Coronavirus Lockdown and Poverty in Nigeria: Implications forCrime Upsurge in Yenagoa Metropolis, Bayelsa State

Nkereuwem Stephen Ekpenyong[a],*; Chinedu Nelson Omere[b]; Alfred Stephen Ekpenyong[c]

[a] PhD, Department of Sociology, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.
[b] Post Graduate School, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.
[c] Department of Sociology, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.
*Corresponding author.

Abstract

The study explored the impact of Covid-19 lockdown on crime upsurge in Yenagoa metropolis, Bayelsa state. The study adopted Robert K. Merton Anomie theory. Correlational study design was utilized. With Taro Yemane formula, the study sampled a total of (399=100%) respondents. Data for the study was gathered through structured questionnaires. However (200=50.1%) copies of questionnaires were retrieved. Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the reliability of the research instrument. Both Probability (simple random, stratified) and non-probability (purposive) sampling techniques were adopted for sampling procedures. Data for the study were analyzed with Simple Percentages, Frequencies and Chi-Square with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0. Data analysis indicated that Covid-19 lockdown led to the proliferation of specific crime types (armed robbery, cybercrime, burglary, human right abuse, domestic/gender violence, bribery) at different frequencies. Based on the result, the study recommended gradual easing of lockdown, provision of post lockdown palliatives, reduction in job losses by government and provision of socio-economic stimulus to cushion the effects of job loss on criminality among others.

Key words: Covid-19; Job loss; Poverty; Crime upsurge

INTRODUCTION

Coronavirus lockdown and criminality are twin problems confronting human demography in recent times. This is predicated on the reality that coronavirus pandemic could nearly double the number of people around the world facing acute hunger (United Nation World Food Programme, 2020). Of a truth, this is an indication of a looming global humanitarian catastrophe. Weak economies (Africa) are on the brink of hunger pandemics**.** There is an exponential increase in the number of people threatened with acute food insecurity. A situation that may likely lead to conflict, due to incompatible interest amid imminent competition for available scarce resources. Led by this line of thought, David Beasley, executive director (WFP) in a video conference reported that the number of individuals experiencing food shortage was already on the rise last year before the outbreak of the lethal pandemic. Despite the surge of food insecurity at pre-lockdown, the economic impact of coronavirus is estimated by the United Nation World Food Programme to increase the number of individuals experiencing food insecurity to 265 million during Covid-19 lockdown (Punch News, 2020). With Covid-19, the world is not only facing a global health pandemic but also a pronged challenge like job loss, poverty and crime surge. Criminologists are united in their assertion that job loss and poverty are the major catalyst to increasing crime rate (Iwarimie-Jaja, 2012). The question now is, will Covid-19 lockdown increase criminality in Nigeria with zero pre-lockdown palliatives? Covid-19

could metamorphose to what Iwarimie Jaja (2013) refer to as crime generator, as majority of the youthful population battle with job loss, poverty, food shortage, increase in price of commodities with a corresponding decline in income among others. This is because Covid-19 lockdown have disrupted the economy and thrown majority of Nigerian youths out of work. "Covid-19 is potentially catastrophic for millions who are already hanging by a thread" the WFP's Senior Economist Arif Husain added. In the same vein, the United Nations Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres, warned that millions of people could be pushed into extreme poverty in Africa due to the coronavirus pandemic and called for "global solidarity" within the continent. According to UN scribe, the pandemic will lead to social inequalities and increase hunger, malnutrition and vulnerability to disease.

The restriction in movement of people and goods is beginning to impact on Nigeria's food supply chain and have led to job loss and low income, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, Sabo Nanono, added. He stated the obvious at the Covid-19/Food Supply Chains Inter-Ministerial Policy Response Meeting held in Abuja. It is possible for factors of this nature to aggravate the crime-situation in Nigeria, with reference to Bayelsa which is an agelong civil servant state, because it breeds frustration by making it almost impossible for individuals that are vulnerable to job loss and poverty to make ends meet. Security experts in Nigeria have raised red flag following the crippling of businesses by the lockdown. Most individuals believe that the crime rate may soar at post lockdown. Nigeria being rated as the capital of poverty by World Poverty Clock may likely experience double jeopardy. Hungry individuals have been quick to exploit the shelter in place order to engage in criminal activities just to survive and make corresponding adjustment to increasing price of food stuffs, job loss and worsening economic hardship.

RELEASE OF INMATES AMID COVID-19 OUTBREAK: THE REIN OF TERROR

Nigerian president, Mohammadu Buhari has asked the Chief Justice of the Federation, to free prison inmates to ease overcrowding as the lethal virus continue to spread. Though this action maybe applauded my health professionals, but to criminologists it is a reign of terror. According to Cohen (1955), subcultures are characterized by deviant values and morals, which enable their members to gain prestige and recognition. Put differently, the behaviour that will be exhibited by the released inmates within a subculture will contrast with that of a dominant culture. Hence, will be fundamentally different from the dominant culture because of the new norms they learnt while in prison. For society as a whole they seem deviant, often criminal. Thus, the unbroken chain of deviance subculture

puts the entire society at risk. In criminal justice system, we were told that prison have three major functions: to serve as punishment for crime, to keep criminals away from wider society and to rehabilitate criminals. The question now is, how will you integrate a criminal that has not completed his/her rehabilitation course in prison into wider society? Such integration will certainly break paving way for innovation as such offender might regroup to form gangs, unleashing mayhem on society (Merton, 1965). In this wise, the primary function of the prison might have been defeated.

Also, considering the fact that there are no sufficient palliatives to cushion the socioeconomic effect of coronavirus, the released inmates may become desperate to feed themselves and their families. This desperation for survival often heightens relapse to crime. Let's take a scenario where it is nearly impossible for Nigerian educated graduates with clean records to secure paid employment, will it be possible for subcultural deviants with criminal records to find a job in dominant culture? Incorrigible criminals will form arduous gangs that will pose serious security threat on the social system.

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK: ANOMIE THEORY

Robert Merton's anomie theory (1968) explains the internal contradiction which existed in societies between cultural goals and the social structure. In Iwarimie-Jaja (2010), Merton (1965) argued that cultural goals are aspirations of people, held of high esteem which is in agreement with institutionalized goals. He further suggests that individual's decision to adopt whatever mode or method in achieving social goals is premeditated or predicated by opportunities created in existing social structure. Put differently, every society places premium on certain goals with seemingly embargo for greater good of all (Ekpenyong & Omere, 2020). The social structure defines the legitimate/ institutionalized means for achieving such goals. The crux of the matter is that, during Covid-19 lockdown majority of youths have lost their jobs which is the only legitimate means of making ends meet or achieving institutionalized goals. "Like we are told, a hungry man is an angry man and he that is down needed fear no fall". The man who is out of job must do anything to survive and the next thing is relapse to crime. The government is still compounding the issue, by releasing inmates who might be socially dislocated aft wards.

It is not surprising that crime rate will escalate in geometric progression, as the nation monolithic economy is already battered by unabated decline in price of crude oil. Companies are already laying off their employees amid economic uncertainties characterized by Covid-19

outbreak. This means that unemployment and poverty will reach its climax. With the ban on vehicular movements, commercial bus drivers, tricycles drivers and motorcyclist in Yenagoa metropolis are already experiencing a decline in income. There is a looming apocalypse. According to Guardian Newspaper (2020), over 2000 youths who engaged in transportation have been relieved of their means of livelihood. What are they going to do after the lockdown and where will they get money to feed their families? This is when integration breaks and innovation take place as freed inmates may regroup and perpetrate crime (Merton, 1968).

METHODOLOGY

The co-relational design was used in investigating the impact of coronavirus lockdown on crime upsurge. The study population comprise both sexes withing the age limits of 18- 45 years in Yenagoa metropolis. This is so because, individual(s) within this age category constitute the labour force and are mostly affected by job loss. The National Population Commission (2006) put the total population (both sexes) of the research locale at 352,285. The application of Taro Yamane returned a sample size of 399. The stratified sampling technique was used to stratify respondent(s) into sixty-two (62) strata, reflecting all the communities that constitute the study area. Furthermore, simple random sampling technique, with balloting method was used to select six (6) communities out the sixty-two (62) communities that make up Yenagoa metropolis. In contacting individual respondent (s), the study adopted purposive sampling techniques to select individuals who fell within the age bracket of (18- 45 years) who experienced job loss during Covid-19 lockdown. Structured questionnaires where used to gather relevant data from the access population. Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the reliability of instrument distributed. Retrieved data where analyzed by Frequency, Percentages and Chi-Square with the aid of Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0.

RESULT/FINDINGS

As earlier noted above, a total of three hundred and ninety-nine (399=100%) copies questionnaire were distributed to respondents in the research locale. However, due to the restriction of vehicular movement, social distancing and certain regulatory guidelines put forward by the Presidential Task Force on Covid-19 (PTF) and Nigeria Center for Disease Control (NCDC), the researcher was able to retrieve only (200=50.1%) copies of questionnaires. Therefore, a sum of one hundred and ninety-nine (199=49.9%) copies of questionnaires, were not retrieved. Hence, analysis will be based on the (200=50.1%) copies questionnaire that were successfully retrieved and found valid.

Table 1
Cross- Tabulation of sociodemographic characteristics and crime type

Variable (s)	Crime Type (s)						$\sum$	X2	DF	P-Value
	Armed Rubery	**Cyber Crime**	**Gender/ Domestic Violence**	**Burglary**	**Human Right Abuse**	**Bribery**				
	(n=76, %=38.0)	(n=54, %=27.0)	(n=31, %=15.5)	(n=7, %=3.5)	(n=29, %=14.5)	(n=3, %=1.5)	(N=200, %=100.0)			
Sex										
Male	76(38.0)	13(6.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	89(44.5)	160.035	5	0
Female	0(0.0)	41(20.5)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	29(14.5)	3(1.5)	111(55.5)			
Age										
18-28	26(13.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	30(15.0)	248.067	15	0
29-38	50(25.0)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	20(10.0)	0(0.0)	76(38.0)			
39-48	0(0.0)	32(16.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	1(0.5)	38(19.0)			
49≥	0(0.0)	21(10.5)	31(15.5)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	56(28.0)			
Education										
No formal education	20(10.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	20(10.0)	192.403	15	0
Primary	19(9.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	19(9.5)			
Secondary	37(18.5)	42(21.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	24(12.0)	3(1.5)	106(53.0)			
Tertiary	0(0.0)	12(6.0)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	5(2.5)	0(0.0)	55(27.5)			

To be continued

Continued

Variable (s)	Crime Type(s)						Σ	X2	DF	P-Value
	Armed Rubery	Cyber Crime	Gender/ Domestic Violence	Burglary	Human Right Abuse	Bribery				
Religion										
Christianity	76(38.0)	32(16.0)	2(1.0)	7(3.5)	29(14.5)	1(0.5)	147(73.5)	175.400	15	0
Islam	0(0.0)	22(11.0)	10(5.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	33(16.5)			
ATR	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	15(7.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	16(8.0)			
Atheist	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)			
Occupation										
Fishing	25(12.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	25(12.5)	407.806	50	0
Civil Servant	11(5.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(3.0)	0(0.0)	17(8.5)			
Unemployed	40(20.0)	21(10.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	61(30.5)			
Trading	0(0.0)	19(9.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	19(9.5)			
Driver	0(0.0)	9(4.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	3(1.5)	13(6.5)			
Motorcyclist	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	7(3.5)	0(0.0)	13(6.5)			
Mechanic/ repairers	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)			
Farming	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(3.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(3.5)			
Plumbing	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	20(10.0)	7(3.5)	8(4.0)	0(0.0)	35(17.5)			
Hunting	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)			
Lumbering	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	0(0.0)	5(2.5)			
Community										
Agudama	27(13.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(3.0)	0(0.0)	33(16.5)	344.526	25	0
Amarata	15(7.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	3(1.5)	22(11.0)			
Kpansia	27(13.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	27(13.5)			
Biogbolo	7(3.5)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	9(4.5)			
Yenegwe	0(0.0)	46(23.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	46(23.0)			
Tombia	0(0.0)	6(3.0)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	19(9.5)	0(0.0)	63(31.5)			
Distribution of Covid-19 palliative(s)										
Very Nicely	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	218.057	15	0
Nicely	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	11(5.5)	0(0.0)	11(5.5)			
Badly	0(0.0)	22(11.0)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	9(4.5)	0(0.0)	69(34.5)			
Very Badly	76(38.0)	32(16.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	3(1.5)	116(58.0)			

Source: Field Work.

Table 1 above shows the crosstabulation of socio-demographic of respondents and crime type. Accordingly, analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between gender and crime type (p<0.000). A further examination shows that (76= 38.0%) of male respondents were predisposed to armed robbery, (31= 15.5%) of female respondents were predisposed to domestic/gender violence while (29=14.5%) of female respondents were predisposed to human right abuse (rape) during Covid-19 lockdown. Overall statistics shows that, (89=44.5%) of respondents are male while (111=55.5%) of respondents are female. Based on this result, it is evident that majority of respondents are female during the period of study. Also, it was revealed in table (1) that age of respondents corelated with crime type (p<0.000). A breakdown of the analysis shows that (50=25.0%) of respondents aged 29-38 years

were predisposed to armed robbery compared to other age groups. This finding supports the data supplied by Nigerian Prison Service to National Bureau of Statistics (2009), indicating that majority (49.8%) of prison convicts were within the age bracket of 16-35 years in 2006 and 2008. In summary, analysis shows that (30=15.0%) of respondents were aged 18-28 years, (76=38.0%) of respondents were aged 29-38 years, (38=19.0%) of respondents fell within the age bracket of 39-48 years. Also, (56=28.0%) of respondents were 49 years and above. In this wise, it agreeable that majority of respondents were aged 29-38 years.

On the basis of education, analysis shows a correlation between education and crime type(p<0.000). Further probing indicates that (37=18.5%) of respondents with secondary education were predisposed to armed robbery followed by (20=10.0%) with no formal

education. In total, (20=10.0%) of respondents had no formal education, (19=9.5%) had primary qualification, (106=53.0%) of respondents had secondary education while (55=27.5%) of the study population had tertiary qualifications. From this result, it is clear that majority (106=53.0%) of respondents had secondary qualifications.

According to table (1) above, religion of respondents corelated with crime type in the research locale (p<0.000). Further breakdown of the analysis revealed that Christians were predisposed to armed robbery in the research locale (76=38.0). This corroborates the result that Christians constitute the overwhelming majority of respondents (147=73.5%), followed by Islam (33=16.5%), African Tradition (16=8.0%) and Atheist (4=2.0%) accordingly. In the same vein, analysis for occupation indicates that occupation associated with crime type (p<0.000). Further examination shows that unemployed respondents (40=20.0%) were predisposed to armed robbery. Further investigation revealed that (25=12.5%) of respondents engaged in fishing, (17=8.5%) were civil servants, (61=30.5%) were unemployed, (19=9.5%) were traders, (13=6.5%) were drivers, (13=6.5%) were motorcyclist, (3=1.5%) were mechanic/phone repairers, (7=3.5%) were farmers, (35=17.5%) were plumbers, (2=1.0%) were hunters while (5=2.5%) engaged in lumbering. Based

on this result, it evident that majority (61=30.5%) of respondents were unemployed. According to table (1), community of respondents were cross tabulated with crime type. Analysis reveals a positive correlation (p<0.000). Further analysis reports that (46=23.0%) of respondents in Yenegwe were predisposed to cybercrime, (31=15.5%) of respondent in Tombia were predisposed to domestic violence/ gender violence while (27=13.5%) of respondents were predisposed to armed robbery in Agudama and Kpansia respectively.

Also, (19=9.5%) of respondents were predisposed to human right abuse in Tombia. In summary, (33=16.5%) of respondents resided at Agudama, (22=11.0%) of respondents resided at Amarata, (27=13.5%) of respondents resided at Kpansia, (9=4.5%) of respondents resided at Biogbolo, (46=23.0%) of respondents resided at Yenegwe while (63=31.5%) of respondents resided at Tombia. Based on this result, it is agreeable that majority (63=31.5%) of respondents resided at Tombia. On the basis of Covid-19 palliatives, majority (116=58.0%) of respondents indicated that Covid-19 palliatives were distributed very badly in the research locale which associated with crime type (p<0.000

Table 2
Cross- tabulation of job loss and crime type

Variable(s)	Crime Type(s)						Σ	X2	DF	P-Value
	Armed Rubery	Cyber Crime	Domestic/ Gender Violence	Burglary	Human Right Abuse	Bribery				
	(n=76, %=38.0)	(n=54, %=27.0)	(n=31, %=15.5)	(n=7, %=3.5)	(n=29, %=14.5)	(n=3, %=1.5)	(N=200, %=100.0)			
You are area is under lockdown										
Strongly Agree	76(38.0)	6(3.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	11(5.5)	3(1.5)	96(48.0)	178.180	15	0
Agree	0(0.0)	36(18.0)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	18(9.0)	0(0.0)	92(46.0)			
Disagree	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	5(2.5)			
Strongly Disagree	0(0.0)	7(3.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(3.5)			
Rate of job loss during lockdown										
Very High	58(29.0)	0(0.0)	21(10.5)	7(3.5)	29(14.5)	3(1.5)	118(59.0)	117.247	15	0
High	18(9.0)	51(25.5)	10(5.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	79(39.5)			
Low	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)			
Very Low	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)			
Source of Covid-19 Palliatives										
Friend(s)	58(29.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	58(29.0)	473.623	25	0
Religious bodies	16(8.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	20(10.0)			
Government	2(1.0)	42(21.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	3(1.5)	49(24.5)			
Philanthropist	0(0.0)	12(6.0)	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	16(8.0)			
Companies	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	25(12.5)	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	28(14.0)			
No regular source	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	4(2.0)	23(11.5)	0(0.0)	29(14.5)			

To be continued

Continued

Variable(s)	Armed Rubery	Cyber Crime	Crime Type(s) Domestic/ Gender Violence	Burglary	Human Right Abuse	Bribery	∑	X2	DF	P-Value
Severity of hardship during lockdown										
Very severe	69(34.5)	36(18.0)	18(9.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	123(61.5)	117.864	15	0
Severe	5(2.5)	11(5.5)	13(6.5)	7(3.5)	29(14.5)	3(1.5)	68(34.0)			
Not severe	1(0.5)	5(2.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(3.0)			
Not very severe	1(0.5)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)			
Rate of Idleness during lockdown										
Very High	76(38.0)	23(11.5)	26(13.0)	7(3.5)	7(3.5)	3(1.5)	142(71.0)	130.411	15	0
High	0(0.0)	31(15.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	22(11.0)	0(0.0)	53(26.5)			
Low	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)			
Very Low	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)			
Lockdown and protest										
Very Violent	74(37.0)	8(4.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	29(14.5)	3(1.5)	115(57.5)	178.571	15	0
Violent	2(1.0)	37(18.5)	31(15.5)	6(3.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	76(38.0)			
Not violent	0(0.0)	7(3.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(3.5)			
Not very violent	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)			
Crime rate during lockdown										
Very High	76(38.0)	42(21.0)	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	13(6.5)	0(0.0)	136(68.0)	153.779	15	0
High	0(0.0)	12(6.0)	19(9.5)	2(1.0)	16(8.0)	3(1.5)	52(26.0)			
Low	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(3.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(3.0)			
Very Low	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(3.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(3.0)			

Source: Field Work.

Table 2 above shows the cross tabulation of job loss and crime type. Firstly, analysis revealed that there is an association between Covid-19 lockdown and crime type (p<0.000). A further examination indicated that (76=38.0%) of respondents strongly agreed that lockdown led to armed robbery and bribery (3=1.5%) during the period under review. In the same vein, (36=18.0%) of respondents agreed that Covid-19 lockdown led to cybercrime, (31=15.5%) of respondents agreed that Covid-19 lockdown led to increasing rate of domestic/gender violence among couples, (7=3.5%) of respondents agreed that Covid-19 lockdown led to burglary, (18=9.0%) of respondents agreed that Covid-19 lockdown led to human right abuse by security operatives (Covid-19 Taskforce). In recapitulation, (96=48.0%) of respondents strongly agreed that they were under Covid-19 lockdown, (92=46.0%) of respondents agreed that they were under Covid-19 lockdown. On the contrary, (5=2.5%) of respondents disagreed that were under Covid-19 lockdown while (7=3.5%) of respondents strongly disagreed on the prevalence of lockdown. Based on this result, it is agreeable that majority (96=48.0%) of respondents are under Covid lockdown during the period of study.

On the basis of job loss, table (1) reveals a positive association between job loss and crime type (p<0.000). This affirms the findings of Ogbebor (2012), which opined that armed robbery, murder, assassination and arson correlated with job loss. Further examination shows that (58=29.0%) of respondents with "very high" job loss were predisposed to armed robbery, (21=10.5%) of respondents were predisposed to domestic/gender violence, (7=3.3%) of respondents were predisposed to burglary, (29=14.5%) of respondents were predisposed to human right abuse while 3 (1.5%) of respondents were predisposed to bribery. In the same vein, (51=25.5%) of respondents with high job loss were predisposed to cybercrime. In summary, majority (118=59.0%) of respondents reported "very high" job loss during Covid-19 lockdown.

According to table (2), sources of Covid-19 palliatives correlated with crime type (p<0.000). Further breakdown of the analysis shows that majority (58=29.0%) of respondents received palliatives from friends, (20=10.0%) of respondents received from religious organizations, (49=24.5%) of respondents received from government, (16=8.0%) of respondents received from philanthropist, (28=14.0%) of respondents received from companies while (29=14.5%) of respondents had no regular source of Covid-19 palliatives. Table (2) above shows the severity of hardship during Covid-19. Analysis reveals a positive association (p<0.000) between severity of hardship and crime type (P<0.000). This finding lends credence to the

assertion put forward by Paranjape (2012), which opine that criminality is a result of individual(s) relationship with society.

Further examination shows that (69=34.5%) of respondents who indicated "very severe" were predisposed to armed robbery, cybercrime (36=18.0%), domestic/ gender violence (18=9.0%). For "severe", (7=3.5%) of respondents were predisposed to burglary, human right abuse (29=14.5%) and bribery (3=1.5%) respectively. However, majority (123=61.5%) of respondents indicated "very severe" on the basis of Covid-19 hardship.

Table 2 also shows the cross tabulation of idleness during Covid-19 lockdown and crime type. Analysis shows an association between idleness and crime type (p<0.000). Furthermore, analysis reveals that very high rate of idleness (76=38.0%) led to armed robbery, domestic/gender

violence (26=13.0%), burglary (7=3.5%), and bribery (3=1.5%). Also, high rate of idleness led to cybercrime (31=15.5%), human right abuse (22=11.0%) accordingly. However, majority (142=71.0%) of respondents reported "very high rate of idleness during Covid-19 lockdown.

Table 2 also shows the cross tabulation between Covid-19 lockdown and protest. Analysis shows a correlation between Covid-19 lockdown and protest (P<0.000). Further breakdown shows that very violent protest (74=37.0%) led to armed robbery, human right abuse (29=14.5%), and bribery (3=1.5%). Also, violent protest, led to cybercrime (37=18.5%), domestic/gender violence (31=15.5%), burglary (6=3.0%) accordingly. In summary, majority (115=57.5%) of respondents were predisposed to very violent protest during Covid-19 lockdown.

Table 3
Cross- tabulation of poverty and crime type

Variable (s)	Crime Type(s)						Σ	X2	DF	P-Value
	Armed Rubery	Cyber Crime	Gender/ Domestic Violence	Burglary	Human Right Abuse	Bribery				
	(n=76, %=38.0)	(n=54, %=27.0)	(n=31, %=15.5)	(n=7, %=3.5)	(n=29, %=14.5)	(n=3, %=1.5)	(N=200, %=100.0)			
Price of foodstuffs during lockdown										
Very High	76(38.0)	19(9.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	23((11.5)	I (0.5)	119(59.5)	176.947	15	0
High	0(0.0)	35(17.5)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	75(37.5)			
Low	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)			
Very Low	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	0.(0.0)	4(2.0)			
You were not poor pre-lockdown										
Strongly Agree	76(38.0)	17(8.5)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	29(14.5)	3(1.5)	127(63.5)	172.922	15	0
Agree	0(0.0)	31(15.5)	16(8.0)	5(2.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	52(26.0)			
Disagree	0(0.0)	6(3.0)	11(5.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	17(8.5)			
Strongly Disagree	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)			
Severity of poverty during lockdown										
Very severe	76(38.0)	35(17.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	14(7.0)	3(1.5)	128(64.0)	140.728	15	0
Severe	0(0.0)	19(9.5)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	11(5.5)	0(0.0)	68(34.0)			
Not severe	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)			
Not very severe	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)			
Average monthly income pre-lockdown										
No regular pattern	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	8(4.0)	4(2.0)	10(5.0)	2(1.0)	24(12.0)	195.994	20	0
≤#5,000	0(0.0)	5(2.5)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	1(0.50	1(0.5)	8(4.0)			
#6,000-#9,000	0(0.0)	15(7.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	19(9.5)			
#10,000-#14,000	0(0.0)	18(9.0)	16(8.0)	0(0.0)	13(6.5)	0(0.0)	47(23.5)			
#15,000≥	76(38.0)	16(8.0)	6(3.0)	3(1.5)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	102(51.0)			
Average monthly income during lockdown										
No regular pattern	45(22.5)	51(25.5)	31(15.5)	7(3.5)	7(3.5)	3(1.5)	144(72.0)	103.568	20	0
≤#5,000	20(10.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	22(11.0)	0(0.0)	42(21.0)			
#6,000-#9,000	10(5.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	10(5.0)			

To be continued

Continued

Variable (s)	Crime Type(s)						Σ	X2	DF	P-Value
	Armed Rubery	Cyber Crime	Gender/ Domestic Violence	Burglary	Human Right Abuse	Bribery				
#10,000-#14,000	1(0.5)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.5)			
#15,000≥	0(0.0)	1(0.05)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)			
Average monthly Expenditure during lockdown:										
No regular pattern	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	9(4.5)	0(0.0)	9(4.5)	371.726	20	0
≤#5,000	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	3(1.5)	4(2.0)			
#6,000-#9,000	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	16(8.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	16(8.0)			
#10,000-#14,000	67(33.5)	24(12.0)	5(2.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	96(48.0)			
#15,000≥	9(4.5)	30(15.0)	10(5.0)	7(3.5)	19(9.5)	0(0.0)	75(37.5)			

Source: Field Work

Table 3 above, shows the cross tabulation of Covid-19 induced poverty and crime type. Analysis shows a positive correlation between price of foods stuffs and crime type (P<0.000). Further examination shows that "very high price" of food stuffs led to armed robbery (76=38.0%), human right abuse (23=11.5%). Similarly, "high price of foods stuffs" led to cybercrime (35=17.5%), domestic/ gender violence (31=15.5%), and burglary (7=3.5%), bribery (2=1.0%) respectively.

However, majority (119=59.5%) of respondents reported very high price of food stuffs during Covid-19 lockdown, (75=37.5%) of respondents indicated high in price of food stuffs, (2=1.0%) of respondent indicated low price of food stuffs while (4=2.0%) of respondents indicated very low price of food stuffs during Covid-19 lockdown.

According to Table 3, majority (127=63.5%) of respondents strongly agreed that they were not poor during pre- lockdown. This correlated with crime type during lockdown (P<0.00), as respondents with "very severe poverty" were predisposed to armed robbery (76=38.0%), cybercrime (35=17.5%), human right abuse (14=7.0%), bribery (3=1.5%). Also, respondents that indicated "severe poverty' were predisposed to domestic/gender violence (31=15.5%), burglary (7=3.5%). However, majority (128=64.0%) of respondents experienced very severe poverty during the period of Covid lockdown, (68=34.0) of respondents indicated "severe poverty", (3=1.5%) of respondents indicated not severe poverty, while a least score (1=0.5%) of respondents indicated not very severe poverty during Covid-19 lockdown.

Table 3 above also shows the correlation of average monthly income and crime type (P<0.000). Analysis indicates that majority (102=51.0%) of respondents earned #15,000 and above before Covid-19 lockdown. This means that monthly income of respondents appreciated during pre-lockdown. Conversely, analysis on respondent's monthly income during Covid-19 depreciated as majority (144=72.0%) of respondents indicated no regular pattern of income. A corresponding (P< 0.000) was reported,

indicating positive correlation with crime type during Covid-19 lockdown. Further examination shows that respondents with no regular pattern of income were predisposed to armed robbery (45=22.5%), cybercrime (51=25.5%), domestic/gender violence (31=15.5%), and burglary (7=3.5%), bribery. Also, respondents who earned less than #5,000 per month were predisposed to human right abuse (22=11.0%). Equally regrettable, analysis indicates an increase in household expenditure despite no regular pattern of income during Covid-19 lockdown, as majority (96=48.0%) of respondents recorded average monthly expenditure of #10,000-#14,000, followed by #15,000≥ (75=37.5%), #6,000-#9,000 (16=8.0%), no regular pattern (9=4.5%) while a least score of 4(2.0%) was reported for respondents with average monthly expenditure of ≤#5,000 respectively. Thus, a decline in average monthly income and increase in average monthly expenditure will lead to what Merton (1965) refers to as innovation. This correlated (P<0.000) with crime type during Covid-19 lockdown.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that Covi-19 lockdown led to job loss, poverty, and increase in price of food stuffs with inverse decrease in income, leading to economic hardship on a large scale. These factors culminated into anomie as conceptualized by Merton (1965). To cap it, integration broke amid ailing social structure. The ineptitude exhibited by government in designing a policy framework to address pre and post lockdown challenges led to innovation on the part of offenders. It is on this basis that social actors who suffered job losses and proliferating poverty resort to self-help which is conceptualized as innovation in criminological parlance. Covid-19 lockdown correlated with specific crime types in the study area, due to the inability of social actors to achieve institutionalized goals through legitimate means. The unconditional release of inmates to decongest the

prisons amid Covid-19 outbreak was also a causal factor. As adequate employment opportunities were not created to absorb the inmates, most of the inmates became socially dislocated. This led to subcultural deviance, most inmates regrouped and sought for means to make ends meet in a defaulting social structure.

RECCOMENDATIONS

Government must mitigate job loss by creating more employment for the teeming population. Gradual easing of lockdown is necessary to allow social actors who engage in occupations like driving, trading, fishing, hunting, farming, and lumbering, mechanical works to recoup their losses. The wearing of nose mask and enforcing of social distancing must be made compulsory for all, irrespective of political, economic or religious affiliation. Government must give its policies a human face by distributing palliatives to indigent households. This will go a long way in cushioning the socioeconomic effects of Covid-19 lockdown. Last but not the least; released innates should be properly integrated into the society. Government must empower the released inmates with skill acquisition and other training to boost self-reliance.

REFERENCES

Channels (April, 2020). *News Update on Covid-19 Outbreak.*

Cohen, L., Felson, M., & Land, K. (1980). Property crime rates in the United State: A macrodynamic analysis, 1947 - 1977 with ex ante forecasts for the mid-1980s. *American Journal of Sociology*, *86*, 90-118.

Daily Update on Coronavirus (2020). Nigeria Centre for Disease Control (NCDC).

Ekpenyong, A. S., & Omere, C. N. (2020). *Coronavirus lockdown and socio- economic status of indigent households in Ibewa community*, ONELGA, Rivers State. An Unpublished Paper.

Guardian Newspaper (May, 2020). Covid-19 Update.

Iwarimie-Jaja, D. (2010). *Criminology, crime and delinquency in Nigeria*. Second Edition. Port Harcourt: Pearl publishers.

Iwarimie-Jaja, D. (2012). *Criminology: The study of crime*. Fourth Edition. Owerri: Springfield Publishers.

Iwarimie-Jaja, D. (2013). *Criminology: The criminologist eye in reoccurring crime problems in Nigeria*. 105th Inaugural Lecture Series, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

Merton, R. K. (1968). Manifest and Latent Functions. *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

Merton, R.K. (1965). *Social structure and anomie glencoe*. Illinois: Free Press.

National Bureau of Statistics (2009). *Social statistics in Nigeria*. Abuja: NBS Publication.

Ogbebor, G. (2012, Nov.). Youth violence in contemporary Nigeria Society: A psychological approach. *Journal of State and Society*, *2*(1), 53-59.

Olukayode, L. (2016). Youth unemployment and crime in Nigeria. *International Journal of African and Asian Studies*, *21*. ISSN 2409-6938. Retrieved from Http:// www.iiste.org

Omere, C.N. (2016). *Recycling crime: Prospect for development: A case study of Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni*. LGA. Rivers state, Nigeria: Unpublished Monograph. Oxford Dictionary.

Paranjape, N. (2012). *Criminology and penology with victimology* (15th ed.). Allahbad, India-Central Law Publications.

Punch Covid-19 headline (2020, Apr.). World health organization guide to identifying the economic consequence of disease and injury. (2009). Geneva, Switzerland.