Article

Effects of Terrorism Threat Levels Collaborating Stereotypes, Stigmatization and Prejudices on Perceived Interpersonal Social Support in The Reintegration of Ex-Detained Suspected Terrorists into The Community

Monday L V Shammah

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities, University of Johannesburg, 2092 Johannesburg, South Africa

*Corresponding Author: shammahmonday56@gmail.com ; mshammah@uj.ac.za

Abstract: This article gives important information about effects of terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotypes, stigmatization and prejudices on perceived interpersonal social support in the reintegration of ex-detained terrorism suspects into the community. The main aim of this research is to examine what effects is embedded in terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotype, stigmatization and prejudice on perceived social support in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community'?. Sixty participants drawn from Kuchigoro Terrorism Internal Displaced Peoples' Camp (TIDPC), Abuja, Nigeria were used for the study. A modified version of "Interpersonal Social Support Evaluation List: shortened version – 12 items" was used for the collection of data. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data. Results indicated significant effects, $F(5, 54 = 3.223, P = 0.05)$. This means terrorism threat levels collaborates stereotypes, stigmatization and prejudices impact on the type of interpersonal social support given to ex-detained suspected terrorists by members of the Community during their reintegration into the community. It was observed and recommended that, there is dire need of deliberate creation of terrorism education awareness and application of psychological interventions, as well as putting in place a mechanism for the resolution of interpersonal conflicts among members of the community. The study's results imply that, the training programs of Correctional Services Personnel should include rehabilitation and reintegration skills.

Keywords: Terrorism; interpersonal social support; reintegration; ex-detained suspect; stereotypes; stigmatization; prejudices

Introduction
Terrorism remains a fundamental psycho-social issue of our contemporary life, shaping people's interpersonal world-views among members of families, communities and of many nations. It is eroding both national and global modernization and civilization, with profound consequences that intrigued human imagination. The world over, almost every individual, family, community or nation is being gripped by fear of terrorism and fundamentalism. This fear precedes behavioral evidences such as stereotype, stigmatization and prejudices that are almost a destabilizing situation among families, communities, nations and community of nations around the globe, with apparent restriction or total withdrawal of interrelation social support. The condition is becoming worrisome in the theatre of our contemporary society, where people are encountering various challenging social situations precipitating personal decisions and formation of self-directed opinions resulting to certain actions and reactions (attitudes) towards others. (Orakwe, 2011).

Attitudes are a focus of research among psychologists because attitudes play a key role in the interactions among individuals. Attitudes impacts our interpersonal experiences, critical thinking and has become the basis of our psychological field dependent or independent. As such, the proliferation of terrorism detention camps for the intend of interrogating suspects to establish decriminalization as well as institutionalization of legal proceedings against them. Our attitudes defined our beliefs, feelings and dispositions, to the extent of making us form and hold stereotype, stigmatization and prejudices against other members of our society suspected of terrorism activities.

Other authors have defined and conceptualized the aforementioned attitudinal terms in relation to other contextual situations. For example, Colman (2003) defined the term "stereotype" as "relatively fixed and over simplified generalization about a group of people usually housing on negative, unfavorable characteristics, but in cases recognizing the possibility of positive." From the aforementioned definition, stereotype can be either positive or negative. Either positive or negative, Lahey (2004) posited that stereotypes are inherently harmful for three reasons, they take away an individual's ability to treat members of a given group as individual entities, which might easily lead to narrow expectations of their behaviors and subsequently leads to faulty attributions, a posture of attribution theory. In his description of people's behaviors in line with attribution theory, Heider (1958) posited that, people always tend to look for explanations for their own behaviors and those of others. As such, we-all often tend to attribute all behaviors apparently by our mood or behavior. In so doing, our stereotype influences the attribution that we make about another people's behavior. These attributions tend to have the effect of deepening or strengthening our prejudice as we keep "seeing" evidence that "supports" our stereotypes and rejecting evidences that are contrary (Lahey, 2004).

Prejudices are often deeply held negative feelings associated with a group than stereotypes or stigmatization. While stereotypes may be free from value and evaluation (e.g. People from Latin America are Catholics), prejudices are loaded with feelings about what is good and what is bad, what is moral and immoral (e.g. "My religion is the only true one, and my God is the only true God."). Consequently, people with prejudices are very likely to end up with hostile encounters where each side believes that their view is right. When this negative feeling of prejudice is translated into an ability to act, we have discrimination. Yet on the other hand, the term terrorism refers to "reverent of individual liberty" "suspicious of centralized federal authority," "pay with wish" "travel Illogical distances," (U.S Government, 2017). In another development, "terrorism threat level" refers to perceived likelihood of an act of terrorism either by an individual or group.

Ex–detained suspected terrorists refers to any individual previously detained but now released in connection to terrorism issues by any of the law enforcement agency (United Nations Security Council, 2007). From the aforementioned, the U.S Government seemed to think that, every individual, who can fit the description of a "suspected terrorist," can become as such, just because he is reacting to one-single or more of the a fore–mentioned requirements. As such, almost every member of the society is a potential "suspected terrorist" unless he is proved otherwise. Normally, suspected terrorists are detained and interrogated because terrorists posit and recline various serious threat levels to individuals, communities, nations as well as international peace and security, given recent terrorists incidences world-wide.

The period of detention has had several 'effects' on many ex-detained terrorism suspects in their communities. Borzycki (2005); Borzycki and Markkai (2007) reported that, many have lost their livelihoods, their personal belongings, their ability to maintain housing for themselves and their families, they may have lost important personal relationships and may have experienced mental health difficulties or acquired self-destructive habits and attitudes. In the literature information on terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotypes, stigmatization and prejudices on perceived interpersonal social support given by members of the communities towards reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into their communities is limited. It therefore becomes very important to examine the unwelcome attitudes of members of the communities where the ex-detained terrorism suspects are to be reintegrated.

In doing so, we are examining effects of terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotypes, stigmatization and prejudices on perceived interpersonal social support in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into their communities. The research objective is translated into the following question, 'what effects is embedded in terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotype, stigmatization and prejudice on perceived social support in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community'? At the

end, the research question is translated into the following Null hypothesis corresponding the research objective and question is raised to be tested. 'There will be no difference in the effects of terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotype, stigmatization and prejudices among participants on perceived interpersonal social support in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community'.

Literature Review

This and the next section review existing theory and studies in the afore-mentioned area. Here, the contributions of various social scientists to psycho-social aspects of terrorism are discussed. The review acts as a foundation to the issue of terrorism, detention and reintegration into the community. Our study is in line with those of University of Nairobi, The Government of Japan and United Nations Development Programmed –UNDP (2017) and International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague (2012) papers, which both argued realistic programs from an extremist and terrorist background. The authors stressed that, for DE radicalization, rehabilitation or reintegration programs for individuals suspected to be radicalized or violent extremists be considered as being successful, the outcomes should be understood as products of the context in which they are being implemented as well as those of the policy mechanisms. Both studies examine some of the fundamental issues of our study but majorly, through sociological perspectives. Both studies pay little attention to the psychological antecedence of non-suspected radicalized and extremism members of the communities where the DE radicalization, rehabilitation and reintegration programs are being implemented. Hence, the need of empirical studies to contribute to the existing literature from a psychological perspective of this nature is highly recommendable.

1. Theoretical Framework

This section reviews an existing relevant theory of the study. In so doing, the study adopted the basic principles of Ecological System Theory of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The theory describes the context in which an individual life and grows up. The theory also describes the changing and interacting environments as well as the individual's role. The theory is made up of four systems summarizing each other like different strata. Worthy of note is the process occurring within and between the different strata which the individual relates. Within the theory, there is the inner stratum, which is christened, micro stratum, which is closely followed by the meso stratum, the exo stratum and finally the macro stratum, respectively. Our adoption of the theory aims to see beyond the description of the strata, but instead create an understanding of the relationship between the individual and his environments. In so doing, the theory can serve as a means of discovering interrelationships (Anderson and Bushman, 2002). The reason for adopting the ecology system theory of human development is that, the interpersonal relationships surrounding ex-detained suspected terrorists are assumed to be key in their successful reintegration into the community.

However, it is important to be mindful that, the theory was developed from a completely different environment. Nevertheless, the theory can be used for this study to help the researchers understand the important relationships existing during the ex-detained terrorists' reintegration processes into the community. As such, we have used certain logicality to get a complete adoptive posture as possible. Therefore, in the study the researchers now see the ex-detained terrorists as normal community members integrating within their complex community system enjoying interpersonal relationships that is affected by multiple levels of the surrounding environment with its full benefits for every member. As such, within the micro level is a narrow network around the individual, for example, the family, school or friends. In this level, the individual has specific roles and interacts within mutual relationships (Anderson, 2007). In this study, the family is viewed as an important micro system playing the key role within which the ex-detained suspected terrorists reintegrate into the community.

On the other hand, the meso level is understood as when different networks at the macro level interrelate. This could be exemplified by the way the family interacts with the justice system, especially the law enforcement agencies during the process of integrating the ex-detained terrorist suspect. The interaction between the ex-detained suspected terrorist's family and neighbors within the community could also be of great significance importance. In another development, ecological system theory at the exo level could also affect the ex-detained suspected terrorists but the ex-detained suspected terrorist may not be directly part of

the system. However, the ex-detained suspected terrorist may interact with the exco system in same way. This kind of structures could be: the authorities, the health care system, the legal system and so on.

The last level is the macro system which includes but not limited to social values, ideologies, laws and policies. The macro system is an abstract system applied at inner levels. It provides a way of understanding and interpreting society (Anderson, 2007). In the context of this study, it may mean, the political situations, which may for example in Nigeria, the country's view on the convention on the Rights of ex-detained suspected terrorists, as well as national and international laws and policies affecting issues concerning ex-detained suspected terrorists with the possibilities of their reintegration into the community. However, the researchers delineated the micro level of the ecological system theory for the study. Furthermore, since there are several narrow networks within the micro level, the community network is used. The reason for the delineation the community networks for the study is viewed by the researchers as the most important micro system with a key role in the reintegration of the ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community.

Therefore, families and relatives are considered, the most important networks among other networks for a successful process of the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. With special emphasis on the beginnings and on-going family roles in the process of the Re socialization of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. Worthy of note is that, the family understands the needs and the reactions of their members who are now ex-detained suspected terrorist individuals, and because of the existing intimate relationships among members of the family, therefore the family holds the position of persuading and ensuring that, the community accepts as well as enabling their ex-detained suspected terrorist members fully reintegrate into the community. To make this happen, the community provides micro networks around the ex-detained suspected terrorists through the various social support programs, that it provides. Consequently, through the available communal social support systems, ex-detained suspected terrorists can mobilize their psychological resources and master their psycho-emotional challenges to fully reintegrate into the community. The community also share the ex-detained suspected terrorists' tasks by supplying them the needed psychological, physical and material resources, including: money, tools, skills as well as cognitive guidance, capacity building, skills acquisition, that might enable the ex-detained suspected terrorists handle their own challenges that may occur during the process of reintegration inti the community.

2. Empirical Review

To get a general picture of the essence of the study, it is needful that we review some of the existing research in this area. It may be relatively easy to find literature on reintegration in general, but it might not be easy to find related literature on the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorist into the community in specific. However, the review is done under the following subheadings, namely: factors necessitating reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community: process of reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community: purpose of detention and reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community: demo-social support in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community: demo-social support variables in the reintegration ex-detained suspected terrorists community into the community; summary of reviews; research questions and hypotheses.

A profile of factors necessitating the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community was reviewed from the literature in this study. The reason is to develop an attempt to understand social support factors reported either to facilitate of distort or completely distract the successful reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. As such, there may be envisaging challenging evidence in making a workable rehabilitative communal system with its consequent reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. Therefore, in considering the factors necessitating the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community, the issue may revolve around societal and personal factors.

Amongst the factors, Salasin (1986) reported that "Stigmatization" is one of the problem ex-detained suspected terrorists faced in the process of reintegration into the community. As such, ex-detained suspected terrorists are treated by the community as outcasts. Detained suspects suffer stigmatization more than non-detained suspects because non-detained suspects are within the community undergoing their communal obligations, while detention isolates detained suspects. Therefore, non-detained suspects do not need re-

entrance into the community. However, detained suspects exiled from their community needs society's social support to re-integrate into their community.

Similarly, other challenges being faced by ex-detained suspected terrorists in the process of reintegration into the community are rejection by the community and social isolation within the family and among friends (Martin, 1964). Another development, other societal challenges being faced by ex-detained suspected terrorist in the process of reintegration into the community includes but not limited to identity threat, stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination (Major and O'Brien, 2005). The literature enumerates certain personal variable in the re-entry of ex-detained suspected terrorist into the community, among which includes but not limited to physical, social and psycho emotional factors. As such, Majors and O'Brien (2005) posits that, ex-detained suspected terrorists self-examined, as well as identified potential threats situations that might alter his/her identified social identity and exceeds his coping strategies. This means, the ex-detained suspected terrorist's appraisal of identity threatening situations creates in them involuntary stress responses and motives, aiming at attempting to reduce their threat coping abilities. In so doing, their self-esteem, intellectual skills, social identity is potentially weakening.

The aforementioned scenery increases the sense of shame and rejection among ex-detained suspected terrorists. It is based on among other reasons that, might make several ex-detained suspected terrorists commit crimes, which may be a recurrent decimal after they have long returned into normal societal life (Irwin and Austin, 1994). The expectation that ex-detained suspected terrorists can automatically become law-abiding citizens are seen to be cautioned because, even the ex-detainees themselves seem to isolate from their communities due to own guilty possibilities. As such, James (2014) observed that since nearly all detainees will return to their community at some point as possible, stakeholders do everything possible, including: activities and programs aiming at preparing ex-detainees to return safely to their Community and become law-abiding citizens.

In doing so, Among (2014) listed three phases in conducting any meaningful program for the reintegration of ex-detained terrorism suspect into the Community, including:: during detention, aiming as preparing detainees for their eventual release; during detainee's release, which seek to connect ex-detainees with the various services they may require and when ex-detainees permanently reintegrates into their Communities, attempting to provide the ex-detainees with supports and supervision. These programs are being funded from varying sources including but not limited to Government, Non-governmental organization and Public and Private spirited individuals. Although from the literature the process of reentry of the detainees into the community commences immediately in detention however, its actual execution is from the time of the onset of the release of the detainee from detention (Harrison, 1991). Evidence from the literature suggests that integration connotes to perspectives. In its narrow sense, it is somewhat like what "The Quaker Council for European Africa (OCEA 2011) refers to as "probation" meaning, ex-detainees are put under probation. In doing so, Ahmad (1997) reported that, when an offender or suspect is on probation, he/she become more psychologically prepared to face the various physiological, mental, social, emotional and spiritual problems following their release from detention. The author reiterated that reintegration should not stop at give financial and material assistance aiming at equipping ex-detainees for life after detention, including: practical programs of proper assistance and supervision gearing at total reintegration into the society.

Therefore, integrative responses of the Criminal Justice System are expected to recognize the a fore mentioned. In doing so, the statutory functions of the Nigerian Prison Systems should revolve around safe humane custody of persons legally remanded or convicted, as well as preparing them for reintegration int the Community. In doing so, Nigerian Correctional Services should enhance its reformation, rehabilitation and reintegration programs with an aim of providing detained terrorism suspects and offenders with sustainable capacity building and skills acquisition techniques, for income generations through their various experiences in the Prison Farms and Industries (Nigerian Prison Act Cap 366, 1990).

Similarly, Correctional Services Officers shoulder with the responsibility of addressing detainees' psycho-emotional or behavioral disorders, substance use and misuse, education and skills acquisition should aim at minimizing key factors of re-invasion and repeated criminal tendencies. Reintegration programs may also be aimed at facilitating psychological resisting abilities among suspected offenders, in other to help them

become contributing members of their communities, including: issues of housing, employment, finance and civic responsibilities (OCEA, 2011).

In order for ex-detainees to attain the fore-mentioned, their families must play the most important role of social support. Distance researches indicate that, the family may be critical to explaining ex-detainee pat ways after released from detention (Klein, Bartholomew and Herbert, 2002). Some studies identified kinds of demo-social support variables that ex-detainees receive from family members that appeared to affect their post release outcomes; for example, Nelson, Deess and Allen (1999).

Summarily, it is evidenced that ex-detained suspected terrorists are stereotyped, stigmatized and prejudiced by members of their families and Communities with regards to issues of employment, shelter, clothing and feeding. The fore-going may give rise to feeling of rejection, social isolation, discrimination, which might eventually affect their self-esteem, intellectual capacities, social functioning and health outcomes. From the fore-going, reintegration from release after detention can be a challenging process, in that; social reintegration involves how effectively the community supports ex-detainee's readjustment to enable them to live in the free society. There are several demo-social support variables posing various challenges on processes of reintegration ex-detainees into the community, including but not limited to: personal, family, community and societal factors. From the literature, experiences of many ex-detainees have fostered inappropriate relationships, biased values and ethical insensitivity, destructive habits and inability to make decisions or plan. As such, almost every ex-detainee would need reintegration services, including: Correctional Services' interventions and family social support, to help them re-integrate into the community with confidence.

Methodology

This research adopts a cross-sectional research design using a purposive research method focusing on ex-detained suspected terrorist. The study used a simple one factor between participants design consisting of one independent variable (terrorism threat level, collaborating stereotype, stigmatization and prejudices) consisting of two or more levels, namely: control group, low, moderate, substantial, severe and critical; and one dependent variable (perceived social support). Each of these variables were measured at one level.

Sixty (60) participants (22 males and 38 females) were selected for study (Table 1). The participants were made up of 23 from the Informal Education Status, 16 from Primary Education Status, 13 from Secondary Education Status and 8 tertiary Education Status; 15 were single, 30 widows/widowers, 5 separated, 8 were married and 3 divorced/divorcees; with age ranges of 18-32 years. All the participants were from the Kuchigoro Internal Displaced People's Camp (IDPC), Abuja as at the time of data collection.

The modified "Interpersonal perceived social support evaluation list: shortened version – 12 items" as consequence of the effects of terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotype, stigmatization and prejudices on participants' perceived social support in their reintegration into the community. The study used a self-report Inventory, comprising of 2 sections and labeled: personal data and self-evaluation of the Modified Interpersonal Perceived Social Support Inventory. The personal data section evaluated participants' age, gender, educational status, marital status and terrorism threat levels; while the evaluation of participants' terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotype, stigmatization and prejudices on participants perceived social support in their reintegration into the community subsection used the modified Interpersonal Social Support Scale with dimension "Definitely False" to "Definitely True" representing the score of 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. The Multidimensional Interpersonal Perceived Social Support Scale was the modified version by Cohen, Merstein, Kamarck and Haberman (1985) adopted for use in this study. The Multi-Dimensional Inter-Personal Scale of Perceived Social Support items are easily understood and have been shown to be relatively free of social desirability bias (Dahlem, Zinet and Walker, 1991). As such, was therefore adjudged as suitable for use for the variable populations of this study.

The rationale of the study was explained to the participants after an informed consent. The general guidelines and rules for participation were reinforced. Voluntary participation and confidentiality were emphasized. The participants were randomly assigned to the various terrorism threat levels through the deep and pick process, as they were instructed to deep their hands into a packet containing folded pieces of paper on which numbers ranges from 1 to 6 were variously written on each piece, representing each terrorism threat

level-condition, with ten (10) pieces of paper containing each number, comprising of ten (10) participants in each group of the six (6) terrorism threat levels. All the participants went through the same process. The researchers administered the questionnaire as well as giving out instructions to the participants as to processes to be followed. Gray areas were handled. The researchers took charge of the entire process and wait to collect the completed copies of the questionnaire. Data collected are analyzed using inferential and descriptive modalities.

Results

Sixty (60) participants were used for the study. Descriptive and Inferential Statistics were used to analyze of the data and the results were presented below.

1. General Statistics

Frequencies and percentages were used for the analysis of participants' bio-data and the results presented as bellow:

Table 1. Frequencies, Percentage, Mean and Standard Deviation figures for all the participants

Age				
Age Range	Frequency		Percentage	
18-22	13		21.7	
23-27	19		31.7	
28-32	21		35.0	
33 And Above	7		11.6	
Total	60		100	
Educational Statistics				
	Frequency		Percentage	
Informal Education	23		38.3	
Primary Education	16		26.7	
Secondary Education	13		21.7	
Higher Education	8		13.3	
Total	60		100	
Marital Status				
	Frequency		Percentage	
Single	15		25	
Widow/ Widower	30		50	
Separated	5		8.3	
Married	8		13.3	
Divorce	3		5.0	
Total	60		100	
Terrorism Threat Level				
Terrorism Threat Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Sd
Control Group	10	16.7	30.4	2.50
Low	10	16.7	32.7	3.35
Moderate	10	16.7	27.1	3.39
Substantial	10	16.7	25.9	3.23
Severe	10	16.7	28.7	3.49
Critical	10	16.7	31.8	1.78
Total	**60**	**100**	**176.6**	**13.29**

Participants of the research were sixty (60), between the ages of 18 and 45 drawn from Terrorism Internal Displaced People's Camp (TIDPC), Kuchigoro, Federal Capital Territory (FCT)-Abuja, Nigeria. Their educational status showed: Informal Education, 23(38.3%); Primary Education, 16 (26.7%); Secondary Education, 13 (21.7%) and Higher Education, 8 (13.3%) respectively.

In another development their marital status showed: Single, 15 (25%); Widow /widower, 30 (50.0%); Separated, 5(8.3%); Married, 8 (11.7%) and Divorce 3(5.0%). On the other hand, their terrorism threat level experiences, 60 (100%, mean176.6, SD = 13.27) representing; control group (16.7%), mean=30.4, SD = 2.50;

Low, 10 (16.7%), mean = 32, SD =3.35; Moderate, 10 (16.7), mean = 27.1, SD = 3.39; Substantial, 10 (16.7%), Mean=25.9), SD= 3.23); Severe, 10 (16.7%), mean = 28 .7, SD = 3.49 and Critical, 10 (16.7%), mean = 31.8, SD = 1.78.

2. Hypothesis Testing

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the research hypothesis at 0.05 alpha level of significance and summary of results presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Sum of Squares (Variance)	F
Between Groups (Major)	15.855	5	3.171	1.36
Within Groups (Error)	584.330	54		
Total	**600.185**	**54**	**.984**	**1.36**

Table 2 showed results of One-way Analysis of Variance determining effects of Five terrorism threat levels (low, moderate, substantial, severe and critical) collaborating stereotypes, stigmatization and prejudices on perceived social support in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. The results as contained in Table 2 above revealed that: there is difference in the effect of terrorism threat between the groups One-way ANOVA, F (5,554) = 3.223, p=0.05). This implies that, the experience of terrorism threat levels among participants largely affects their social support for the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. Consequently, the research hypothesis is hereby rejected instead, the alternate hypothesis is upheld.

Discussion

The study aimed at self-assessment by members of the community of the effects of terrorism threat levels collaborating stereotype, stigmatization and prejudices on perceived interpersonal social support in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. One hypothesis was raised to be tested in the study, which was based on six terrorism threat levels (control Group, Low, Moderate, substantial severe and critical). Data was collected analyzed based on the aforementioned hypothesis and the result showed mean difference among participants between the six terrorism threat levels.

A further critical interpretation was needed to create deeper understanding of the results. As such, the results showed that, the mean for low terrorism threat level participants was significantly higher than the means of the other terrorism threat levels. This was followed by the mean for participants of critical terrorism threat level and subsequently the mean for participants of the control group. On the other hand, the mean for participants of substantial terrorism threat level was the lowest among all the terrorism threat levels. This was followed by the men for participants of moderate terrorism threat level and subsequently, the mean for participants of severe terrorism threat level.

The aforementioned findings partially supported the view postulated by Bronfenbrenner (1979) which explains that individual's interpersonal relationship is greatly influence by the social context the individual lives and grow up. On the other hand, the findings contrast what Anderson (2007) explained that, within the micro level of the ecosystem theory, exists a narrow social network such as the family, school, friends or members of the community within which an individual interacts in mutual relationships.

In another development, the findings showed that members of ex-detained suspected terrorist's community would normally exhibit caution in their interpersonal relationship especially towards ex-detained suspected terrorists. This could be connected to what, Salasin (1986) described as the cause of the various social stigmatization being faced by ex-detained suspected terrorists in the process of reintegration into the community. Similarly, it could be responsible for some of the identified threats, stereotype, prejudice, discrimination and isolation being experienced by certain categories of ex-detained suspected terrorists in the process of reintegration into the community as revealed by the study's findings. This contrasts with what, Major and O'Brein (2005) postulates that, it is the right of every member of the community to compete for

social recognition, seek political control and demand honor and mutual respect among members of their communities. From the findings, it is evidenced that, ex-detained suspected terrorist's members of the community would rather choose to socially isolate for the fear of the horrific physical and psychological trauma that is associated with the action.

Conclusion

The possibility that, the sample used for data collection were mainly participants involved with terrorism issues, which is at the moment the world's biggest challenge, the tendency of participants giving 'reactivity' responses on the instrument is not in doubt despite the full assurance and debriefed by the researcher that the data was only for the purpose of the study. Therefore, the results should be generalized with caution. Hence, future research should involve 'naturalistic or participant observation' method to enable more generalize results.

Effects of terrorism threat level collaborating stereotype stigmatization and prejudices in the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community have shown that natural human inclination is for rejecting, isolating and discriminating interpersonal relationships but when their situations are not met, it may result in mutual and cordial interpersonal relationships. Also, terrorism threat level is seen to affect the perceived interpersonal social support that members of the community can give in the support of the reintegration of ex-detained suspected terrorists into the community. This will make it very difficult to achieve peace building conflict resolution and forgiveness among members of the community.

Therefore, it is recommended that individuals, families, communities, organizations and governments with responsibilities on issues of terrorism, fundamentalism and extremism should make deliberate efforts to execute programs aiming at deteriorating perpetrators of terrorism, desensitizing the victims as well as arming vulnerable members of the community against terrorism threat levels.

Conflict of Interest: The researcher has no special interest in the process of the research or its outcome. Therefore, the research was conducted according to lay down principles.

Informed Consent Statement: All areas of the study needed participation of the participants were fully discussed; each participant understood the involvements and verbally consents to participate in the research.

References

Ahmad, S. (1991). Criminology: Problems and perspective. *Journal of Sociology of Social Welfare*, *18*, 178. https://www.scribd.com/document/611042960/Criminology-Problems-Perspectives-by-Ahmad-Siddique-1

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 27-52. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11752478/

Anderson, C. (2007). *Reintegration of former Child Soldiers: The reintegration process in Gulu, Uganda, from an ecological perspective.* Swedish International Development Cooperation. https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=1324289&fileOId=1324290

Anikelechi, I. G., Ojakorotu, V., & Ani, K. J. (2018), "Terrorism in North –Eastern Nigeria, education sector and social development". *African Renaissance, 15*(4), 208-225.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development. In D. R Shaffer & K. Kip (Eds.). *Developmental Psychology: Childhood & Adolescence* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning, Inc.

Borzycki, M. (2005). *Interventions for prisoners returning to the community*. Australian Institute of Criminology. https://www.aic.gov.au/publications/archive/archive-123.

Borzycki, M., & Makkai, I. (2007). Prisoner reintegration post-release. Canberra. *Australian Institute of Criminology Journal*, *5*(2),654-671. https://www.coursehero.com/file/p3vcksc/Borzycki-M-and-T-Makkai-2007-Prisoner-reintegration-Post-release-Canberra/

Colman, A. M (2003). O*xford Dictionary of Psychology.* Oxford University Press Inc. https://www.oxfordreference.com/display/10.1093/acref/9780199534067.001.0001/acref9780199953 4067

Crocker, J. Major, B., & Steele C. (1998). Social stigma. In S. Fiske, D. Gilbert & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 504 -553). Department of Psychology, University of California.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoil identity*. Prentice Hall.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of Interpersonal relations.* Wiley.

Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies (IDIS). (2017). *Project report on strengthening community resilient against radicalization and violent extremism.* University of Nairobi, Africa Policy Institute (API), Government of Japan & United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

International Center for Counterterrorism (ICCT). (2012). *Designing rehabilitation and reintegration programmes for violent extremist offenders: A realist approach.* ICCT: https://www.icct.nl/sites/default/files/import/publication/ICCT-Veldhuis-Designing-Rehabilitation-Reintegration-Programmes-March-2012.pdf

Irwin, J., & Austin, J. (1994). *It's about time: Americans imprisonment bing*. Oxford University Press.

James, N. (2014). Offender recently correctional statistics, reintegration into the community and recidivism. *Congressional Research Service.* https://www.crs.gov.134287.

Lahey, B. B. (2004). *Psychology: An introduction*. The Vergel Foundation. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15709941/

Major, B. C., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review Psychology, 56,* 393-421. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15709941/

Mutambara E., Nwali, R. C. I., Aro, G. C., Ekwe, M. O., Ngene, I. O., Nwankwo, F. M., & Ani, K. J. (2022), "Boko haram and defence mechanism of the Nigerian Army: A critical appraisal. *African Renaissance, 19*(2),141-158. https://www.adonis-abbey.com/edition_menu.php?edition_id=441

Nelson, M., Deess, P. & Allen, C. (1999). *The first month out: post-incarceration experiences in New York City.* Vera Institute Justice.

Orakwe, I. W. (2005). Killing the Nigerian prisons through prosecutional ineptitude. *The Reformer*, *2*(1), 45-48.

Prisons Act Cap 366 of the Laws of the Federation of Nigeria. (1990). https://lawsofnigeria.placng.org/laws/P29.pdf

Quakar Council for European Affairs. (2010). The social reintegration ex-prisoners in Council of Europe Member States: Executive summary and recommendations. *Brussels: Quakar Council for Europeans Affairs (QCEA).* https://www.qcea.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/rprt-reintegration-execsummonly-en-may-2011.pdf

Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre & the Security Service. (2017). https://www.gov.uk/browse/justice/reporting.crimes-compensation.

United Nations Office on Drugs & Crime. (2006). Custodial and non-custodial measures. *Social Reintegration.*http://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/gateng/4social Reintegration.

United Nations Security Council. (2004). Press release: List of suspected terrorist organization and individuals, national reports continue to play crucial role in fight against terror. *Security Council Told*. http//www.un.org/press/en/2004/sc8102.doc.htm.