

**JUDICIAL OFFICERS' KNOWLEDGE OF PSYCHOLOGY
AND ITS PERCEIVED IMPACT ON EFFECTIVE JUSTICE
ADMINISTRATION IN NASARAWA STATE**

**Ibrahim Ignatius Felix Ruwan^{1*}, Vakpa Iliya², Agnes O. Okorie¹, Gbenga Oba
Fadare¹ & Charlton Jose¹**

¹Department of Psychology, Nigerian Defence Academy Kaduna

²Department of Psychology, Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

*ruwanfelix@gmail.com

.ABSTRACT: This paper examined Judicial Officers' knowledge of Psychology and its perceived impact on effective Justice Administration. Using Survey paper method, 49 participants comprising of 42 Lawyers and 7 Magistrates within Karu and Keffi LGA of Nasarawa State participated in the study. Structured questionnaires were used to collect the data. Three research hypotheses were tested. The study found that: i). There was a relationship between Judicial Officers Knowledge of Psychology and Perceived effective justice administration. ii) There was no significant difference between lawyers and magistrates on their knowledge of psychology. iii) But there was a significant difference between junior lawyers and senior lawyers on the perceived impact of psychology knowledge on effective justice administration. Discussion, conclusion and recommendations were made which include the need for a synergy between the two professional regulatory bodies that is the Nigeria Psychological Association and Nigeria Bar Association to facilitate mutual professional co-operation. Psychologists should diversify their interest towards enhancing effective justice administration and the justice system entirely.

Keywords: Knowledge of Psychology, Judicial Officers, Justice Administration, Nasarawa State.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between psychologists and judicial officers has improved positively since the publication of the first volume of a book that advocates the application of psychology in legal practice by the famous German Psychologist Hugo Munsterberg "On the Witness Box" in 1908 (Nweze, 2010). Psychologist and judicial officers' daily routings are centered on interactions with human behavior. Law according Sternlight (2010), have been recognized to be people's profession, advocating almost always on every aspect of our daily lives. A lawyer for example spends most of his time interacting with people and their behaviors. People here include client, judges, witness, or colleagues. Judges too like the lawyers have lawyers, litigants, witnesses, juries and the whole system to face. Apart from their daily interaction with people, judicial officers spend time as well interacting with human being, they engage in client interview, examination and cross examination of a litigants and

witnesses, counseling, given legal advice, negotiations, fact finding and paper. The judges in addition to the above responsibilities have tons of evidence from litigants and witnesses to sieve from in other to reach a fair and just judgment.

While the above task performed by judicial officers requires good legal, logical and analytical skills and knowledge, it also requires that judicial officers who engage in them should possess traits and necessary skills that would arm them with good understanding of people, their actions and reactions. It also requires that they are authority in the knowledge of human behavior (Sternlight & Robbennolt, 2015). Today some lawyers and judges are beginning to understand that the practice of law is far more people oriented than is legal education. In 1955, then Harvard law school Dean Erwin Griswold as cited in Robbennolt (2015), gave a speech entitled “Law schools and human relations” He wrote: “when analyzing the law in intricate detail, it may be hard to keep in mind the vital fact that the problems really relate to people, either the people who are parties in the case, or the people who will be affected by the law established once the case is decided”. From the forgoing explanations, one can conclude that justice administration is a process that involves people – people here includes attorneys, litigants, witnesses, judges, and even juries. It also brings to question of how they act, react, what motivates them to act and react the way they do, what controls their emotions, decisions and conclusions before, during and after a case has been established and how in turn courtroom decisions affects them directly or indirectly (Lahey, 2009).

A proper understanding of people and their behaviors as highlighted above can better be done with the knowledge of psychology. According to Lahey (2009), “any understanding of the profession of law, courtroom drama and politicking that ignores the human element – the psychology of the people involved would amount to an incomplete understanding and is tantamount to injustice or miscarriage of justice”.

Judicial officers as a matter of fact have the requisite knowledge and are educated as well as have good experience in the most micro aspects of law and the justice system, they are equally known to be experts when it comes to procedures that involves justice administration such as planning for court cases, prosecuting or defending litigants, examining, cross examining and re-examining a litigants or witnesses, they are also good when it comes to analyzing different parts of court room proceedings from when a case is filed to when sentence is given. Despite the wealth of knowledge and experience they have, about advocating, it is very disheartening to know that most lawyers and even the judges don't know much about human behaviours, neither do they know why these people act the way they do (Singer, 2011). Many do not know what is psychology, who a psychologist is, nor do they know what they do or how they can be of benefit to them as legal practitioners in the execution of their daily activities.

Psychology is a science concerned with the study of human and animal behavior and mental processes. In the mind of many people, psychology is only associated with mental illness or with assisting in the resolution of relationship problems. (Zoysa & Shackel, 2011). To others, a psychologist is that fortune teller that reads human mind and can tell you your

thoughts and what you did in the past. Seemingly there is a wide misconception about psychology, as the study of human and animal interaction, Psychology also encompasses how these organisms perceive the world around them and how they react to these perceptions. Interactions of this kind may be observed in all areas of human activities.

The goals of psychology, as a scientific field that study human behaviour, is to understand, predict, explain, control and modify human behaviors. This makes psychology paramount to our justice system. Any justice that is not built on the understanding of why a litigant acted the way they did before, during and after the commission of an offense will amount to great injustice.

Legal practitioners can determine the truth and nothing but the truth only when they possess wide, good knowledge and understanding of how people think, and make decisions. They are expected to have good skills especially about why they do, what they do, how they form attitude and what direct their behaviors generally (Zoysa & Shackel, 2011). Human behavior is central to every aspect of law whether criminal or civil law. Most law students commonly graduate from law school understanding little if anything about perception, memory, cognitions as it relates to general human behaviors. "While good lawyers ultimately pick up some of this information through experience, there is no reason to leave new lawyers to flounder based on a lack of understanding of these psychological principles". It is important to note that, just like the experienced lawyers, new lawyers too can benefit immensely from research and findings of psychology in law and legal practice as well as general human behaviors (Robbenolt, 2008).

Law is a body of rules or regulations that guide human conduct and there rules are imposed and enforced among the members of a given state. These rules most time form the pattern of behaviors of members of that society (Rosch & Lart, 2001). Law of a country will be tyrannical if it does not accommodate the people, their custom, beliefs and general world view to which it is supposedly made for. This simply means that any law must base on proper understanding of the people it was promulgated for. This equally, if justice is to be ensured, it must be based on judgment that stem from a good knowledge and understanding of a judicial officers that knows the litigant's actions and reactions. Human beings as noted earlier are influenced by not only physical influences or impulse but as well as psychological (covert) forces within him or her. In most situations, when such forces become overwhelming they even have greater influence into one's life than the physical or external (Overt) impulses. Today many countries of the world, judicial officers have come to realized that the practice of law is far more people oriented than what they were thought at law school. Law school now offer people oriented causes now than they did in the 1950s, courses that promotes alliance between psychology and law such as Forensic psychology, Psychology and Law, Legal Psychology, Psychological Jurisprudence, etc. has been opened in different universities for the promotion of inter discipline relationship between psychology and law.

Justice administration involves all processes and procedures that end at given justice to citizens. It is a compendium of activities, structures, and personnel of the justice system, the

police, court and the prisons in the dictation, arrest, prosecution of crime suspects. Justice administration is a compendious term that stands for all the complexes of activities that operate to bring the substantive law to bear, or to keep it from coming to bear, on persons who are suspected of having committed crimes. Justice administration focuses on rule of law that govern the dictation, investigation, apprehension, interviewing, and trial of persons suspected of committing crime and those persons whose responsibility it is to work within these rules. The administration of justice is not only restricted to the courts, it involves the law enforcement, legal practitioners, and those whose duties are necessary to ensure that they function effectively. The concern of administration of justice is the fair, just and impartial upholding of rights and punishment of wrongs, according to the rule of law. It also focuses on preventing illegal activities and punishments of offenders (Robbenolt, 2008). This can only be achieved if they all appreciate what the benefits of the study of psychology and human behavior can offer to the study of law and the legal system as a whole and its application in the courtroom.

Statement of the Problem

Psychology over the year has made giant strides through research to unveil some facts about our legal system. So many revelations have been made about eye witness testimony, false confession, improving interviewing skills, mediation and negotiation, among other important studies. Nevertheless, legal practitioners and educators have still not taken full advantages of the great effort that has been made in the field of forensic psychology.

Psychology- as a science of how people think, feel, behave, has been helpful to many disciplines which include law to have knowledge about people and their behavior and how to modify such behaviors. Even with this insight, law scholars have not seen reasons why this insight can be incorporated into the law school curriculum; neither has the practitioners taken advantage of this insight to hone their skills toward improving justice administration. It is a fact that judicial officers live their lives daily working with and on human behavior, but some important questions worth asking are;

1. How much knowledge do they have about this behavior they advocate for or against?
2. How exposed are they to the knowledge of psychology.
3. How much do they know about behavior motivators and factors that make people behave the way they do?

As noted above, psychology over the years has offered great insight into many issue practicing legal luminaries confront on a daily basis in and out of court and how those things can reshape our justice system, but most of this research are underutilized and in most cases not even recognized at all by our judicial system.

Sincerely, judicial officers have wealth of experience about how people behave, through their training and experience during years of practice. But one challenge observable is another fact that most of them, their knowledge of human behavior cannot go beyond the

limits of pleading guilty, liable or not to the point of explaining the intricacies, and mysteries surrounding what people do and why they do what they do.

Objectives

This research is carried out in order to achieve certain objective which includes:

- i. To examine the relationship between Judicial Officers' knowledge of Psychology and perceived Effective Justice Administration.
- ii. To examine the significant difference between Lawyers and Magistrates on their Knowledge Psychology.
- iii. To determine the a significant difference in perception between Junior Lawyers and Senior Lawyers on the impact of psychological knowledge on effective Justice Administration.

Hypotheses

- i. There will be a relationship between Judicial Officers' knowledge of Psychology and perceived Effective Justice Administration.
- ii. There will be a significant difference between Lawyers and Magistrates on their Knowledge of Psychology.
- iii. There will be a significant difference in perception between Junior Lawyers and Senior Lawyers on the impact of psychological knowledge on effective Justice Administration.

Conceptual Framework

Psychology as a study of human behavior and mental processes, since its inception have gained ground into many disciplines especially those that have a direct relationship with human behavior. It has helped many disciplines understand human behavior and how their actions, reactions and policies (of these disciplines) become stimuli that elicit corresponding response and how a change in policies and decisions can bring about a change in people's behaviors. Psychology's contribution is not restricted to social sciences and the natural sciences but as well to humanities and the legal profession, it has contributed tremendously in understanding the human part of law and how legal practice and decision can influence litigants, psychology and the justice system as a whole (Nweze, 2010). Despite these lofty benefits, many judicial officers, i.e. lawyers and judges in particular are naive about the benefits that the discipline of psychology can offer to their legal skills and practices.

The Nigerian Criminal Justice System

The legal system that Nigerian criminal justices administration operates had its root in the British legal system, which in turn originated its laws from the common law. Onimajesin, (2009). The British common laws are norms and rules peculiar to each community applied by the English judges, whenever they were settling disputes; this became known and

established as British common law, Dambazau,(1994). The law has two principal parts, the criminal and the civil law, criminal law is for criminal offences, identifying the ingredients thereof and specifying the potential punishment, Clarkson, (1987). The justice system is governed by federal and states legislation in line with the federal arrangement of government in Nigeria. 'Criminal Justice System can be defined as the collective institutions through which an accused offender passes until the accusations have been disposed of or the assessed punishment concluded. The system typically has three components: law enforcement which includes; police, (sheriffs, marshals), the judicial process (judges, prosecutors, defense lawyers), and corrections (prison officials, probation officers, parole officers). Thus, the justice system is made up of three sub-systems or components: the police, the courts and the prisons or corrections, responsible for law enforcement.

The police; there are a number of agencies charged with the responsibility of policing in Nigeria, principal among them is the Nigeria Police Force,(NPF). Section 214. (CFRN,1999). Others are the independent corrupt practices and other related offences commission (ICPC). The Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC). Department Of State Services, (DSS). Nigeria Security and Civil Defence Corps, (NSCDC). In addition, to other sisters' security agencies whose responsibility ends at handing over all arrested criminal suspect to the police for further prosecution

The courts; the judicial powers of the state are vested in the courts, being courts established for the federation. Section 6. (CFRN, 1999). Courts of the first instance include magistrate or district courts, customary or traditional courts, shari'ah courts, and for some specified cases, the state high courts. Under same constitution, the regular court system comprises federal and state trial courts, state appeals courts, the federal court of appeal, the federal supreme court, and shari'ah (Islamic) and customary (traditional) courts of appeal for each state and for the federal capital territory, Abuja. In principle, customary and shari'ah courts have jurisdiction only if both parties agree. Trials in the regular court system are public and generally, respect constitutionally confined individual rights, including a presumption of innocence, the right to be present, to confront witnesses, to present evidence, and to be represented by legal counsel.

The prisons; the Nigerian prison service is the agency of government responsible for the running and administering of the prison system in the country. It has a command structure with 8 zonal commands, 36 state commands, 1 FCT command; it has a professional spread that includes among the officers, psychologists, medical and environmental health officers, sociologists, lawyers, general administrators, engineers, etc. These professionals work across the whole justice system. The essence of which is to ensure that the goal of law enforcement is attained. Orakwe, (2015). The justice system as an entity is a organized or complex whole, an assemblage or combination of units or parts, forming complex or unitary whole, the major character being that, what affect the function of one part can potentially affect other part as well as the entire system.

Psychology in Nigerian

Psychology in Nigeria is relatively young discipline compared to western countries of Europe and America. Psychology in Nigeria as an academic discipline started formally in 1964, which was when the first degree awarding department of Psychology was established in University of Nigeria Nsukka (Mefor, 2014). Since its establishment, the knowledge and discipline of psychology has surge astronomically within the country. Many Nigerians have developed interest not only in knowing what the discipline is all about but also to study and practice psychology as a career. Psychology as both an academic and applied discipline has contributed immensely to the development of the Nigerian Society especially in the areas of nation building with respect to the knowledge of human behavior.

Psychology and the Nigerian Justice System

The contrition of Psychology to the Nigerian nation has been perceived to be one sided. Many psychologists in practice today are mainly confined within the clinical setting and the Classroom while a few are found within the correctional setting. Despite their huge contributions in their respective fields, Impact of Nigerian Psychologists are yet to be felt in other areas where they are most needed. It is very sad, but it is true that the knowledge, potentials and fruit of psychology is yet to impact positively in many places which they are supposed to be spear heading especially in area of conflict management, rehabilitation and integration of internally displaced people in crisis areas and places ravaged by insurgency. One important area is our justice system. There are many Psychologists working in educational institutions, many in the clinical settings, some in the military and Paramilitary, but it is regrettable to note that if there is any psychologists work with the Nigerian justice system. Just as Nweze (2010) noted that “if they exist, the number of qualified Psychologists with expertise in Legal/Forensic psychology are limited in the Nigerian justice system as a whole”. This shows how one sided impact psychologists are making in the country. Our justice system might have suffered starvation of the knowledge of psychology; this might have resulted in so many miscarriages of justice due to absence of key stake holders that would have contributed to ensuring true justice that is not based on head knowledge.

Psychologists especially in the western society of Europe and America are among the key decision makers that determines court sentences and acquittal. Unlike in Nigeria, they have many psychologists that work with the legal system. It is not much a news that the legal system as well as it framework hardly recognize the need and usefulness of Psychological knowledge and professionals within the justice system as such there are little or no room in the justice system for a psychologists to take an internship programme not to talk of working as a major decision maker in issues of justice dispensation.

One of the major factors that results in low level of co-existence between psychology and law in Nigeria can be attributed to the apparent communication gap that has been created between lawyers, judges and psychologists. The psychologists have not really done much to showcase what they capable of doing and how they can contribute to the legal system. This has contributed to the prevailing ignorance among many judicial officers about what

psychology is and what psychologist is capable of contributing to the enhancement of judicial process and the system as a whole (Nweze, 2010). Many judicial officers in Nigeria cannot confidently say exactly what and how psychology can contribute to the legal system. The aim of this paper is to find out from the lawyers whether psychology is relevance to legal profession.

The Role of Psychology in Justice Administration

Psychologists especially in the continent of Europe and America have developed to the point that they have become stakeholders in justice system and an important component in judicial decision making. Being psychologically aware is essential not only in courtroom but also among other arms of the criminal's justice system as the police and the prison service. For the purpose of the paper focus will be made on the role of psychology that relates to the court and judicial system. Psychologist especially those who specialize in the forensic sub-discipline offer a wide range of services in law courts.

Some of these services include:

Psychological Evaluation and Assessment:

Psychological assessment/evaluation is the systematic collection, organization, and interpretation of information about a person and their situations, and the prediction of their behaviour (Gather, 1968).

The purpose of psychological evaluation/assessment in general is to provide information on which important decisions can be made either within the clinical setting, justice system or an organization. Assessment help in coming up with answers about one's state of mind before, during and after commission of an offence and whether a witness testimony or confessions are reliable or not. Assessment helps to ascertain a litigant's mental status during investigation or trial. This report of the assessment or testimony is aimed at helping judicial decision makers in reaching a just sentence for or against a litigant.

Psychological evaluations/assessment done by psychologist within the justice system includes the following:

Criminal Responsibility/Mental State Assessment:

In the justice system especially the criminal justice system, a sentence of guilty or acquittal for a crime can only be passed on a litigant only when the case and evidence for or against the person is proven with sufficient evidence and beyond reasonable doubt that the accused actually committed or did not commits the said crime. The prosecutor must be able to prove to the court that all elements of crime are fully in place at the point of commission of the crime. In addition, the prosecutor must be able to prove with sufficient and credible evidence to that effect.

A guilty sentence can be passed on an accused only when the two elements of crime are proven to be available, they are;

- i. Actus Reus (criminal Act) there must be presence of an unlawful act of omission or commission that is prescribed as crime by the law. There must be evidence of a crime scene in case of murder, armed robbery etc.
- ii. Mens Rea (Guilty Mind) this looks at the mental state of the person accused of the crime especially before and during the crime. Whether the suspect acted voluntarily, purposefully or intentionally. This looks at the fact whether the person understands the gravity of the crime he committed and its implication. To obtain a conviction, the prosecutor must prove that the accused actually committed the said crime with evidence and that the person is in his/her right frame of mind and committed the crime willfully with full knowledge of the crime implication.

This simply means that a litigant can be convicted of crime only when a prosecutor can prove beyond reasonable doubt that the litigant actually committed the guilty act accompanied by a guilty mindset (Wikipedia.com, 2016).

It is easy for one to say or observe a criminal act but a criminal mind or reason behind a crime is often difficult to be ascertained by a layman through guess work or common sense due to the fact that criminal act must be accompanied with mental component such as motive and intent. Psychologists are often invited to assess a litigant's mental state at the point of commission of offence. This is due to the fact that determination of mental and emotional status of a litigant is beyond the academic and professional scope of a judicial officer. Psychologists assess the litigant to determine whether mentally he/she is criminally responsible for the crime accused of. Assessment especially a valid and reliable one is conducted to determine the legal sanity of the person standing trial, i.e. Whether the person understands the gravity of what he did at the point of committing the crime. The outcome of this assessment helps the court in making judgment.

Psychologists are often called in court to examine a litigant's mental abilities, whether a malfunction in his/her mental state caused the person to be unable to differentiate between right and wrong with reference to the crime charged with (Dixon, 2015). For a defendant to be exonerated of a crime by reason of insanity, a psychological assessment must prove that, as a result of mental disease or defect the defendant was unable to understand the consequences of his act to himself and on others, it must further prove that the defendant's mind was affected to such an extent that the person was unable to perceive the nature and quality of the act with which he/she is charged of, or the person was unable to tell right from wrong with reference to the act committed. Psychologists working within the justice system are usually invited to help prove to the court the mental state of one facing trial to avoid wrong judgment or punishing a person for a crime he/she did not willingly commit (Nweze, 2010).

Mental state assessment has helped in exonerating many accused persons. Some through this assessment receive lesser sentences compared to what they may likely have been sentenced when found guilty with no mental disability, this makes many to mangle claiming mental disability so as to receive a lesser sentence. This report and decision of a psychologist

formed through assessment is not just about receiving lighter sentence or proven one to be malingering to have a mental disorder but is all about ensuring that wrong judgment are reduced or totally avoided in our justice system (Dixon, 2015).

Competence to Stand Trial in Court:

This assessment is carried out to ascertain that capability of the litigant to understand the legal charges against him and as well his ability to understand the court language (legal terms) and also to know his right and privileges (Nweze,2010). In this assessment, the psychologist access to the litigant's level of mental and intellectual ability and emotional disposition to testify in court particularly on persons with history or suspected to suffer from mental disability.

Dusky (1960) as cited in Goldstein (2011), express that fitness (competence) for trial is based on whether a defendant is physically and mentally fit to consult with his attorney and communicate with the court, with a reasonable degree of rational understanding and whether he/she has rational as well factual understanding of the proceedings against him. Justice carried out with a litigant not really in tune with court proceedings neither does he has the physical and mental capacity to consult his attorney and to understand the court or contribute in the proceeding will amount to injustice especially when sentence is passed on him with no regard to his mental disability.

Expert Witness/Testimony:

Psychologist are often called to carryout assessment as earlier noted, the expectations of the person that made referral is to get an outcome. In the case of judicial system, the outcome and opinion of the expert are most times accepted as evidence in judicial proceedings. This assessment outcome and expert opinion form part of judicial decision making. It is important to note that witness of fact or lay witnesses may testify only to knowledge they acquired first hand through their senses while an expert gives testimony of his findings based on the application of his knowledge and training and can offer their opinion based on the outcome of his analysis and evaluation. An expert witness is brought to court to help judicial officers make sense out of a behavior that are beyond their professional experience and also where the law does not permits them to operate (Rotgers & Barret, 1999).

Psychologist as an Amicus Briefs:

Amicus Curiae brief literally means ‘‘friends of the court’’. A person acting in this capacity is often a professional who wishes to provide either legal, scientific, technical information to the court to aid it decision. An Amicus is not a party to the case and is not entitled to be heard as a matter of right but as an individual the court grant such a person discretionary leave to file a written brief or orally to provide insight to an issue that the parties to the case may not be able to have because of lack of time, space or expertise.

American Psychological Association (APA) the United State of America Psychological regulatory body have been invited in many occasions. They have as well written several

brief to courts to help clarify on areas misunderstood or misinterpreted by the court. Their brief is meant to inform the courts of the scientific evidence pertaining issues relating to human behavior and mental process.

Therapeutic Service:

A Psychologist working within the justice system provides therapeutic service not just on litigants but as well on lawyers and judges and also to other members of the justice system like the police and correctional institutions. Psychologist counsel and administer psychological therapies to help solve emotional, mental and families' challenges affecting them. Most times psychologists offer therapeutic services to individuals who are compelled by the court to participate in treatment, this may involve couples therapy and assessment of parents before custody is granted. They also carryout rehabilitation service to litigant suffering from addiction and behavioral challenges.

Psychologist as a Consultant:

Psychologist serves a consultancy role within the justice system. Within the legal system, he assists in the structuring of services used to promote and protect the right and privilege of citizens. The lawyers and judges may confer on them on a case or subject matter within the case for a more sound decision. Psychologist consultant educate their clients (which are lawyers and judges) on the insight psychology that can contribute to their cases, conduct research on court related behaviors, how to are influenced by psychological factors and how to equally control these factors to ensure justice prevail.

METHOD

Design

This study adopts survey design. A total of 49 participants were through Purposive sampling method comprising of 42 Lawyers and 7 Magistrates regardless of their marital status, 30 equivalents to 61.2 percent are males while 38.8 percent equivalents to 19 are females. 24 respondents which represent 57.1 percent of the population were called to bar between 1 to 6 years and are regarded as junior lawyers, 18 equivalents to 42 percent were called to bar between 7 – 25 years ago as well referred to as senior lawyers. The age range of the participants falls between 21 to 70 years of age. Participants used in this paper were made up of Judicial Officers, particularly lawyers that have been called to bar and currently practicing and Magistrates of Magistrate courts within Karu and Keffi Local Government Area of Nasarawa State, Nigeria.

Instruments

The instrument used in this research is an adopted structured questionnaire develop by Mackay,(2004) it consist of three sections, A, B,C and section D was develop by British Crime Survey, 2008

Section A: Demographic Information

This section was design to collect demographic information from respondent. It has four items which includes Sex, Year called to Bar, Age and whether the respondent is a Lawyer or a Magistrate

Section B: The perception on the role of Forensic Psychology in Nigeria criminal justices system was develop by Mackay (2004).

The instrument for this study was a modified version of the generic role perception questionnaire (GRPQ) Authored by Dr. Stuart Mackay. The instrument have 20-item tool with a 10-point scale that is used to obtain views of the role of another profession. The roles of other professions, test re--test reliability: correlation coefficient $r = 0.7$. With the content validity verified through consultation with sample group. The statements/questions, scales of measurement, questionnaire layout, format and question ordering was made in conformity to the original instruments of GRPQ.

Section C: The Knowledge of Forensic Psychology for Judicial Officers was develops by Mackay (2004).

This section consists of 16 items measuring the role of Psychology among Judicial Officers. The items were adopted from previous test measuring Knowledge of Psychology and Misconceptions on Psychology as found in studies and published articles of Rosenthal, Soper, Rachal, McKnight, and Price (2004), Adult Knowledge of General Psychology Questionnaires, Taylor and Kowalsky (2004), Knowledge of Psychology Test and also a test published in the works of Reiko (2008), Public Knowledge of Psychology Questionnaire with coefficient validity of 0.78. The above studies were examined and their instruments were compared and adapted to come up with the instrument used in this study titled Role and Knowledge of Psychology Test for Judicial Officers (KOP-JO).

Section D: Effective Justice Administration Questionnaire (EJAQ) develop by British Crime Survey, 2008

This section consists of 13 items that assesses Effective Justice Administration as perceived by Judicial Officers. These items were adapted from the British Crime Survey Questionnaire (British Crime Survey, 2008). Respondent were asked to rate their level of confidence in the effectiveness of the Justice System (the Police, Court and Prisons Service).

Respondent were asked to rate how confident are they in the effectiveness of the Justice system in administering justice or how effective do they think the Justice system is really doing it set objective of administering justice. Each item is scored on a four point Likert Scale, ranging from 4 Very effective or Very confident, 3 Fairly effective or Fairly confident, 2 Not effective or Not confident, and 1 Not effective or confident at all. The reliability strength of the instrument has an internal consistency of 0.83 using KR-20 (Reiko, 2008).

Descriptive statistics of simple percentage was used to analyze participants' demographic data which includes Sex, Age and years of practice. Pearson Correlation statistics was used to analyze the first hypotheses while Independent t-test was used to analyze second and third Hypothesis all at 0.05 level of significant using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

RESULTS

Table 1: Summary of demographic Data of the Participants

VARIABLES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT %
Sex		
Male	30	61.2
Female	19	38.8
TOTAL	49	100
Year Called to Bar		
1 – 6	24	57.1
7 above	18	42.9
TOTAL	49	100
Position		
Lawyers	42	85.7
Magistrate s	7	14.3
TOTAL	49	100

Table 1 shows the summary of frequency and percentage of participants' based on Sex, Years called to Bar and Position whether Lawyer or magistrate. 49 participants were used in this study comprising of lawyers and Magistrates.

Out of the 49 participants of this paper, 30 were male representing 61.2 % while 19 equivalent to 38.8% are female.

To distinguish between senior and junior lawyers, Year called to Bar was collected at an interval level and later categorized into a nominal scale of Senior and Junior lawyers this also help to determine their years of experience. The result shows that 24 of the respondents representing 57.1% has between 1-6 years of experience and are also referred to as Junior Lawyers, while 18 lawyers representing 42.9 have above six years of experience are regarded as senior lawyers.

Position here is used to describe whether the respondent is either a lawyer or magistrate. The table shows that majority of the respondent were lawyers having 42, represent 85 % of the total participants while just 7 magistrates representing 14.3% returned back their filled questionnaires.

The general overview of the participants of this paper shows that, the participants comprises of both lawyers and magistrates. Majority of the respondents were lawyers, as well having

more of junior lawyers with between one to six years of experience also with more of male than females.

The first hypothesis was that there will be a relationship between Judicial Officers Knowledge of Psychology and Perceive Effective Justice Administration.

Table 2: Correlation table showing the relationship between Judicial Officers Knowledge of Psychology and Perceive Effective Justice Administration

Variables	N	M	SD	Df	R	Sig.
Knowledge of Psychology for Judicial Officers	49	38.69	3.11			
				47	0.51	0.725
Effective Justice Administration Questionnaire	49	36.27	5.47			

N=49, r (47)= 0.51, P<0.05).

The Second hypothesis stated that there will be a significant difference between Lawyers and Magistrates in their Knowledge of Psychology.

Table.3: Independent t-test analysis showing the difference Lawyers and Magistrates in their Knowledge of Psychology.

Variables	N	M	SD	Df	t-test	Sig.
Lawyer	42	38.79	3.265			
Magistrate	7	38.14	2.035	47	0.502	0.618

t=0.502, value 0.618 at 0.05 level of significant.

The third hypothesis states that “there will be a significant difference in perception between Junior lawyers and Senior lawyers on the impact of Psychological Knowledge and Effective Justice Administration.

Table .4: showing Difference in perception between Junior lawyers and Senior lawyers on the impact of Psychological Knowledge and Effective Justice Administration.

Variables	N	M	SD	Df	t-test	Sig.
1-6 Years	29	39.24	2.824			
7-30 Years	20	37.9	3.401	40	1.503	0.140

The result shows that at d.f 40 the t-test value is $t=1.503$ while the significant value is 0.140 at 0.05 level of significant.

DISCUSSION

The result shows a relationship between Judicial Officers Knowledge of Psychology and Perceived Effective Justice Administration. This implies that the Knowledge of Psychology by Judicial Officers will have positive impact in ensuring and enhancing Effective Administration of Justice to the common man. To the best of the researcher's knowledge at the point of carrying out this study, there are no known paper outcomes in line with this, the result indicates that fair, impartial and just upholding of human right regardless of who is involved can effectively be achieved if the judicial officers understand the people involved and the motivation behind their actions. It further agrees with Robbenolt, (2008), who opines that the impartial upholding of right and punishment of wrongs according to rule of law can be enhanced with increase knowledge of human behavior and motivations. Also support Edwin Griswold assertion as cited in Robbenolt, (2008), that legal practice is far more people oriented than just legality of law education and procedure. Furthermore, the result support Justice Stephen Breyer as cited by Foxhall, (2000), who spoke in APA and ABA joint conference that science of Psychology has become part of the legal system, he advocated for the bar, the bench to work together to find out it legitimate role to the legal system. Breyers further asserts that both Psychology and Law should set up structures to help Judges make better decision.

However, the finding is of great importance because it has increased our awareness that psychology and psychologists has an important role to play in the justice system. It has thrown a challenge to the psychologist to intensify in study that addresses the bottle necks in our justice system. Another significant point of this finding is the need for increase participation of psychologist in real legal issues, such as experts witnessing, consultative services or Amicus Curiae to the court and law chambers.

The second hypothesis which states that there will be a significant difference between magistrate and lawyers on their knowledge of psychology was not confirmed. This simply implies that judicial officers regardless of their position have the same or similar level of knowledge about Psychology.

As judges saddled with the “gate keeping” responsibility of determining what goes in and out of court as evidence and witnesses (expert witnesses), their knowledge of Psychology is supposed to be unquestionable. Just as Judge Sheila Murphy cited in Foxhall (2000), noted that lack of inclusion of experts especially Psychologists on the onset of some cases “is causing an implosion in our judicial and correctional System. This result further supports the work of Ojiji (2015) which found that most lawyers know little about what psychology is and what it has for them.

Our justice administration will greatly improve if our lawyers and judges improve their knowledge of human behavior. Just as Robbenolt, (2008), notated, human behavior is central to every aspect of law whether criminal or civil likewise the same knowledge of Psychology is equally needed by both the lawyers and judges who serve as priest and ministers in the temple of justice as they address themselves.

The last hypothesis of this paper which states that there will be significant difference in perception between Junior and Senior Lawyers on the impact of Psychological Knowledge on Effective Justice Administration is confirmed. This means that the higher a Lawyer’s experience in Law practice the greater his understanding of Psychological related matters. This finding corroborate the assertion by Ronnenolt, (2008), who believes that most senior lawyers or experienced lawyers as tagged in the work learns more of psychological knowledge from “cases, finding of psychology in law and legal practices as well as general human behavior through personal study”.

Conclusion/ Recommendation:

Based on the established fact from the paper there was significant relationship between the knowledge of psychology and the justice system, this paper hereby recommends the following.

As a result of low knowledge of psychology by judicial officers which affect effective justice administration, our justice system should employ the services of psychologists as co-teachers in Law departments, law schools, and also as in house experts in law firms and courts to help them in making up their cases and give their expert inputs on cases. Judges should liase with psychologists to give their expert opinion by educating the court about incident and behavior that are beyond their expertise.

There should be a synergy between the two professional regulatory bodies; i.e. Nigeria Psychological Association and Nigeria Bar Association to facilitate mutual professional co-operation.

Finally, Psychologists must work to sell their skills, knowledge and paperes beyond the four-walls of the classroom, and the clinical setting to the justice system. They must prove their worth by investing their time, energy and resources to real legal and social issues bordering our country. Nigerian Psychologist needs to actively support the ongoing effort of the Nigeria Psychological Association to urgently put in place legal sanctioned mechanisms

for regulating the teaching and practice of psychology in Nigeria as recommended by Ojji, (2015).

REFERENCES

- British Crime Survey. (2008). *Fairness and Effectiveness in the criminal Justice System: development of Questions for the British Crime Survey.*
- Clarkson, P. (1987). Peace & the social responsibility of the integrated adult. *Institute of Transactional Analysis News*, 15, p. 4.
- Dambazau, A.B. (1994) *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 2nd Edition. Ibadan: University Press.
- Desky, B.(1980). *Changing the Public Attitude toward Psychology.* University of Wollongong thesis collection retrieved from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/thesis/1650>
- Dixon, D. (2015). *Psychology in the courtroom.* Retrieved from <http://nwforensic.Psychology.com/wordpress/articles-media/paper-publications>.
- Foxhall, K. (2000). *Bringing Law and Psychology Together.* Retrieved from www.papergate.net/post/howimportant-is-psychology-for-legal-sciences
- Gather, L. (1968) Public Perception of Psychology and Mental health related problem,
- Goldstein, K. (2011). Fallible Eyewitness Memory and Identification. In, L. C. Prain. (Eds). *Conviction of the Innocent.* APA, Washington, DC .
- Lahey, S.K. (2009). *Living in Social World, Advanced Social Psychology.* Retrieved from [www.users.miamioh.edu/Shermarc/P324 bias.html](http://www.users.miamioh.edu/Shermarc/P324%20bias.html)
- Mefor, P.C. (2014). Challenges and Prospects of Psychology in Nigeria. *European Journal of Social Science.* Vol 2
- Nweze, A. (2010). The Role of Psychology in Contemporary Criminal Justice System Development. *Paper Presented at Annual Conference of Nigerian Psychology Association,* Nasarawa State University Keffi.
- Ojji O. O. (2015). Fifty Years of Psychology in Nigeria: Are we Still Teaching Science or Folktaels? *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Science*, 8(2),99-110
- Onimajesin, S.I. (2009). ‘Criminal Justice System in Nigeria – An Appraisal’. In R.O.Lasisi and J.O.Fayeye (ed) *Leading Issues in General Studies: Humanities and social sciences.* Review 1(2). 195-205.

- Orakwe I.W. (2005). 'Killing the Nigerian Prisons through Prosecutorial Ineptitude.' *The Reformer*, 2 (1): 45 – 48. Abuja: Nigerian Prisons Service
- Reiko, D. (2008). Misconceptions about psychology among introductory psychology students. *Teaching of Psychology*, 4, 138–141.
- Robbennolt, J.R. & Matthew, T.(2008). *Can Judges Determine Their own Impartiality?*
- Robbenolt, J. R. (2015). *Lessons for lawyers*. Retrieved from www.apa.org/monitor/2012/11/lawyers.aspx
- Rosch, D. & Lart, A (2001). Misconceptions About Psychology Among Introductory Psychology Students. *Teaching of Psychology*, 4, 138–141.
- Rotger, M., & Barret, K. (2011). *Forensic & Legal Psychology: Psychological Science Applied to Law*. New York, Worth Publishers
- Rosenthal, G.T., Soper, B., Rachal, C., McKnight, R.R.& Price, A.W.(2004). Profession of Psychology Scale: Sophisticated and Naïve Student's Responses. *ProQuest Psychological Journal*. 31 (3) p202
- Singer, A.(2011). *Using Psychology to Win in Court*. Retrieved From <http://www.trialconsultants.com/library/using-psychology-to-win-in-court/html>
- Sternlight, J. R & Robbennolt, J. K. (2015). *Psychology and Effective Layering: Insight for Legal Educators*. Retrieved from www.scholars.law.unlv.edu/facpub/921
- Sternlight, J. R. (2010). *.Psychology for Lawyers; Understanding the Human Factors in Negotiation and Decision Making*. Retrieved from [Htti//scholars.law.unlv.edu./book](http://scholars.law.unlv.edu/book)
- Stuart Mackay (2004). Senior Lecturer & Head of the Directorate of Medical Imaging & Radiotherapy, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, The University of Liverpool, United Kingdom (UK).
- Taylor, A. K., & Kowalski, P. (2004). Naive psychological science: The prevalence, strength and sources of misconceptions. *The Psychological Record*, 54, 15–25
- Zoysa, P. & Shackel, R. (2011). A Point of View: The Use of Psychology in the Administration of Justice in Sri Lanka: *Sri Lanka Journal of Forensic Medicine, Science & Law*. Vol. 2.
- Wikipedean.com, 2015.