



## **Comparative Study of Embarrassability and Emotional Intelligence among Recidivist and Non-Recidivist**

**Amala Josephine Emekpo<sup>1</sup>, Harry Obi-Nwosu<sup>1</sup>, Okechukwu Christian Onuoha<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

Corresponding author: Amala Josephine Emekpo

Email: [amynancy82@yahoo.com](mailto:amynancy82@yahoo.com)

### **Abstract**

Criminality is one of the problematic threats to human existence and is hydra-headed and spreads across different social groups. Hence, this study that comparatively studied Embarrassability and Emotional Intelligence on Recidivists and non-Recidivist inmates in Anambra State Nigeria. That involved 240 inmates; 120 recidivist and 120 non-recidivist from two different prisons. Stratified random sampling technique (hand draw) was utilized in the selection of the participants. Among the 240 participants, 200 were male while 40 were female. Their age ranged from 18 to 60 years with mean age of 31.21 and standard deviation of 9.73. Two instruments, namely: Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale (SES) and Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) were used for data collection. Ex-post facto research design was used for the study while independent t-test was applied as statistical tool to analysis the data in line with the test hypotheses. The first hypothesis of the study was confirmed at ( $t(238) = 2.18, p < .05$ ); indicting that recidivist showed significant lower embarrassability compared to non-recidivist. The second hypothesis was also confirmed at ( $t(238) = 7.99, p < .05$ ); indicating that non-recidivists are more emotionally intelligent than recidivists. From the research findings, it was recommended among many others that there is need to develop psychological intervention that can improve the emotional intelligence of inmates; thus, the need for psychological services in Nigerian prisons.

**Keywords:** Embarrassability, emotional intelligence, recidivist and non-recidivist

## Introduction

Criminality is one of the problematic threats to human existence; it is hydra-headed and spreads across different social groups. Truthfully, people of different ages, races, backgrounds as well as religious inclinations are affected by criminality in its different forms; and could as well engage in crime at different occasion or in a different mood. Curbing this reality of criminality that stares humanity at the face brought about huge budgetary allocations to security across the globe. For instance, Udomma, (2018) revealed that Nigeria has spent over 75 billion Naira for the growing number of internal security issues. Researchers have continued to search for possible solutions to criminality and most research have centred among others on 'ways' to catch the offender as well as strategies on how to defined crime targets (Obi-Nwosu et al., 2014). It is also the interest of forensic psychology, to understand the motivations for crime, personal characteristics of criminals and victims, as well as defendants, so as to be able to investigate and solve crime. This perspective makes the understanding of salient personal qualities of offenders important as well as a research interest of note.

Haralambos and Holborn (2008), stressed that crime is inevitable and a normal aspect of social life; as such, an integral part of all healthy societies. However, its functionality in a society such as Nigeria has to be viewed seriously because of the social and psychological problems it has caused many victims. In fact, no matter the functionality of crime in the society, the act of crime is condemnable and unacceptable in a healthy society, no matter the justification criminals may present. In the 1970s, the popular crimes that were prevalent in Nigeria include: armed robbery, stealing, assault, burglary, rape etc; but today, terrorism, bomb blasts, kidnapping, drug trafficking, money laundry, child trafficking, assassinations and other criminal activities have become the order of the day. Ekhomu (2010), noted that Nigeria was beset with myriad of security challenges such as kidnapping, terrorism, civil disturbance, political violence, fraud, assassination, armed robbery, etc. In spite of stringent laws and punishments to check these crimes, they have continued to be on the increase with the police seemingly helpless and incapable of savaging the situation.

Federal Ministry of Finance Nigeria (2014) stated that crime remains a threat to budget implementation, achievement of Millennium Development Goals and Vision 20: 2020 in Nigeria. By definition, crime is any culpable action or omission prohibited by law and punished by the state; and could also be seen as deviant behaviour that violates prevailing norms which include: cultural norms, social, political, economic norms, etc. Crime could as well be seen as an act that violates the law of the society or serious offence against the law of the society for which there is a severe punishment. This would mean that a criminal should be seen as any person who breaks any of the rules, social norms or behaves in a way contrary to the standard in which the society is governed and has the possibility of affecting the wellbeing of other members of the society (Roth 2006).

Crime occurs in every aspect of human endeavour and is perpetrated by both young and old, male and female, literate and illiterate, religious and atheists, leaders and followers,

government and governed as well as members of the law enforcement agents (Animasahun, 2008; Pakes and Pakes, 2009; Olukoya, 2011; Oyebiyi, 2011). Based on this fact, Criminal behaviour is a common phenomenon in every society, but certain societies have recorded higher percentages of criminal activities than others. Nonetheless, the problem of crime and criminal activity is constantly growing in a sporadic dimension (Ajibola, 2004).

According to crime statistics by the Nigeria Police (2005), crime has shown an upward trend in the past years in Nigeria; also, the problem of criminality in Nigeria has assumed a serious dimension despite the fact that official statistics down play the problem to a minimal level. This situation may explain why affluent people have resorted to hiring private security personal which was previously not so. Additionally, as a result of the crime situation, the confidence people used to have in the law enforce agency especially in the prevention and control of crime has waned considerably. Tenibiaje and Owuamanam (2005), opined that the upward trend in crime rate in Nigeria was not limited to male criminality but also including female gender. These criminal behaviours or criminal tendencies have some undertones which could involve personality traits as well as emotional disposition.

All efforts to combat crime have not really yielded much positive result, possibly because the root of crime has not been properly attended to. For instance, reports worldwide indicates that on any given day, there are plenty of crime stories in the media. However, Pakes and Pakes (2009), stressed that most of the news report indicates that the criminal justice system cannot mitigate the rising rate of crime alone; thus, the need for psychological intervention. Similarly, Aremu (2007), reported that rarely does an evening pass in which the locally televised nightly news does not provide coverage of at least one shocking and disturbing act of criminal violence involving juveniles and youths. Hence, necessitated the need to examine some psychological qualities such as embarrassability and emotional intelligence as psychological factors that could impact crime and crime avoidance.

Indeed, some scholars such as Nweke et al., (2024) investigated some personalities attributed to criminality and made interesting and useful discovery, especially in respect to offenders profiling. However, since the interest of forensic psychology involves preventing and solving crime, it is imperative that some salient personal traits of individuals be studied in respect to crime; so that it may be possible to attach special security importance to some people, as well as improve existing literature concerning profiling of criminals. In this regard, there is paucity of studies to the best of the researchers' knowledge; specifically in respect to the relationship between embarrassability, emotional intelligence and crime. Thus, this study intends to close the gap and enrich existing knowledge by examining the difference between recidivist and non-recidivist on embarrassability and emotional intelligence.

Embarrassability according to APA (2007) is a self-conscious emotion in which a person feels awkward and flustered in other people's company or because of attention of others, for example, when being observed engaging in actions that are subject to mild disapproval from others. It often has an element of self-deprecating humor and is typically

characterized by nervous laughter, a shy smile, or blushing. The definition above suggested that how people experience embarrassment differs; as such, different situations embarrass people differently and at different level; depending on the personality of the individual, emotional intelligence as well as other psychological variables. In addition, embarrassability is the propensity for an individual to experience embarrassment and has been frequently acknowledged as an important personality characteristic. While some people are easily and frequently embarrassed, others may not be affected by even major violations of decorum. This is to show that some crime offenders may experience less embarrassment as a result of his/her behaviour than others (Miller, 2010).

According to Wikipedia, (2018), embarrassment is an emotional state that is associated with moderate to high levels of discomfort, and is usually experienced when someone has acted in a way that is socially unacceptable or frowned-upon and was witnessed by or revealed to others. Usually, some perception of loss of honour or dignity is involved, but the embarrassment level and the type depends on the situation. Thus, embarrassments of crime offenders are usually associated with societal condemnation, loss of dignity and honour, sometime loss of freedom etc. Embarrassment is similar to shame in some sense, except that shame may be experienced for an act known only to oneself. (Wikipedia, 2018) Also, embarrassment usually carries the connotation of being caused by an act that is merely socially unacceptable, rather than morally wrong.

APA (2007) stressed that susceptibility to embarrassment, or embarrassability, is a trait closely related to social anxiety and has demonstrated associations with loneliness, anxiety and depression. Several theories of embarrassment have been proposed, suggesting antecedents such as transgression of personal standards and uncertainty about how to proceed socially following an unexpected disruption. An additional theory that has received considerable attention is social evaluation theory. This suggests that embarrassment directly results primarily from an acute concern over others' evaluations (Miller, 2010). The social evaluation model fundamentally proposes that two components are necessary to produce embarrassment: the perception of negative evaluation from others (e.g. following a self-presentational failure) and fear of such negative evaluation (Leary & Kowalski, 1995). Moreover, individual differences in fear of negative evaluation have been consistently associated with embarrassability (Miller et al., 2009). Experientially, embarrassment is characterized by feelings of awkwardness, foolishness, chagrin and a heightened self-awareness (Keltner & Anderson, 2000). Thus, vulnerability to this type of embarrassment has typically been labeled 'empathic' or 'vicarious' embarrassability. Although this characterization tends to support an 'avoidance' model of embarrassment; however, theories of emotions are also clear in offering a more differentiated picture.

Emotions theory suggested that emotions such as embarrassment, shame and guilt may serve as social regulators by motivating prosaically acceptable behaviours that prevent their occurrence (Frijda 2001). Simply put, embarrassment may also lead individuals to engage in health behaviours in response to inappropriate behaviours that are already embarrassing or because they fear being embarrassed for undertaken in an inappropriate behaviour. However, embarrassment, like fear, is not a unidimensional construct with simple links to outcome (Consedine et al., 2004).

Generally, embarrassment is a complex phenomenon involving simultaneous concerns about bodily inadequacy and negative social judgments and is likely that these components may relate differently to behavioural outcome. It is pertinent to know that embarrassment is associated with negative emotions about the self as a result of self-reflection and evaluation, brought forth by a deviation from social standards (Tangney, 2003). Thus, the observed negative relationships and problem behaviours among inmates in Nigeria could be a reflection of lack of emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence as one of the study variables evolved from Thorndike (1920) concept of 'Social Intelligence' which was later coined as Emotional intelligence by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and defined as the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own feelings and emotions as well as that of others' with the ability to discriminate among them as well as to use rational information to guide one's thinking and action. It involves the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understanding and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in self and others (Mayer et al., 2000) it could as well be seen as the capability of an individual to recognize his or her own emotions as well as those of others as well as the ability to distinguish between different feelings, and label them appropriately, use emotional information to guide thinking and behaviour, and manage and/or adjust emotions to adapt to environment or to achieve one's goals (Colman & Andrew, 2008)

Emotional intelligence has been argued to be a key ability for effective functioning in everyday life and successful management of social relationships. As such, certain levels of emotional intelligence would help prisoners to be well adjusted in prison and would create certain level of happiness and productivity. High emotional intelligent has been associated with better social support and fewer interpersonal problems (Schutte et al., 2001) Brackett et al., (2004) opined that it helps in stress management, lowers incidence of violence and drug problems, particularly in males (Brackett et al., 2004); and have positive health outcomes (Martins et al., 2010). Notably, the perception and use of emotional information are abilities that is beyond general intelligence; it allows individuals to better manage their interpersonal relationships (Mayer et al., 2008).

Saying that issues of emotional intelligent is more pronounced among prison inmates in Nigeria is not surprising; in the sense that when people are imprisoned, their freedom is curtailed. This lack of liberty can lead to different types of reactions such as frustration, anger, anxiety and depression. Similarly, Haney (2003) observed that during incarceration, prisoners often develop a wide range of psychological disorders such as depression and anxiety. Unlike people who are not imprisoned, the option of dealing with emotionality is limited among prisoners (Osinowo, 1999). It can take the form of isolation, being uncommunicative, hostility or refusing to eat or work. However, prison inmates who are emotionally intelligent may enjoy life better than those with low level of emotional intelligence. This is because they possess the ability to understand, repair, control, and manage their emotion and the emotion of others as well as cope or adapt well to stressful environment without falling apart (Freudenthaler & Neubauer 2005).

Theoretically, this work anchored on personal standard theory by Salovey's (1997) which stated that individuals define themselves in terms of a specific persona; including a set of

personal standards of conduct important to the person, consisting of underlying beliefs, values, attitudes, concerns, and abilities that the individual deems crucial to his or her self-image. Hence, behaving in a way contrary to the perception of self-image stimulates a sense of self embarrassment and such evaluation of one's behaviour in line with the perception self-image requires some levels of emotional intelligence. This association between embarrassability and emotional intelligence is as well confirmed by Caruso and Salovey (2004) that opined that the part of the brain that regulates emotion is vital in thinking, reasoning as well as intelligence. As such, in order for one to be embarrassed for their misbehavior, there must be some level of emotional intelligence.

Some empirical findings that are related to the study variably (embarrassability and emotional intelligence) such as: Animasahun (2010); Ermer et al (2012); Ugoani (2015) indicated that emotional intelligence is important in understanding psychopathology. Also, that there is a relationship between emotional intelligence and inmates adjustment as well as personality stability. Furthermore, Nweke et al., (2024) observed an association between emotional regulation and offenders' status. On the other hand, Obi-Nwosu et al., (2014) observed a negative relationship between embarrassability and examination misconduct.

### **Hypothesis**

1. Recidivists' will show significantly lower embarrassability than non-recidivists.
2. Recidivists' will show significantly lower emotional intelligent than non-recidivists.

### **Participants**

The participants for this study were two hundred and fourth (240) recidivists and non-recidivist inmates. They comprised of 120 (60 recidivists and 60 non-recidivist) participants selected from the Amobia prison and 120 (60 recidivists and 60 non-recidivists) participants selected from the Onitsha prison respectively. They were selected through the use of stratified random sampling technique (hand draw) and were made up of 200 (67.1%) males and 40 (32.9%) females randomly selected from two prisons in Anambra state Nigeria. Their ages ranged from 18 to 60 years, with the mean age of 31.21 and standard deviation of 9.73 years.

### **Inclusion Criteria**

The participants must be literate in Igbo and English language and must have a minimum of SSCE. Also, must be an inmate in either of the selected prison (Amobia or Onitsha prison).

### **Instruments**

Two sets of instruments were used in this study for data collection they include: Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale (SES) developed by Kelly and Jones (1997), and Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) developed by (Schutte et al., 1998).

### **Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale (SES)**

The Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale is a 25-item instrument developed by Kelly and Jones (1997) which uses personality trait-based statements, rather than situations, to measure a person's vulnerability to embarrassment. It was scored on a 7-point likert scale; (1- completely disagree to 7- completely agree). Some of the items were scored in reverse direction to ensure consistency (4, 18 and 25). The score range for the susceptibility to embarrassment scale is 25 to 175. The mean score for college students is 92, with higher scores indicating higher degrees of embarrassability. The developers reported a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.92. Over an 8-week interval, the test-retest correlation of 0.64 was found and a convergent validity of 0.66 was found between SES and Modigliani's Embarrassability Scale. Also, a divergent validity of .07 was found between SES and emotional empathy (Kelly & Jones, 1997). The out-put of the pilot study yielded a reliability coefficient of .71 indicating that the instrument is reliable and can be used for data collection.

### **Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS)**

Self-Report Emotional Intelligence (SSREI) scale developed by Schutte, et al, (1998) was also used for data collection. The SSREI comprised of 33 items; of which three items (5, 28 and 33) are reverse scored. The items contain 5-point Likert Scale items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), a total score was derived by summing up the item responses. The mean score across many large samples is about 124, with a standard deviation of about 13. So, scores below 111 or above 137 are unusually low or high. The scale has demonstrated high internal consistency with Cronbach alpha ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.81 - 0.90, and a two-week test-retest reliability coefficient ( $r$ ) = 0.78. It was observed from the pilot study that the instrument is reliable and fit for data collection; with a reliability coefficient of .70.

### **Pilot test of the instruments**

An introduction letter was collected from the HOD of psychology department, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka for a formal introduction of the researchers to the administration of Nnewi prison. With the aid of the introduction letter and the permission letter from the controller general, approval for data collection was giving to the researchers; with a date agreed upon for the actual exercise. The researchers went to Nnewi prison on the agreed day and a prison warden was assigned to the researchers to help facilitate the data collection. The instruments (Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale and Emotional Intelligence) was administered on 50 inmates that were conveniently selected. However, 47 copies were returned while 40 properly filled copies were selected and used for analysis. The participants were made up of 27 males and 13 females with age range from 18 to 60 years and a mean age of 33.23 (SD=10.03).

From the data analysis, the reliability coefficient of .71 was obtained for Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale; while the Emotional Intelligence Scale yielded a reliability coefficient of .70. Therefore, all measures tested indicated a high reliability coefficient which implies that the instruments are suitable for the study.

### **Procedure**

The researchers obtained an introductory letter from the Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka seeking for permission to conduct a study at the various prisons (Nnewi prison, Amobia prison and Onitsha prison). A letter of permission was obtained from the Controller General of Prisons in Nigeria (Awka) to carry out the research work at the stipulated Prisons in Anambra State. Letters were sent to the Deputy Controllers of the selected Prison so as to allow the researchers to administer the questionnaires. After obtaining permission from the prison authority, with the help of the prison warder assigned to the researchers, various cell provost assistance was solicited for. The prison warder called out the inmates from their respective cells after which, the researcher informed them on the reason and nature of the study as well as solicited volunteers to put down their names which was used for random sampling of the actual participants for the study. The researchers made clarification for questions that arose and assured the participants of the confidentiality of their responses as well as encouraged them to make their responses as honest as possible. Thereafter, the questionnaires which contain demographic information; including how many sentences they have served, were distributed to them and there was no time limit for any participant. Thus, the researcher ensured that the participants completed their questionnaire. The study lasted for a period of two weeks; one week for each prison. At the end of the exercise, the researcher appreciated the participants and the warder that assisted and left the prisons with the stimulus materials for scoring and analysis.

### Design/Statistics

The Ex-post facto research design was used for the study. While an independent t-test was applied as statistical tool for the analysis of the data in order to test the hypotheses.

### Results

**Table 1:** Summary table of descriptive statistics on embarrassibility and emotional intelligence among recidivists and non-recidivists

| PARTICIPANTS            |                 | N   | Mean  | S.D   | Std. Error |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----|-------|-------|------------|
|                         |                 |     |       |       | Mean       |
| EMBARRASSIBILITY        | NON-RECIDIVISTS | 120 | 94.65 | 28.10 | 2.57       |
|                         | RECIDIVISTS     | 120 | 64.53 | 30.27 | 2.76       |
| EMOTIONAL_ INTELLIGENCE | NON RECIDIVISTS | 120 | 68.18 | 49.38 | 4.51       |
|                         | RECIDIVISTS     | 120 | 54.92 | 44.83 | 4.09       |

Table 1 above, showed that non-recidivists reported numerically high mean ( $M = 94.65$ ,  $SD = 28.10$ ) on embarrassibility than recidivists ( $M = 64.53$ ,  $SD = 30.27$ ). Also, non-recidivist showed numerically high mean ( $M = 68.18$ ,  $SD = 49.38$ ) on emotional intelligence than recidivist ( $M = 54.92$ ,  $SD = 44.83$ ). Thus, the means scores above revealed that there is a variation on the level of embarrassibility and emotional intelligence among recidivists and non-recidivists.



**Tables 2: Summary table of Independent Samples Test**

|                        |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      |      |        |                 |                 |                       |  |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|
|                        |                             | F                                       | Sig. | T    | Df     | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference |  |
| EMBARRASSIBILITY       | Equal variances assumed     | 14.80                                   | .000 | 7.99 | 238    | .000            | 30.12           | 3.77                  |  |
|                        | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 7.99 | 236.70 | .000            | 30.12           | 3.77                  |  |
| EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE | Equal variances assumed     | 9.04                                    | .003 | 2.18 | 238    | .030            | 13.26           | 6.09                  |  |
|                        | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 2.18 | 235.81 | .030            | 13.26           | 6.09                  |  |

Table 2 above, reported the independent sample t-test on embarrassment and emotional intelligence. Thus, the hypothesis 1 which stated that recidivists will show significantly lower embarrassment than non-recidivists was accepted ( $t(238) = 2.18, p < .05$ ). This means that recidivists showed lower embarrassment than non-recidivists. Furthermore, Hypothesis 2 which stated that recidivists will show significantly lower emotional intelligence than non-recidivist was confirmed ( $t(238) = 7.99, p < .05$ ). This indicated that non-recidivists are more emotionally intelligent than recidivists.

## Discussion

This research systematically examined the comparative study of embarrassment and emotional intelligence among recidivists and non-recidivists. The objectives of this study were confirmed as the two hypotheses postulated were tested.

The first hypothesis of the study was accepted which indicated that recidivists are less likely to show feelings of embarrassment than non-recidivist. However, this result is in consonant with the findings of other researchers such as Obi-Nwosu et al., (2014), who found that embarrassment have a negative correlation with examination misconduct, that is, as embarrassment increases, examination misconduct decreases. The finding of this present study was in tandem with the empirical work of Thompson (2014), who found that common mechanisms could underlie Personal Embarrassibility and Vicarious Embarrassibility, but that a negative perception and heightened awareness of one's social image could confer a unique vulnerability to Personal Embarrassibility.

The second hypothesis of the study was as well accepted indicating that recidivists are actually low on emotional intelligence than non-recidivists. However, this finding was in consistent with the result of Animasahun (2010), who found a significant positive correlation between prison adjustment with emotional intelligence, spiritual intelligence and intelligent quotient. Animasahun proposed that emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence skills are far more important than intelligent quotient in crime regulation. The result from Batool and Khalid (2011) also supported the findings of this present study by demonstrating that people who are involved in self-destructive behaviours are found to have lower emotional intelligence. Ermer et al., (2012) found out that individuals with psychopathy are impaired on a range of emotional intelligence abilities and that emotional intelligence is an important area for understanding deficits in psychopathy. Moreover, Afolabi (2013) observed that those with higher emotional intelligence were involved in positive outcomes like prosocial behaviour, parental warmth with good peer and family relations. Ugoani (2015) also found a strong positive relationship between emotional intelligence and personality stability. Furthermore, Nweke et al., (2024) observed that emotional regulation (cognitive appraisal significantly predicted offenders' status (recidivism and non-recidivism); tough cognitive suppression was not associated with an increase in offenders status.

### **Implication of the Study**

This present study validates the theoretical framework of the study which is of the view that discrepancy in a person's action and self- image triggers the negative emotion known as embarrassability but not in the absence of emotional intelligence. Hence, the finding that observed that recidivists are low on emarrassability as well as emotional intelligence compare to non-recidivists. As such, the novel literature and empirical findings in this study could be used to further develop the theoretical framework of the study.

Being that recidivist are low on embarrassability and emotional intelligence, incarceration as well as public humiliation alone will not resolve or reduce the rate of crime and recidivism; rather, introduction of programs and activities that can enhance the emotional intelligence of criminals.

It is also important that policy makers should corroborate with psychologist on the introduction of psychological assessment and intervention in Nigerian prisons as well as making psychological services accessible for inmates since the observed factors (embarrassability and emotional intelligence) are more of a psychological factor. Furthermore, psychologist should be among the correctional team in every prisons in Nigeria.

### **Limitation of the Study**

Since this study is not a pure experimental study that have the potency of establishing cause and effect rather, utilized self-report questionnaires. Some of the participant might be faking their responses; hence, could affect the out-come of the research. However, before the administration of the questionnaires, they were assured of the confidentiality of their identity and were told that their identity is not needed. Thus, would increase the generalizability of the findings.

## Recommendations

The recommendations are made in line with the findings of this study

1. Prison inmates should be exposed to emotional intelligence training on a regular basis, this would help to stem those who would likely go back to crime.
2. More emphasis should be placed on re-educating the inmates on the need to control their emotion (angry) on crime provoking situations and also, people who demonstrate high level of emotional intelligence and embarrassibility should be properly encouraged.
3. Psychological services are highly recommended in Nigerian prisons. Thus, the need to develop psychological intervention that can improve their emotional intelligence.
4. Finally, government, non-governmental agencies and the general public should embark on youth empowerment programs that would alleviate poverty at least to the barest minimum while enhancing their young minds and directing them towards better and rewarding activities.

## Suggestion for Future Studies

Researchers are urged to ascertain the ecological validity of the present study by replicating this study in a different geopolitical zone. In the course of further studies, researchers should consider individuals' family background, employment status, parental upbringing, urban and rural factor, and possibly socioeconomic status of the participants; this would help to identify the actual reasons for committing crime.

## Conclusion

This research examined the comparative study of embarrassibility and emotional intelligence among recidivists and non-recidivist. Following the objectives of this study, two hypotheses were postulated and tested in this study. The first hypothesis was accepted, indicating that recidivists differ significantly than non-recidivists on embarrassibility. The second hypothesis was also accepted, meaning that recidivists are low in emotional intelligent than non-recidivists. Hence, the researcher hereby concluded that personality trait of embarrassibility and emotional intelligent are significant factors that can influence crime.

## References

- Afolabi, O. A. (2013). Roles of Personality Types, Emotional Intelligence and Gender Differences on Prosocial Behavior. *Psychological Thought*, 6(1), 124–139.
- Anderson, R., Barton, C., Bölme, R., Clayton, R., Ganán, C., Grasso, T., & Vasek, M. (2019). Measuring the changing cost of cybercrime. *Accepted Post-Print Version Cardiff University*.

Animasahun, R. A. (2010). Intelligent Quotient, Emotional Intelligence and Spiritual Intelligence as Correlates of Prison Adjustment among Inmates in Nigeria Prisons. *Journal of social science*, 22(2): 121-128.

Animasahun, R., A. (2010) Intelligent Quotient, Emotional Intelligence and Spiritual Intelligence as Correlates of Prison Adjustment among Inmates in Nigeria Prisons. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 22(2):121-128.

APA (2007), *APA dictionary of psychology*, American Psychological Association, Washington DC.

Aremu, A. O. (2007). The Nigeria Police and zero corruption tolerance: the function of emotional intelligence. *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal*, 15(1): 193-212

Batool, S. S., & Khalid, R. (2011). Development of Indigenous Scale of Emotional Intelligence and evaluation of its psychometric properties. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 9, 66-72.

Brackett, M. A., Mayer, J. D., & Warner, R. M. (2004). Emotional intelligence and its relation to everyday behaviour. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 36(6):1387-1402.

Brackett, M. A., Mayer, J. D., & Warner, R. M. (2004). Emotional intelligence and its relation to everyday behaviour. *Personality and Individual differences*, 36(6), 1387-1402.

Caruso, D.R. & Salovey, P. (2004). *The emotionally intelligent manager: how to develop and use the four key emotional skills of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Colman & Andrew (2008) Emotional Intelligence: A Comparative study on Age and Gender Differences. *International journal of basic and applied research*. 8(9):1-12

Consedine, N., Magai, C., & Neugut, A., I (2004) the contribution of emotional characteristics to breast cancer screening among women from six ethnic groups. *Preventive Medicine*. 38(1):64-77

Ekhomu, O. (2010) *Boko Haram Security Considerations and the Rise of an Insurgency*. Routledge  
emotional actions readiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 212-228.

Ermer, E., Kahn, R. E., Salovey, P., & Kiehl, K. A. (2012). Emotional intelligence in incarcerated men with psychopathic traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(1), 194-204

Federal Ministry of Finance Nigeria (2014) Budget Documents. *Citizen's Portal*

- 
- Freudenthaler, H. H., & Neubauer, A. C. (2005). Emotional intelligence: The convergent and discriminant validities of intra-and interpersonal emotional abilities. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 39(3), 569-579.
- Frijda, N. H., Kuipers, P., & ter Schure, E. (1989). Relations among emotion, appraisal and Adolescents in Nigeria. *Advances in Applied Psychology*, 1, (2): 135-144.
- Haney C. 2003. Mental health issues in long-term solitary and “supermax” confinement. *Crime Delinquent*. 49:124–56
- Haralambos, M., & Holborn, M. (2008) *Sociology Themes and Perspectives: New 7th Edition*; HarperCollins UK
- Kelly, K.M., & Jones, W.H. (1997). Assessment of Dispositional Embarrassability. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*; 10, 307-333.
- Keltner, D., & Anderson, C. (2000). Saving face for Darwin: The functions and uses of embarrassment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 9(6), 187–192.
- Kihlstrom JF, Cantor N. *Social Intelligence*. In: Sternberg RJ, ed. The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence. Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology. Cambridge University Press.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1995). *Social anxiety*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Martins, A., Ramalho, N., C., & Morin, E. (2010) A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences* 49(6), 554-564
- Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: emotional intelligence. *Annual review of psychology*, 59, 507–536.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. and Caruso, D.R. (2000) *Models of Emotional Intelligence*. In: Sternberg, R.J., Ed., Handbook of Intelligence, Cambridge University Press,
- Miller, R. S. (2010). *Are embarrassment and social anxiety disorder merely distant cousins, or are they closer kin?* In S. G. Hofmann & P. M. DiBartolo (Eds.), *Social Anxiety: Clinical, Developmental, and Social Perspectives* (pp. 93–118). London, UK:
- Nigeria Police (2005) Nigeria Police Force: *Wikipedia the free encyclopedia*
- Nweke, I., B., Obi-Nwosu, H. & Onuoha, O., C. (2024) Emotional Regulation and Impulsivity as predictors of Offender's Status (Recidivism and Non Recidivism) Among Inmates in Awka correctional service. *Practicum Psychologia*, 13(1), 190-203.

- 
- Obi-Nwosu, H., Ngozi, N. and Osayi, K. (2014), "Embarassability, psychoticism, and tendency to engage in examination misconduct among a Nigerian sample", *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 3(8), 1648-1657.
- Pakes, F. & Pakes, S. (2009) *Criminal Psychology*. Willan Publishing; United Kindom
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990) Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*. 9, 185–211.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., Rhodes, E., & Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(4), 523–536
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25(2), 167–177.
- Tangney, J.P. (2003) *Self-relevant emotions*. In M.R. Leary, and J.P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity*. New York: Guilford Press, 384-400.
- Tenibiaje, D.J. and D.O. Owuamanam, 2005. Personality traits of female inmates in some Nigerian prisons. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 5
- Thompson (2014) Thompson (2014), Personal Embarrassability and Vicarious Embarrassability. *Journal of Individual Differences* 35(1):22-29.
- Udomma, (2018) Press Release from the Ministry of Budget and National planning. *Ministry of Budget and National Planning*
- Ugoani, J. N. N. (2015). Emotional Intelligence and Personality Stability among Urban Adolescents in Nigeria. *Advances in Applied Psychology*, 1(2): 135-144.