toward sustainable development; yet, rather than decrease, corruption has proliferated to all segments of Nigeria, making it the "common cold" of Nigeria's social ills. Gire notes further that corruption can be likened to a deadly virus that can possibly attack the vital structures that make for society's progressive functioning, thus putting its very existence into serious peril.

The view of Gire (1999) was mostly on developing countries where limited but valuable funds and resources that are initially earmarked for industries, hospitals, schools, and other infrastructures are either outrightly embezzled, misappropriated, or other wise severely depleted through kickbacks and over-invoicing by agents of government. Gire further notes that corruption stifles business that are unwilling to engage in this nefarious activity; ironically, it also eventually destroys the companies that yield to this practice, thus halting or at least delaying considerably the march towards economic progress and ultimately sustained development.

Accordingly, one can say corruption has become a cankerworm that impedes political, social and economic development in Nigeria, such that international community recognizes this as a major social problem for the country. Odulami (2003) opines that corruption is responsible in large measure for the broken promises, the dashed hopes and the shallow dreams that have characterized the existence of the multitude of Nigerians in the last few decades. Odulami notes that corruption remains a way of life; especially in government and business, with the Nigerian media being awash with reports of shady deals in the executive and legislative corridors, which have attracted the usual concern and criticisms from the civil society – including the Catholic Church of Nigeria, whose clergy have been vocal in the condemnation of the vice.

Essentially, corruption has been ascribed to most Nigerian's as a way of making quick money. By every standard, corruption can be felt both in high and low places across the length and breadth of the country. Accordingly, Gire (1999) notes that at the individual level, issues of allocation of jobs, and the assignment of responsibilities, are not based on merit or potential but rather on who has the resources and willingness to grease the palms of those in charge. Still in his view (Gire), he notes further that society loses in several ways. First, productivity is not at optimal levels because the most efficient people are not the ones doing the job. Second, being so flagrantly by passed leads to frustration and create a potential for the development of feelings of hopelessness, dejection, and low morale.

Further, corruption in Nigerian society has been a thing of worry and concern for the Government of the day, private corporate bodies, religious bodies, academic institutions, and to every responsible and reasonable Nigerian. To the end, the Federal Government under the headship and leadership of President Olusegun Aremu Obasanjo came up with two (2) bodies meant to fight corruption and fraud to a stand still. These bodies (i.e. Independent corruption practices commission and other related offences, and Economic and financial crimes commission). Essentially, these bodies are most needed by Nigerians since corruption has almost become a normal, common and usual thing, and even a way of life. Infact, corruption in Nigeria has received international recognition and attention. For example, Gire (1999) notes the activities of Transparency International (TI), a Berlin-based nonprofit, non-governmental organization in recent times. Essentially, this body was established for the main purpose of combating corruption primarily in international business but also at national levels, whose published results of the 1996 and 1997 survey ranking countries in terms of perceived corruption by a cross-section of business people across several countries (Gire, 1999). Based on the analysis of Transparency International (TI), it was revealed that of the 54 countries surveyed in 1996 and 52 countries in 1997, Nigeria was perceived as the most corrupt in two successive years. In the 1996 survey, Nigeria was followed by Pakistan and Kenya. Cameroon was the third African country in the top ten most corrupt list. However, the country with the least perceived corruption was New Zealand, Denmark was rated second and Sweden came third, there was no African country in the top twenty least-corrupt nations list. The only other African country that was listed in the 1997 survey was South Africa which ranked 20th on the most corrupt list (Gire, 1999).

From the foregoing therefore, it is now crystal clear that corruption has been an African thing, and at the same time, a Nigerian thing. This reflects that corruption is everywhere in Nigerian nation in particular and African, in general. Specifically, in Nigeria, it is obvious to see ordinary citizens discussing and theorizing on corrupt practices, whereby citizens now have a relatively broad understanding of the social consequences of the practice, either through the activities of religious

groups or commissions established to fight corruption and other related acts seriously e.g., the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission and other related acts (ICPC) and Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC). Apart from these existing mechanisms, knowledge about corruption can be ordinarily gained by individuals through regular experiences from paying themselves, being denied a service because of lack of money/network, or through the folklore of corruption from family members and/or neighbours. It needs be emphasized that individuals are furthermore well aware that the demand for money does not come from junior category employees alone, but also from high-ranking personnel. People now see that bribe payment or influential network is required to receive a service at any given level.

In addition, corruption has been fully analysed by one respectable scholar, named Deflem, M. Deflem (1995) sees corruption as a colonization of social relations on which two or more actors undertake an exciting relation by way of a successful transfer of the steering – media of money or power, thereby side-stepping regulate the relations. According to him, Deflem identifies two types of corruption, named monetary and bureaucratic corruption. In monetary corruption, the exciting relation is carried out by way of a transfer of money, and in bureaucratic corruption by way of a transfer of power.

In line with this, Lash (2003) assess corruption as the 'misuse of public power for private gain' such that an incentive for corruption arises wherever a public official has discretionary power to allocate government services on which it has a monopoly to the following government benefit: contracts, access to government loans, raw materials, import and export licenses, scholarship, healthcare or subsidized housing. Essentially, corruption in Nigeria is pervasive and endemic to such an extent that the country is rated the third most corrupt nation in the world, and as such corruption is found very inherent in the Nigerian System (Omotoso, 2005). Accordingly, Omotoso evaluated the effect of corruption on development in the Nigerian democratic system by picking on the President Olusegun Obasanjo's observation on the issue of corruption in a nationwide broadcast on the N55 million bribery scam in the National Assembly. Further, Omotoso analyzed President Obasanjo's view on corruption in which it was highlighted by the President that:

Corruption brings a nation no good. The resources meant for water supply, road, education, health and other basic and social services that are captured and stolen by a handful of Nigerians through corrupt acts stultify development when you encourage, cover up or join hands in such acts, you are destroying the nation and our collective future (Obasanjo cited in Tell, 2005).

Very importantly, Omotoso (2005) further indicated that corruption is terrorism against the state and is more deadly than HIV/HIDS as it denigrates and distorts the normal course of things and inflicts poverty an under development on the

people. Omotosho emphasized also that corruption in government increases poverty, as it weakens government and lessens its ability to fight poverty, and as such, the realization of this calls for a concerted effort by all and sundry towards the eradication of corruption.

Based on the above analysis, it is very clear now that corruption is a serious dilemma confronting Nigerian nations and that people must be enlightened on the need to see corruption or corrupt practices as an evil act that deserves to be afraid of. That is, Nigerians are supposed to be made to see corruption as something that has no good side and that can really undermine real development. This now points to the direction of this study, which is understanding the fear levels that can possibly be generated by corruption since it is a criminal act.

Therefore, it can be said that the focus of this study is to empirically assess fear of corrupt practices. Essentially, no single study has been found to address the issue of fear of corrupt practices but there are lots of literatures on the area of fear of crime. With this, one could therefore see corrupt practices as a part of criminal acts. So, studying fear of corrupt practices is like studying part of fear of crime.

Basically, fear of crime was seen as being problematic both as a research topic and a public policy issue. It is problematic as a research topic because it is difficult to define, operationalize and measure. It is also identified as being problematic as a public policy issue because our criminal justice policy issue because our criminal justice policy is largely, almost exclusively, on the promotion of fear (Fattah, 1995).

Fattah notes that crime is multi-dimensional, multi-faceted phenomenon, and that criminal offences vary great in their seriousness, their consequences, and the likelihood of their occurrences. According to him, he notes those who are afraid do not fear all crime, or even the most common ones, to the same degree. They may feel very vulnerable to certain types and quasi immune to others. Women, for example, might fear rape more than other crime network; the elderly might be mostly afraid to have their house or apartment violated or broken into, particularly while they are inside. (Fattah, 1995). Very importantly, one general shortcoming of fear of crime research (particularly the earlier studies) is the failure to differentiate between various types of crime. It relied on "global" measures of fear rather than offence-specific measures (Warr, 1984). Similarly, like other researchers (Gibbs, Coyle & Hanrahan 1987; Mictie & Lee, 1984; Vin 1980), Fattah and Sacco (1989) are critical of the "global measures" inability to distinguish levels of fear associates with particular offences. The global measures do not allow us for example, to detect the difference between respondent who might be afraid for their personal safety because of a concern about being sexually assaulted and others who may be unconcerned about sexual assault but are "anxious" about being robbed or having their purse snatched (Fattah, 1995).

Much of the confusion over the measuring of fear seems to arise from a failure to recognize elementary distinctions between perception, cognition and emotion (Warr, 2000). According to Warr, he notes that in spite of the claims of some; fear is not a perception of the environment (an awareness or experience of sensory stimuli) but a reaction to the perceived environment. Further, Warr notes that in as much as fear may result from the cognitive processing or evaluation of perceptual information (e.g. a judgement that an approaching male is armed or that a sound signals danger). Fear is not itself a belief, attitude, or evaluation, and as such fear should be seen as an emotion, a feeling of alarm or dread caused by an awareness or expectation of danger. In line with this, Warr now emphasizes that as fear an affective state, it is ordinarily (though not invariably) associated with certain physiological changes, including increased heart rate, rapid breathing, sweating, decreased salivation and increased galvanic skin response (Thomson, 1979, Mayes, 1979).

Fear of crime can be characterized according to a number of properties, including intensity (the English Language recognizes many degrees of fear: terror, worry, alarm, apprehension of a population that experiences fear during some reference period), and duration, both among individuals and within social units (e.g. communities, cities, nations). (Warr, 2000)

Fattah (1995) expresses fear of crime as a promoter of caution and prudence. In his view, Fattah notes that risks of criminal victimization are not evenly distributed within the general population and as such certain attitudes enhance the chances of being victimized while others lower the probabilities of victimization. Therefore, Fattah emphasizes that fear of crime promotes the latter attitudes thus acting as a risk – reducing factor. Fear fosters caution, prudence and vigilance. Accordingly, he notes that these are desirable virtues in the dangerous society in which we live, and that modern life is a hazardous life and in our industrial, technological, motorized, and mechanized society we are daily exposed to a wide variety of risk and hazards (Fattah, 1995).

Clemente and Kleiman (1977) point out that as fear becomes manifest in avoidance and antisocial patterns of behaviour, sociability, mutual trust; a willingness to help others, and a sense of belonging and satisfaction in one's neighbourhood and community eventually disappears. Garofalo (1981) defines fear of crime as an "economic reaction characterized by a on sense of danger and anxiety produced by their the threat of physical harm... elicited by perceived cues in the environment that relate to some aspect of crime. Essentially, people's fear of crime varies depending on their personal experience, where they reside, the time of day or night, and who else is around (dacruz, 2004). The concept of "fear of crime" is a response to external stimuli visualized and conceptualized as a major concern to the safety of an individual. These fears lead to an emotional response that creates

perceptions of crime within a community (Yin, 1980). People's perceptions of crime are shaped by numerous factors in today's society (Hatfield and Bandaranaike, 2001). While the perceptions held by some individuals may be well-founded, others may be at less personal risk than they actually believe (Grabosky, 1995). Lunney (1995) refers to two types of fear associated with crime: formless fear, which is a vague uneasiness about one's safety in the community, evidenced for examples, by fear of being home alone, and concrete fear, which is based on actual experiences with crimes, either as a victim or by knowing a victim, and which is evidenced by fear of specific offences such as sexual assault.

Generally, research on fear of crime conceptualizes it in one of four ways (Skogan, 1999). There definitions are cognitive in nature, reflecting people's concern about crime, their assessments of personal risk of victimization, and the perceived threat of crime in their environment. The remaining approach to defining fear is behavioural and defines fear by the things people do in response to crime. The 'concern' definition of fear focuses on people's assessment of the extent to which crime and disorder are serious problems for the community or workplace. Concern has been seen as a judgement about the frequency of seriousness of event and conditions in one's environment. The second meaning of fear, risk of victimization, is the perception that one is likely to be victimized. Obviously, assessments of risks are respondent's perceptions of likelihood of things happening to them, and these are frequently recommended as measures of 'fear'. The third definition of fear of crime focuses on threat of crime. Essentially, definitions of fear focusing on threat emphasize the potential for harm that people feel crime holds for them. Threat levels seem high when people feel that something could happen to them, if they exposed themselves for risk. The final, important conceptualization of fear of crime has been related with what people do i.e. seeing fear as behaviour. This particular operational definition of fear focuses on the behavioural, than cognitive aspects of attitude. Based on this perspective therefore, fear is best assessed by how it manifests itself in the frequency with which people go out after dark, restrict their shopping or fortify their homes or workplaces against criminal invasion.

Some theories have been offered to explain fear of crime. Linden (1996) summarizes three models to explain fear of crime. First, victimization model, says high levels of crime lead to a high number of victims which results in a high level of fear in anticipation of being victimized. Therefore, crime causes fear. Second, social control, says the deterioration of social control, or the perception that this has occurred, is the source of fear, more than the objective risk of victimization. Eventually, this fear will cause more crime. Lastly, vulnerability model says there are personal characteristics that contribute to people's fear; some sense they are physically vulnerable in being unable to resist an attack or socially vulnerable because they are exposed to the threat of victimization and will suffer serious social and economic consequences.

There are characteristics in people that prompt them to fear. Some of these characteristics play a more substantial role than others in determining one's level of fear (John Howard Society of Alberta, 1999). Gender has been one factor implicated in the literature to have a role in fear of crime. Even gender has been found to be the strongest predictor of fear (Trojanowicz, Kappeler, & Gaines, 2002). Women have a much greater fear of crime than men, but are victimized less than men. Women's fear comes mostly from their vulnerability to sexual aggression (Crowell and Burgess, 1996). Women do not simply become aware of this fear one day nor are they born with it. Women are socialized into thinking that they are vulnerable to attack. Australian studies have confirmed that women are afraid than men both alone in their own home and walking alone at night in their neighbourhood (Kelley, 1992; O'Malley, 1991). Accordingly, Trojanowicz, Kappeler and Gaines (2002) revealed that gender appears to be the best predictor of fear of crime. In their view, they emphasized that young males constitute the group that is victimized, most often, women express their highest levels of fear of crime. It is believed that women's fear of crime is related to their vulnerability of being raped, sexually assaulted and even sexually harassed in public place. Studies have therefore attributed women's fear to feeling of passivity, dependency, and lack of power in society (Pantazis, 2001). John Howard Society of Alberta (1999) notes that gender was the strongest predictor of fear, with women having a much greater fear of crime than men, but are victimized less than men.

Along this line, Stanko (1992) noted that although traditional survey demonstrate that young men are at the highest risk of victimization, women consistently report, on average, fear of crime that is three times higher than males. Accordingly, Hannah (2003) expressed that although one would expect that fear of crime is related to likelihood of victimization, yet women report higher fear even through official reports indicate they are less likely to be target of crime than males. Thus paradox has led Skogan (1987) to observe that fear of crime has often been perceived as "irrational". Therefore, Skogan in aligning with Smith (1988) agrees that this fear of crime paradox may fail to capture the lived experiences of women's physical and sexual violence similarly, research investigating women's fear of victimization led Warr (1984, 1985) to suggest that women report general victimization fear because of an intertwining of general fear with their fear of sexual assault.

Warr now emphasizes that women's fear of victimization may be founded on a different basis than those fears held by men, as men rarely fear sexual assault (Warr 1985, 1987). In his research findings Ferraro (1995, 1996) observes that women and men reported the same fear levels for non violent crime. This view takes us to the issue of corrupt practices which is the focus of this study and it is really a non-violent crime.

So, this study is interested in understanding gender differences in fear of corrupt practices. Essentially fear of corrupt practices may be somewhat different from fear

of general crime and it includes being afraid of “bribery”, “Over-invoicing”, “embezzlement”, “examination malpractices”, “corruption”, “Judicial corruption”, e.t.c.

Age is another powerful predictor of fear. But unlike gender, with age, the fear varies from crime to crime. When it comes to age, it is customary to assume that the elder are the most afraid, and for many crimes, this assumption holds true, such as in mugging cases and break and enters John Howard Society of Alberta (1999). However, when it comes to crimes like rape, sexual assault and stranger attacks it has been found that younger people tend to be more fearful (Evans, 1995).

Essentially, results of research examining the age/fear of victimization relationship have been mixed (Ferraro, 1995). Ferraro (1995), based on an extensive review of literature, concludes that the relationship between age and fear is actually curvilinear. That is, both the youngest women and oldest women queried in various surveys report the highest levels of fear. Ferraro (1996) further asserts that the fear women hold, especially by those who are young operates in the shadow of sexual assault. In line with these findings, Warr (1985) revealed similar findings that younger women (those under the age of 35) fear the act of sexual assault most.

According, it was noted that as women get older their fear begins to resurface as they become increasing more vulnerable, physically (Kennedy and Silverman, 1984). Many other studies have also linked up some other demographic characteristics with fear of crime. One of these other demographic characteristics is past experiences with crime. Although, many studies have examined whether or not past experiences with crime and criminals have any effect on the level of fear that a person holds, but findings have not been unanimous (John Howard Society of Alberta, 1999). In studying the effects of crime on college students, Dull and Wint (1997) found that those students. Who had been victims of crime had less fear of personal crime, but more fear of property crime, than those not victimized. Accordingly, John Howard Society of Alberta notes that certain crimes generate more fear for victims than others and with the case of being a victim of a robbery, for example, it generates a high level of fear because it contains elements that cause a greater amount of fear to be instilled in its victims.

Similarly, Warr (1987) reports ‘that there is an increased sensitivity to fear of victimization depending on both the type of crime and the characteristics of the individual.. Keane (1995) reveals that experiencing specific offences may be a better predictor of fear than others.

However, Mesch (2000) notes that previous experience with victimization may indirectly affect fear of crime. Some other variables such as income levels, educational levels, and ethnicity and geography have also been linked with fear of

crime. For examples, low income levels have been found related to increase fear of crime (Evans, 1995; Silverman & Kennedy, 1983). Also, low educational levels (Evans, 1995) tend to increase levels of fear. In respect of ethnicity, studies have found that fear levels vary according to ethnic background (John Howard Society of Alberta, 1999). In her view, it was noted that while white respondents tend to show the least amount of fear, the question of who has the most fear has not been unanimously agreed upon. Accordingly, John Howard Society of Alberta revealed that for the crime of theft from car, the 'Black' group showed a slightly higher level of fear than the 'Asian' group and the 'White' group once again had the lowest level of fear. Walker (1994) also found that Asian groups had the most fear, followed by black groups, and than White groups. Other studies have found that Black respondents were the most fearful (Evans, 1995; Silverman & Kennedy, 1983).

Further, Keane (1995) found women with lower SES were more likely to worry about walking alone outside the home after dark and about being alone inside the home at night. Keane therefore suggests that fear was stronger for single women than for married women. According to statistics Canada (1998), single women generally have the lowest average yearly income (\$30,130) when compared to other groups. Single women, typically having fewer financial resources than men or married women are more vulnerable (Hannah, 2003). Along this line of findings, Pantazis (2000) reveals that the financial constraints are not the only obstacle to those in poverty. Poverty is associated with physical situational correlates that accompany low-income living such as poor living and working conditions, which contribute to an increased risk of victimization.

A psychological factor of neuroticism (personality trait) has also been implicated to influence levels of fear experienced by people. Osinowo (1998) revealed that individuals high on neuroticism report more fear of crime than individuals low on neuroticism. Although much research studies on the links between personality traits and fear of crime have not been fully conducted. However, with a general fear level, some personality traits have been implicated. This is in line with investigators at Massachusetts General Hospital (2005) that found that the Medical Orbitofrontal Cortex (MOFC) appears thicker in people who are better able to control their emotional responses to unpleasant memories. Similarly, these researchers found out that those who exhibited better fear inhibition were also more likely to have an energetic, outgoing personality. Along this line, one of the study co-authors, named Dr. Scott Rauch, the director of the Psychiatric Neuroscience Research Division at Massachusetts General Hospital, says "understanding how personality is based in the brain is important both for insights into personality disorders and for conditions in which personality may confer vulnerability, such as anxiety disorders.

Based on the above analyses, one would expect that there may be a need to actually study some specific types of crime such as corruption or corrupt practices. Thus was what actually involved the study. So this study was meant to empirically understand the extent fear of corrupt and levels practices in people. Basically, it is the aim of the study to investigate the influence of some psychosocial factors on fear of corrupt practices among students, using Olabisi Onabanjo University as a study.

It is therefore hypothesized that personality factors of extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness will significantly independently and co-jointly predict fear of corrupt practice. It was also hypothesized that females will report more fear of corrupt practices than males; that students within age-group 18-30yrs will report more fear of corrupt practices than students within age-group 31-45 years; that students who had prior criminal victimization (i.e. past experience with criminal victimization) will report more fear of corrupt practices than students who had no prior (i.e. past experience) criminal victimization. It was further hypothesized that ordinary students will report more fear of corrupt practices than student political office holders; that female political office holders will report more fear of corrupt practices than male political office holders.

METHOD

DESIGN

This study was a cross-sectional survey research, which specifically utilized Ex-Post Facto design. The independent variables in the study were grouped under psychosocial factors which included personality characteristics (i.e. Extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, conscientiousness and agreeableness), and Socio- demographic attributes such as Sex (males versus females), age groups (18-30yrs Vs 31-45yrs), and category of studentship (Ordinary Students Versus Political Officeholders).

PARTICIPANTS

A total of 250 students (i.e. University undergraduates) took part in the study as participants. The participants were made up of 137 (54.8%) males and 113 (45.2%) females, with a mean age of 24.12 and SD=3.78. The participants were also made of 223 (89.2%) singles; 25 (10%) married individuals while only 2 (0.8%) were divorcees. In terms of educational level, 79 (31.6%) were holders school certificates (i.e SSCE. GCE); 136 (54.4%) were holders of Ordinary National Diploma/National certificate of Education while only 35 (14%) of the participants were higher National Diploma Holders. In respect of ethnic affiliation, 204 (81.6%) of the participants were Yorubas 25 (10%) were Igbos; 8 (3.2%) were Hausa/Fulani while 13 (5.2%) were of other ethnic affiliations not specified in the study. Based on religious

affiliations, 158 (63.2%) were Christian; 90 (36%) were Muslims while only two (2) were of other religious groups not being specified in this study. In respect of family background, 155 (62%) of the participants were from monogamous homes while 95 (38%) were from polygamous homes. In terms of category of studentship, 93 (37.2%) were Student political office holders (i.e Students Representative Council Members, Departmental's Students Executive Council, Faculty students' Council etc., while 157 (62.8%) were ordinary students. Based on level of study, 35 (14%) of the participants were in 100 level; 83 (33.2%) were in 200 level; 99 (39.6%) were in 300 level while only 33 (13.2%) were in 400 level.

INSTRUMENT

Questionnaire format was used for data collection in the study. The questionnaire was made up of three (3) sections, namely section A section B and section C. Section A of the questionnaire was made up of personal data measures such as sex, age, marital status, educational level, level of study. Section B of the questionnaire was meant to assess personality characteristics (i.e extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, conscientiousness and agreeableness traits). Section C of the three questionnaires was meant to assess fear of corrupt practices. Based on section B (the personality characteristics scale) reliability coefficients were reported for each subscale. The extraversion sub-scale was a 22 item measure. A Cronbach alpha of 0.86 and a Guttman split-half reliability coefficient of 0.82 were reported for it. The neuroticism sub-scale was a 23-item measure, with a Cronbach alpha of 0.91 and a Guttman split-half reliability coefficient of 0.87 being reported for it. The agreeableness subscale was a 12 item measure with a Cronbach alpha of 0.89 and a Guttman split-half reliability of 0.83 being reported for it. The conscientiousness subscale was a 12- item measure with a Cronbach alpha of 0.94 and a Guttman split-half reliability coefficient of 0.88 being reported for it, while the openness to experience subscale was a 11- item measure having a cronbach alpha of 0.96 and a Guttman split half reliability coefficient of 0.92 being reported for it.

Altogether, the subscales for the personality characteristics measures were found very reliable and valid. The subscales were developed and designed by Costa and McCrae (1992). The scale has a response format ranging between. The section C of the questionnaire which measured levels of fear of corrupt practices was a 28-item scale having a response format ranging between "Extreme fear" (4) "Moderate fear" (3) "little fear" (2) and No fear" (1). High scores in the scale reflected high level of fear of corrupt practices while low scores reflected low level of fear of corrupt practices. The scale was developed and designed by the authors of the study.

The scale items for the fear of corrupt practices scale was developed through indepth literature search on corruption and focus group discuss with selected university student chosen across three (3) selected universities in Ogun State.

The universities, Ago – Iwoye, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijebu-Ode, and Babcock University, Ilisan remo. Altogether, the generated items were 42 in number. The generated 42- item fear of corrupt practices scale was given out in copies to four (4) experts in social psychology (Department of psychology), Sociology /criminology (Department of sociology), Political science department and Faculty of Law. This task got the item reduced from 42 items to 33 items had at least 50% support from the experts. In a further analysis, the generated 33 items were hence subjected to inter-item analysis. The conducted inter-item analysis got the items reduced to 28 items with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92 which indicated a high inter-item consistency.

A Cronbach alpha of 0.92 and a Guttman split half reliability coefficient of 0.87 were reported for the scale. (i.e. the 28 – item fear of corrupt practices scale). This also justified the reliability and validity of the scale.

PROCEDURE

The study was conducted in Olabisi Onabanjo University located in Ago-Iwoye, a part of Ijebu community. The study was conducted on student population. The participants were randomly selected from each of the five (5) faculties based in the permanent and mini campus sites. 60 participants were randomly sampled from each faculty, such that for the five (5) faculties, 300 participants were sampled altogether. Out of these 300 copies distributed, only 257 copies were retrieved. Out of the retrieved copies, 4 copies were badly filled while the three copies were filled without indicating some of the personal data measures such as sex, age, marital status, etc. Based on this, 250 copies of questionnaire were found fit for data analysis. The 250 copies were hence scored and coded for statistical data analysis using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

A number of ten (10) research assistants participated in the study. The research assistants were trained for the study by the author. They were fully involved in questionnaire distribution, scoring and coding of the questionnaires items.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Both the descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were employed for data analysis. The descriptive statistics was meant to obtain some descriptive or summary information on some data such as sex, age, marital status, level of study, educational level, and category of studentship etc. The inferential statistics was meant for testing the stated hypotheses. Specifically, the statistical tests of multiple regression analysis and t-test for independent measures were employed for testing the hypotheses.

RESULTS

The study stated and tests six (6) hypotheses. The results are stated below:

HYPOTHESIS ONE

This stated that personality characteristics of extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, conscientiousness and agreeableness will significantly independently and co-jointly predict fear of corrupt practices among undergraduate students. The hypothesis was tested by multiple regression analysis. The results are stated below on table 1:

Table 1 A summary table of multiple regression analysis showing the independent and co-joint influence of some personality measures on fear of corrupt practices.

Predictors	b	t	P	F	R	R ²
Extraversion	-.17	-2.42	<.05	4.48	<.05	.08
Neuroticism	-.02	-.34	>.05			
Agreeableness	.06	.78	>.05			
Openness to experience	.23	3.04	<.05			
Conscientiousness	.07	.94	>.05			

The table 1 above showed the independent and co-joint influence of personality measures on fear of corrupt practices. It was revealed that personality characteristics of extraversion had a significant independent influence on fear of corrupt practices ($b = -.17, t = 2.42, P < .05$); personality characteristic of openness to experience also had a significant independent influence on fear of corrupt practices ($b = .23, t = 3.04, P < .05$). However, personality characteristics of neuroticism ($b = -.02, t = -.34, P > .05$); agreeableness ($b = .06, t = .78, P > .05$) and conscientiousness ($b = .07, t = .94, P > .05$) were shown not to have significant and independent predictive influence on fear of corrupt practices respectively. Further, it was revealed that the personality characteristics of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, openness to experience and conscientiousness significantly and co-jointly predicted fear of corrupt practices among students [$F(5, 244) = 4.48, P < .05, R^2 = .08$]. Therefore, in view of this, it can be said that hypothesis one was partially supported by the study findings.

HYPOTHESIS TWO

This stated that females will report more fear of corrupt practices than males.

The hypothesis was tested by t-test for independent measures. The results are shown below on table 2.

Table 2: A summary table of t-test for independent measures showing the difference between male and female students on fear of corrupt practices.

Group	N	X	SD	DF	T	P
Male	137	38.51	8.61		-1.69	>.05
Female	113	40.34	8.46	248		

The table 2 above showed the difference between male students and female students on fear of corrupt practices. It was revealed clearly that female students did not report more fear of corrupt practices than male students [$t(248) = -1.69, P > .05$]. This indicated that both male and female students were not significantly different on fear of corrupt practices. However, a close look at the mean scores of male students and female students on fear of corrupt practices vividly showed that females ($X = 40.34$) had a higher mean score on fear of corrupt practices than males ($X = 38.50$). Nevertheless, hypothesis two was still found not being supported by the findings.

HYPOTHESIS THREE

This stated that students within age group of 18-30yrs will report more fear of corrupt practices than students within age group 31-45years. The hypothesis was also tested by t-test for independent measures. The results are revealed on table 3 below.

Table 3: A summary table of t-test for independent measures showing the difference between students within age-groups 18-30years and 31-45years on fear of corrupt practices.

Group	N	X	SD	DF	T	P
18-30yrs age group	157	40.37	8.73	248	2.68	<.01
31-45yrs age group		37.43	7.68			

The results on table 4 above showed the difference between students within age-groups 18-30yrs and 31-45yrs on fear of corrupt practices. The results vividly showed that students within age-group 18-30yrs reported more fear of corrupt practices than students within age group 31-45yrs, [$t(248) = 2.68, P < .01$]. It was further revealed that students within age group 18-30yrs even had a higher mean score ($X = 40.37$) on fear of corrupt practices than students within age group 31-45 years ($X = 37.43$). This therefore supported the hypothesis three fully.

HYPOTHESIS FOUR

This stated that students who had past experience with criminal victimization will report more fear of corrupt practices than students who had no past experience

with criminal victimization. The hypothesis was tested by t-test for independent measures. The results are shown on table 4 below.

Table 4: A summary table of t-test for independent measures showing the difference between students who had and had no past experience with criminal victimization on fear of corrupt practices.

Group	N	X	SD	df	t	P
Yes (i.e Past Experience with criminal victimization)	77	42.47	9.52			
No (i.e No Past Experience with criminal victimization)	173	40.54	8.46	248	2.94	<.01

The results on table 4 above revealed the difference between students who had and had no past experience with criminal victimization. The results showed students who had past experience with criminal victimization reported more fear of corrupt practices than students had no past experience with criminal victimization, [$t(248) = 2.94, P < .01$]. The results showed further that students who had past experience with criminal victimization ($X = 42.47$) had a higher mean score on fear of corrupt practices than students who had no past experience with criminal victimization ($X = 40.54$). Therefore, it is clear that hypothesis four was supported by the findings of the study.

HYPOTHESIS FIVE

This stated that ordinary students will report more fear of corrupt practices than student political office holders. The hypothesis was tested by t-test for independent measures. The results are shown on table 5 below:

Table 5: A summary table of t-test for independent measures showing the difference between ordinary students and student political holders on fear of corrupt practices.

Group	N	X	SD	Df	t	P
Political office holders	93	38.94	8.38	248	-.56	.05
Ordinary Students	157	39.57	8.70			

The results on table 5 above revealed that ordinary students did not report more fear of corrupt practices than student political office holders [$t(248) = -.56, P > .05$]. This indicated therefore that student political office holders and ordinary students were not significantly differed on fear of corrupt practices. Somehow, the results above revealed that ordinary students ($X = 39.57$) had a slightly higher mean score

on fear of corrupt practices than student political office holders ($X = 38.94$). However, hypothesis five was not supported by the findings of the study.

HYPOTHESIS SIX

This stated that female student political office-holders will report more fear of corrupt practices than male student political office-holders. The hypothesis was

tested by t-test for independent measures. Table 6 below shows this vividly:

Table 6: A summary table of t-test for independent measures showing the difference between female and male students political office holders on fear of corrupt practices.

Group	N	X	SD	Df	t	P
Male	61	38.21	8.95	91	-1.15	>.05
Female	32	40.31	7.10			

The table 6 above clearly portrayed the difference between male and female political office holders on fear of corrupt practices. The results clearly showed that female political office holders did not report more fear of corrupt practices than male political office holders [$t(91) = -1.15, P > .05$]. This indicated that there was no significant difference between male and female political office holders on fear of corrupt practices. However, the result showed vividly that female political holders had a higher mean score ($X = 40.31$) than male political office holders ($X = 38.21$). But nevertheless, one can still say that hypothesis six was not significantly supported by the findings of the study.

DISCUSSION

The study was actually meant to investigate psychosocial analysis of fear of corrupt practices among students. The study was meant to be an eye-opener as to the roles being played by both psychological factor (i.e. personality characteristics and social factors (i.e social attributes – sex, age, category of studentship e.t.c.) on fear of corrupt practices.

The hypothesis one which stated that personality characteristics of extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experiences, conscientiousness and agreeableness would significantly independently and co-jointly predict fear of corrupt practices was partially supported by the results of the study. In the first place, the results showed that only the personality traits of extraversion and openness to experience were found to significantly and independently predict fear of corrupt practices respectively. This indicated that students who were identified as extraverts reported more, fear of corrupt practices than students who were identifies as introverts.

Also the findings that openness to experience significantly and independently predicted fear of corrupt practices implied that students who were high on openness to experience tended to experience more fear of corrupt practices than students who were low on openness to experience.

Further, the study results revealed that personality characteristics of neuroticism, conscientiousness and agreeableness did not significantly and independently predict fear of corrupt practices among students respectively. In addition, it was however revealed that some personality characteristics such as extraversion and openness to experience had co-jointly and significantly influenced fear of corrupt practices. In line with this, the result showed that 8% of the variance in fear of corrupt practices was accounted for by the personality characteristics while the remaining 92% of the variance in fear of corrupt practices could have been responsible for by other factors not being considered in the study.

Generally, this finding is corroborated by the findings of investigators at Massachusetts General Hospital (2005), that personality has an influence on fear. Specifically, the findings of Osinowo (1998) that personality factor of neuroticism influenced fear of crime did not corroborate with the findings of this study, which showed that personality trait of neuroticism did not independently and significantly predict of fear of crime.

The second hypothesis which stated that female students would report more fear of corrupt practices than male students was not supported by the findings of the study. The results vividly showed that male and female students were not significantly different on fear of corrupt practices. This reflected that female students could not be found to report more fear of corrupt practices than male students. This finding did not corroborate the findings of Crowell and Burgess (1996) who showed that females or women report more fear of crime than male or men. The finding of this study did not also corroborate the findings of Trojanowicz, Kappeler and Gaines (2002), who also showed that females reported more fear of crime than males.

The third hypothesis stated that students within age-group 18-30yrs will report more fear of corrupt practices than students within age group 31-45yrs was supported by the findings of the study. The findings showed clearly that students within age-group 18-30yrs reported more fear of corrupt practices than students within age group 31-45years. The findings showed further than students within the age-group 18-30yrs even had a higher means score on fear of corrupt practices than students within the age-group 31-45yrs. This therefore showed that hypothesis three was fully supported by the findings of the study. The findings of this study corroborated with the findings of Evans (1995), who revealed that younger individuals tend to be more afraid than the elderly when it comes to crimes such as sexual assault, stranger attacks etc.

The fourth hypothesis stated that students who had past experience with criminal victimization would report more fear of corrupt practices than students who had no past experience with criminal victimization was also supported by the findings of the study. The findings showed that students who had past experience with criminal victimization reported more fear of corrupt practices than students who had no past experience with criminal victimization. This therefore reflected that individual students who had in one form or the other had an experience with criminal victimization tended to exhibit more fear, such as fear of corrupt practices than individual students who might not have experienced criminal victimization in any form. One fact of note is that experience happens to be the best teacher, either violent happenings or non-violent happenings.

This finding is said to be corroborated by the findings of John Howard Society of Alberta (1999) who noted that certain crimes generate more fear for victims than others, and with the case of being a victim of a robbery, for example, it generates a high level of fear because it contains elements that cause a greater amount of fear to be instilled in its victims. Further, the finding of this study was also corroborated by the findings of Dull and Wint (1997) who found that those students who had been victims of crime had less fear of personal crime, but more fear of property crime, than those not victimized.

The fifth hypothesis stated that ordinary students will report more fear of corrupt practices than student political office-holders was not supported by the findings of the study. The findings showed that ordinary students and student political office-holders were not significantly differed on fear of corrupt practices. This reflected that, either a student was ordinary or political office-holders, their fear levels seemed similar.

Hypothesis six stated that female student political office holders would report more fear of corrupt practices than male student political office holders was not supported by the findings of the study. The findings showed therefore that female and male student political office holders were not significantly differed on fear of corrupt practices. Somehow, the results clearly revealed that female student political office holders group still had slightly higher mean scores on fear of corrupt practices than male student political office holders group.

CONCLUSION

The study has delved into understanding the role of psychosocial factors in fear of corrupt practices among university students. The findings of the finding have been found revealing and interesting. Therefore, in view of what has been found, it is therefore concluded that:

- v Personality traits of extraversion and openness to experience had significant independent influence on fear of corrupt practices among university students respectively;
- v Personality traits of conscientiousness, agreeableness and neuroticism did not have significant independent influence on fear of corrupt practices among university students respectively;
- v The five personality traits had significant co-joint influence on fear of corrupt practices;
- v Male and female students were not significantly differed on fear of corrupt practices;
- v Students within age group 18-30yrs (younger) reported more fear of corrupt practices than students within age group 31-45yrs (older);
- v Students with past experience with criminal victimization reported more fear of corrupt practices than students with no past experience with criminal victimization;
- v Ordinary students and student political office holders were not significantly differed on fear of corrupt practices;
- v Female student political office holders were not significantly differed from male student political office holders on fear of corrupt practices.

IMPLICATION/RECOMMENDATION

This study has clearly shown the role of some psychosocial factors in fear of corrupt practices. With the findings that personality traits of extraversion and openness to experience predicted fear of corrupt practices indicated that efforts should be geared towards controlling for fear levels among the identified individuals who might have been identified to have personality characteristics of extraversion and openness to experience. The findings of the study also showed that students within age-group 18-30yrs (younger group) expressed more fear of corrupt practices than students within age-group 31-45yrs (older group). The implication of this is that students or individuals within the age group, 18-30yrs should be enlightened on the need to control for their fear levels. This could be attained through systematic enlightenment programmes whereby various techniques of controlling for one's fear levels could be taught and as such one would be equipped with enough ability of dealing or controlling fears emanating from corrupt practices being perpetrated around one.

Generally, efforts should be put in place to establish bodies that can systematically fight corruption to a stand still in our nation's higher institutions of learning. It is a common saying now that corruption among our students' union leaders has been a thing of worry to scholars and community leaders. So efforts should be made to establish bodies that really look like EFCC or ICPC as a sure mechanism of fighting corruption or corrupt practices in our nation's higher institutions of learning.

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

REFERENCES

- Clemente, F. and Kleiman, M.B. (1977). Fear of crime in the United States: A Multivariate Analysis. In: Hotfield, F and Banderanaike (ed) *the impact of crime: fear and concern in a regional context – A study of the Townsville Thuringowa Region*. A paper presented at the character, Impact and prevention of crime in Regional Australia Conference convened by the Australian Institute of criminology and held in Townsville 2-3 August, 2001.
- Costa, P.T., Jr and McCrae, R.R. (1992) Normal Personality assessment in Clinical practice; The NEO Personality inventory, *Psychological Assessment*, 4:5- 3
- Crowell, N.A and Burgess, A.W. (1996). *Understanding Violence against women*. Washington D.C. National Academy Press.
- daCruz, B.K. (2004). Fear of crime: The impact of community policing. Armstrong Atlantic State University. Retrieved June 5, 2005 from <http://www.nssa.us/nssafrn1/24-2/04/DaCruz>.
- Deflem, M. (1995). Corruption, law and justice: A conceptual clarification. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23 (3): 243–258
- Evans, D.J. (1995). *Crime and Policing: Spatial approaches*, England: Avebury
- Fattah, E.A. (1993). Some Reflections on crime, our Response to crime, and the prevention of family violence. In E.A.Fattah (ed.). *Victimization and fear of crime among the elderly: A possible link?* An unedited paper presented at Australian institute of criminology conference of 23-25 February, 1993. Retrieved June 14, 2005 from <http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/older people/fattah.pdf>.
- Fattah, E (1995). Victimization and fear of crime among the elderly: A possible link? An unedited paper presented at conference of 23-25 February, 1993. Retrieved June 14, 2005 from <http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/older people/fattah.Pdf>.
- Fattah, E.A and Sacco, V.F. (1989). Crime and victimization of the elderly. In E.A Fattah (ed). *Victimization and fear of crime among the elderly: A possible link?* Unedited paper presented at Australian institute of criminology conference of 23-25 February, 1993-retrieved June 12, 2005, from <http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/older people/fattah.pdf>.
- Ferraro, K.F (1995) *fear of crime: interpreting victimization*, state University of New York Press

- Ferraro, K.F. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces*, 75(2) 667-690.
- Ferraro, J.K. and LaGrange, R.L. (1987). The measurement of fear of crime *Sociological Inquiry*, 57(70): 101.
- Gibbs, J.J, Coyle, E.J & Hanratian, K.J (1987). Fear of crime: A concept in need of clarification. In E.A. Fattah (ed). *Victimization and fear of crime among the elderly: A possible link? An unedited paper presented at Australian institute of criminology conference of 23-25 February 1993*. Retrieved June 14, 2005 from [http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/older \[people/fattah. Pdf](http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/older%5Bpeople/fattah.Pdf).
- Gire, J.T (1999). A psychological Analysis of Corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*. Vol. 1, No 2, Summer.
- Grabosky, P.N. (1995). *Fear of crime and Fear Reduction Strategies. Trends and issues in crime and criminal Justice*, No. 44, Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Hannah, S. (2003). Stranger Danger Explaining women's fear of crime. *western criminology Review*, 4 (3). Retrieved July 14, 2005 from [http://www.Sonoma.edu/v4n3/ scott.html](http://www.Sonoma.edu/v4n3/scott.html)
- Skogan (1987). The impact victimization on fear. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33 (1), 135–154
- Hatfield, F and Bandaranaike, S. (2001). The impact of crime: Fear and concern in a regional context: A study of the Townsville-Thuring-owa Region. *A paper presented at The character, impact and prevention of crime in Regional Australian Conference convened by the Australian institute of criminology and held in Townsville, 2-3 August.*
- John Howard Society of Alberta (1999) Fear of crime. Retrieved April 15, 2001 from <http://www.johnhoward.ab.ca/docs/fear/fear/fear13.htm>.
- Keane, C. (1995) Victimization and Fear: Assessing the role of the offender and the offence. *Canada Journal of Criminology*, 37:431-455
- Linden, R (1996). *Building a Safer Canada: A community-Based Crime Prevention Manual*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Lunney, R.F. (1995). Fear of crime-crime in the GTA and public perception. Retrieved August 11, 2003 from <http://www.peelpolice.on.ca/ctued/html>.
- Massachusetts General Hospital (2005). Fear Response, Personality Share some space in the Brain. Retrieved May 10, 2006 from <http://www.caromont.org/123525/cfm>.

- Mayes, A. (1979). The physiology of fear and anxiety. In fear in animals and man, edited by W. Sluckin. In M. Warr (ed). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenue for research and policy. Retrieved July 17, 2005 from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/criminal-justice/2000/vol4/04front.pdf>.
- Mesch, G.S. (2000) Perceptions of Risk, Lifestyle activities and fear of crime. *Deviant Behaviour*, 21: 47-62
- Miettie, D and Lee, G.R. (1984). Fear of crime among older people: A Reassessment of crime-related factors," In E.A. Fattah (ed) victimization and fear of crime among the elderly: A possible link? An unedited paper presented at Australian Institute of Criminology conference of 23-25 February 1993. Retrieved June 14, 2005 from <http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/olderpeople/fattah.pdf>.
- O'Malley, P (1991) *Perceptions of crime. Fear of crime, and attitudes to police in Victoria: selected findings from the Australian Bureau of statistics, crime and crime prevention survey*, Victoria, Bundora National Centre for socio legal student, Zattobe University.
- Odulamu, (2003) *Corruption Notebook*. Global Integrity/The Centre for public integrity.
- Omotoso, F. (2005). Corruption, Democracy and Development in Nigeria. Paper presented at the national conference on corruption and Development in Nigeria organized by the faculty of social science, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria, 22nd and 23rd June, 2005
- Osinowo, H.O. (1998) Fear of Crime: The role of sex, neuroticism, and prior victimization in Ibadan, Nigeria. *African Journal for the Psychological study of social issues*, 4 (2).
- Silverman, R.A., & Kennedy, L.W. (1983). *Age, perception of social diversity and fear of crime (Discussion paper 2)*. University of Alberta; Population Research Laboratory, Department of Sociology.
- Skogan, W.G. (1999). Measuring what matters: crime, disorder, and fear. Retrieved May 10, 2003 from <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/1/170610-1.pdf>.
- Thomson, R. (1979). The concept of fear. In fear in animals and man, edited by W. Sluckin. In M. Warr (ed). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenues for Research and policy Retrieved July, 17 2005 from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/criminal-justice/2000/vol4/04front.pdf>.
- Transparency International (1997). Internet corruption perception index – 1997. World Wide Web. In: Gire (Ed). A psychological Analysis of corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, Vol. 1, 2, Summer.