

**Efe Efosa Ehioghiren
Augustina Izehiuwa
Efosa-Ehioghiren
Eromonsele Addeh**

*Ehioghiren, Efe Efosa
Human Initiative Development
and Research Centre (HIDRC)*
Benin City, Edo State of Nigeria
e-mail:

ehioghiren2004@gmail.com

ORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7979-2716>

*Efosa-Ehioghiren, Augustina
Izehiuwa*

Department of Guidance and
Counseling, Ambrose Alli
University, Nigeria

ORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3503-2583>

Addeh, Eromonsele

National Institute of
Construction Technology and
Management, Uromi, Edo State

e-mail:

a.eromonsele@nict.edu.ng

Published First Online:

24.06.2024

Pages: 109 – 122

DOI:

[https://doi.org/10.37075/JOMS
A.2024.1.09](https://doi.org/10.37075/JOMS A.2024.1.09)

THE PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY OF A FRAUDSTER: IMPLICATIONS FOR TODAY ACCOUNTING PROFESSION

ABSTRACT

The study examines the Psychology and sociology of a fraudster: Implications for today accounting profession. The investigation was guided by three questions and a hypothesis. The study employed a survey research approach, and the 274 auditing businesses in Nigeria's South-South geopolitical zone comprised the study's population., the Taro Yamane was uses to determine the sample of the study and Spearman rank correlation was used to analyse the data. Results from the research reveal that there was a correlation in capability ($r= 0.121$ $p< 0.05$), lifestyle ($r= 0.561$ $p< 0.05$ and environment ($r= 0.108$ $p< 0.05$) and the psycho-social behaviour of the perpetrator of fraud. The implication was that the professional auditors should apply professional scepticism and exercising due care in engaging their work for better delivery and discharge of their duties, as this will lead to the detection of fraud and the reporting of red flags that are of material misstatement. The study recommended that an active, strong and proper supervision of internal control system will put to serious check the action of fraudulent activities.

KEYWORDS: Psychology, Sociology, Fraudster, Power theory, Accounting Profession.

JEL: M21

INTRODUCTION

The business environment and the society are becoming complex day in and day out and behavioural scientists to date have not be able to pinpoint a psychological and sociological specific behaviour that acts as a dependable and valid indicator of a person's propensity to perpetrate fraud., even though some effort

has been made in this direction (Sridharan & Hadley, 2018). This is further compounded by the advanced technological and global era of today world.

Burnes, Henderson, Sheppard, Zhao, Pillemer and Lachs (2017) believe that studying fraud today requires a multidisciplinary approach rather than just one discipline. To fully understand the fraud phenomena, economic, psychological, social, criminological, and political methods

are necessary. Murphy and Free (2016) affirm that businesses have been making efforts to reduce and prevent fraud and proactively manage fraud risk, this effort has not completely yielded. Kramer (2015) reaffirmed that preventing fraud is a considerable challenge to organizations as fraudsters continuously discover different methods to commit fraud. ACFE (2016) observed that detecting fraud is even more difficult as fraudsters usually attempt to hide their tracks. Worrying is the fact that many of the world's organizations have witnessed widespread corporate accounting fraud, these Fraudulent, money laundry, embezzlement and such like take place under the supposed watchful environment where there is professional accountant. Azam (2018) corroborates this statement that these financial crisis and fraudulent activities are as a result of the silence of the auditors.

The fraud triangle, which has been referred to as the main framework dealing with fraud incorporated in professional auditing standards, serves as the foundational idea in accounting literature and international audit standards around the world (Omar, Nawawi & Salin 2016). The fraud triangle is a theory that explains why individuals steal. Lokanan (2015) affirmed that the triangle of fraud has been used as standard ways to investigate and understand the factors that make people commit fraud. Ramamoorti (2016) argues that these three elements: pressure, opportunity and rationalization must exist to commit a crime. The investigators can identify the pressure (such as exaggerated income or net income) that resulted in fraud by analyzing the financial statements. (Abdullahi & Mansor 2015). A deficiency in internal controls or a lack of effective internal controls has been perceived as providing the chance for fraud, and fraud has been justified using these methods. (Kalana 2019).

Awang, Ismail, Rahim and Rahman (2016) say that the desire to deceive for one's own gain is a common element in all frauds. Although the fraud triangle creates a foundation for examining elements that influence fraud Bassem and Yustrida (2019) added that there could be many other variables that may influence an individual's intent to commit fraud. (Brown, Hays & Stuebs 2016) There has been discussion to move fraud research beyond the fraud triangle and the fraud diamond which is "an individual's capability" to perpetrate the fraud. (Sridharan et al, 2018) added that these capabilities include the knowledge and intelligence necessary to carry out the fraud, as well as the skills needed to avoid detection.

Md Abdul (2022) claimed that deception, purposeful intent, intensity of desire, risk of suspicion, breach of trust, rationalization, etc. are all human characteristics that go into fraud. Therefore, it is crucial to comprehend the psychological and sociological aspects that may have an impact on fraudsters' behaviour.

Psychology generally aims to comprehend, explain, foresee, and observe both individual and societal behaviour (Bassem et al., 2019). Personal psychology is the study of people specifically. Social psychology is thought of as the study of group behaviour, while abnormal/personal/forensic psychology and sociology concentrate on deviant behaviour (Iuga, Nurse & Erola 2016). Cross-cultural psychology (anthropology) examines the impact of culture and context on behaviour.

The rationale of drawing on behavioural sciences is clear from the intuition that one needs to think like a crook to catch a crook as many business professionals, especially in the financial field, tend to reduce behavioural explanations (Ehioghiren & Atu, 2016). But with the continued

occurrence of fraud in growth, the spotlight behavioural factors may be an important approach not only to detect fraud but in other words, when discussing and conducting cross- disciplinary research the subject of fraud, must certainly bring in the human factors (Ramamoorti, 2016)

Equally, psychological and sociological factors as seem will influence the way a person interprets the situation they are in and this, in turn, will influence the action they choose to take (Young 2020). Fraud, like other crime, can best be explained by three factors: a supply of motivated offenders, the availability of suitable targets and the absence of capable guardians control systems or someone “to mind the store”, so to speak (Huber 2016). The authors focus on psychological and sociological aspects of fraud by identifying a number of psychological and sociological correlates of fraud offending, but quick to note that these are by no means unique to fraud, and do not necessarily differentiate fraudsters from law-abiding citizens. Petty and Briñol (2015) agrees that the psychological and sociological behavioural sciences help to support the interdisciplinary field of fraud examination and forensic accounting in theory development, in practice, in fraud prevention, deterrence, and detection.

Nevertheless, there are several examples of attempts to separate those who will commit fraud from those who won't (or who are likely to commit fraud given the correct circumstances; Federal Bureau of Investigation 2018). These efforts include "honesty" or "integrity" tests designed to gauge a candidate's dependability (Bonita, Michael & Georgiy 2017). The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI) are two examples of personality tests that are used as a standard for identifying people who are likely to commit fraud (Judges, Gallant, Yang & Lee 2017).

Remember that psychological and social aspects may be seen as a marker for fraud but not a complete explanation for it when examining the factors related with fraud in general as well as specific categories of fraud (Ehioghiren, et al., 2016). The following questions are specifically supported by this research: To what extent has a psycho-social behaviour aided capability of the perpetrator to commit fraud; to what extent has the Psycho-social behaviours for desire to attain certain lifestyle influence fraud and to what extent has vulnerable environments attractive potential for fraudulent reward aided Psycho-social behaviours. Against this backdrop this paper examines the Psychology and sociology of a fraudster: Implications for today accounting profession (Kadoyo, Khan, Narumoto, & Watanabe, 2021).

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Definitions of Psychology and Sociology

Psychology is the study of the nature, functions, and phenomena of behaviour and mental experience; simply put, it is the science of human behaviour (Ramamoorti 2016). In general, psychology seeks to understand, explain, predict, and control individual and group behaviour. (Bassem 2019) added that specifically, in the case of personality psychology which studies individuals; while Sociology looks at group behaviour and their social influence; these revolves round cross-cultural context on behaviour in different aspect of human endeavour abnormal, personality, forensic, sociology, and including psychiatry that focus on deviant behaviour and industrial psychopaths (Button & Cross 2017).

Fraud Triangle

A criminologist named Donald R. Cressey made a comment about the Sutherland study in the 1950s. According to Cressey, three things—pressure, justification, and opportunity—encouraged the occurrence of fraud. The Fraud Triangle idea was thus named after these three elements (Cho, Cam, & Oltramari, 2016).

Pressure: which cannot be explained in terms of money, may be one of the things that causes fraud to happen. According to Cressey, the pressure mostly alludes to financial pressures like debt, a lavish lifestyle, drug addiction, and other potential financial inducements.

Opportunity: enables fraud to take place. It is typically brought on by a company's lax internal controls, a lack of monitoring, and abuse of power. Opportunity is one of the three components of the fraud triangle that is most likely to be reduced by process, procedures, control, and early fraud detection initiatives (Chuchuen & Chanvarasuth, 2015).

Rationalization: is a key component of fraud, as the fraudster continually looks for justification for his actions. For instance, the fraudster may justify his actions by saying that doing so will bring happiness to his family and the people he cares about, that his working career has been long enough for him to feel entitled to more (in terms of position, salary, and promotion), and that the corporate profit is so significant that it is unimportant for him to receive a share of it.

Petty et al. (2015) cite Cressey's fundamental study, which states that professional people may commit fraud due to financial pressures that cannot be disclosed, the belief that there is a chance that the theft will go undetected, and the justification that the actions taken are appropriate. For many years, the Fraud Triangle has served as the foundation for the majority of talks on white-collar crime in the accounting curriculum. The Fraud Triangle turns into a useful tool for auditors to observe the intent of fraud perpetrators (Kalana, 2019).

Fraud Scale

In addition to Cressey's Fraud Triangle, Albrecht's Fraud Scale was another fraud theory that was proposed in 1984. According to Albrecht's Fraud Scale, three things—situational pressures, opportunities for fraud, and personal integrity—can cause fraud to occur. Albrecht changed the rationalization component to personal integrity because, in his opinion, rationalization is harder for outsiders to understand whereas personal integrity can be determined by a person's past actions (Azam 2018). These are transgressions of morality, integrity, and accountability, which are at the core of accounting fraud. By evaluating the circumstances around a fraud perpetrator, it may be determined that pressure factors contribute to ethical issues and that rationalization is a cause of ethical concerns.

Modern Fraud Theories

The A-B-C Analysis

According to a study by Ramamoorti, fraud is primarily caused by behaviour. He suggested using an A-B-C model to classify and sort out fraud. The three sorts of fraud identified by Ramamoorti (2016) are: a poor apple, a bad bushel, and a terrible crop. Individual fraud, or

fraud committed by an individual, is referred to as a bad apple. A bad Bushel, also known as collusive fraud or fraud conducted in collusion, and a bad Crop, also known as fraud committed in collaboration with societal and cultural mechanisms that influence the occurrence of fraud, respectively.

A bad harvest is the most hazardous of the three sorts. A rotten crop is defined by moral weakness among the organization's leaders, which soon spreads to the workers under them. Fraud eventually becomes a culture in the organization, practiced in congregation from the top to the subordinates, spreading nearly entirely across it (Young 2020).

Fraud Diamond and M.I.C.E. Model

After examining the four components of fraud, Huber (2016) suggested that the Fraud Triangle can be strengthened by including the fourth component, capability. The perpetrator's capacity may include authority and sufficient knowledge. The potential for fraud, pressure, and justification bring the perpetrator closer to the door, but the culprit must be able to recognize the possibility of entering the door and engaging in fraudulent behaviour.

The Fraud Diamond alters both the pressure factor and the added aspect of capability. The Fraud Triangle's pressure component may not always refer to external financial pressure. For instance, not all participants involved in bribery in a case involving many parties may have been motivated by financial need. Another illustration comes from Ramamoorti (2016), who revealed that affluent and powerful CEOs who are also fraudsters. It is clear that the primary motivation is not pecuniary.

Fraud Triangle is unable to fully see the pressure aspect in this situation.

Four variables, popularly known by the acronym M.I.C.E. (money, ideology, coercion, and entitlement), can be used to explain the situational pressure that may inspire the occurrence of fraud. The financial pressure that leads a person to commit fraud is referred to as the "money factor." Excessive spending, debt, pressing family requirements, and other factors can contribute to financial stress. The ideology component indicates that the offender believes his actions are for the greater good (Xu, Wang, Xu, & Xu, 2022). For instance, he believes that earning money illegally is not an issue because he will give the cash to numerous individuals in need. The coercion element denotes the presence of a third party who sets a bad example, threatens, intimidates, and coerces others to commit fraud. The term "entitlement" describes the ego of a person who believes that his fraud would go undetected (Xiao & Porto 2021).

Theory of Power

When attempting to comprehend how someone becomes involved in fraud, the fraud triangle and fraud diamond theories are helpful. However, the power hypothesis explains how one person might persuade another to take part in the hoax. The perpetrator of a fraud "has the desire to carry out his or her own will-influence another person to act and do as the perpetrator wishes - regardless of resistance," according to Huber (2016). In 1959, John French and Bertram Raven divided "power" into five distinct factors, each originating from the various facets of the interaction between an actor and the subject of their influence.

French and Raven demonstrated that the following factors impact A's influence over B:

- (1) The capacity of A to benefit B (reward power)
- (2) A's capacity for coercion over B (expert power),
- (3) A's specific knowledge or skill (expert power),
- (4) A's legal authority to dictate behaviour to B (legitimate power), and
- (5) the degree to which B identifies with A (referent power)

The Fraud Triangle Re-Interpreted

The "fraud triangle," which is loosely based on what police officers and detectives have referred to as "means, motives, and opportunity," is a crucial conceptual framework for comprehending fraud. The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE) has widely spread the concept of the "fraud triangle," which consists of three components: perceived incentives or pressures, perceived opportunities, and rationalization of fraudulent behaviour (Azam 2018).

It should come as no surprise that the psychology of the fraudsters affects all three aspects of the fraud triangle. Human behaviour is influenced by individual motivations and perceived pressure, and the desire to defend misbehaviour is psychologically anchored in the idea of cognitive disagreement (Xiao et, al. 2021). To some extent, the perpetrator's individual, behavioural calculus influences even the judgment of opportunity, even the comparatively low risk of being caught. Therefore, it is in our best interests to look for psychological explanations and answers rather than merely logical ones when attempting to comprehend the underlying causes of deception.

- If everyone is becoming wealthy, then why shouldn't I?
- Taking money is only a brief "loan"; it will be paid back once the gambling or betting winnings are realized.
- I deserve these "perks" as fair remuneration, and the business can surely afford them.
- If anything, this is a victimless crime, and I am not harming anyone—in fact, what I'm doing is for the best of reasons!
- The situation is not particularly serious.

Although the fraud triangle is a potent conceptual tool, there are other factors that do not easily fit within the fraud triangle framework, such as basic greed and covetousness, a "payback motive" to make the organization pay for perceived inequities, or a "catch me if you can" attitude that some white-collar criminals display. Similar to this, the white-collar criminal's evaluation of the organization's attitude toward fraud, even if the perpetrator is identified (e.g., organizational inaction and reluctance to take any action, turning a blind eye, being satisfied with a warning, poor track record in vigorously prosecuting fraud), gets factored into the behavioural calculus but is not immediately apparent as a separate descriptive category. Therefore, ACFE's founder Joseph Wells offers the following piece of advice: "Let them know you're watching!"

Due to the well-connected and frequent first-time offenders, white collar crime is very challenging to prosecute. Such fraudsters go to great lengths to hide their actions, get rid of any relevant evidence, and sabotage the audit trail. Indeed, according to (Burnes et al. 2017), white collar crime is a key topic in criminology because it highlights the dynamics of inequality in prestige, position, power, and reputation as well as the "differentials of power and influence." As a result, even the adage "where there's smoke, there's fire" may not quite apply because the fraudster may utilize a smoke screen or another method to suppress the smoke, leaving no obvious signs of fire. Instead, we should remember the adage that scientists who are looking for extraterrestrial life sometimes use: "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence." Due to all of these factors, a lot of corporate and economic crimes go unpunished while having serious financial repercussions, and white-collar crime is still mainly an unmanaged risk in firms Yang, Su, Wang, & Xu, (2022).

When prosecuting white collar crimes, it's crucial to take into account the "other fraud triangle," which consists of the peaks of "the act, the concealment, and the conversion," to figure out how the fraudulent act was carried out, what steps the fraudster took to cover his or her tracks or obscure the audit trail, and ultimately how he (as well as potential others) illegally benefited from the act (Brown, et al 2016).

The following categories of fraud have been listed for comparison's sake.

- a) A major or senior official of an organization defrauding that organization. Examples of this include wrongdoing by "high-flying entrepreneurs" (Brown, et al. 2016) against shareholders or creditors or corrupt actions by senior public officials.
- b) Fraud committed by a customer (an "outsider") or an employee (an "insider") against an organization. Embezzlement, insurance fraud, tax evasion, and other types of fraud against the government fall under this category.
- c) Fraud committed by one person against another in a situation involving direct face-to-face contact. This would include traditional "con games" (Button et al. 2017), salesperson frauds, and predatory acts by dishonest investment advisers, dubious roof repairers, and other people who prey directly on a consumer (Xiao & Porto 2021).
- d) Fraud conducted against a large group of people via print, electronic, or other indirect media. This might include share market manipulation, deceptive advertising, and investment solicitations targeted at a sizable number of potential victims, such as advance fee frauds in Nigeria (Bonita et al. 2017).

Three facts of Fraud

(a) Identity

Fraud often relies on being taken for a usual business practice, and those who do it are successful to the extent that they can come off as trustworthy and honest. In order to obtain their victims' trust and money, con artists have used positions ranging from high government authority to ethnic affiliation. The most blatant example of the strategic exploitation of social identity to conduct financial crimes is affinity fraud, in which similarities in ethnicity, religion, or profession is exploited as a shortcut to determine who to believe (Cho, et al. 2016). Impression management, a technique used to fabricate a false social reality, is the strategic

deployment and manipulation of identity. This impression management is intended to mislead others for financial gain, such as by purposefully misrepresenting one's identity in a professional capacity in order to obtain employment or exploiting others due to their familiarity with the victim.

(b) Interaction

Fraud is an interactional crime that can lead to vulnerability to financial fraud since it depends on the nature of the relationship between the two parties for its effectiveness in addition to requiring both a deceiver and a victim. According to the national fraud victimization survey, for instance, fraud efforts are more likely to be successful when the victims (or know of the culprit) are certain vulnerable victims. Some offenders take advantage of these victims because of the interaction relationship. Sociologists are particularly interested in fraud because it reveals a variety of social network characteristics, both good and bad (Iuga et al., 2016). These social networks and linkages have a negative side that increases opportunities for dishonesty, vice, and improper behaviour (Yang, Su, Wang, & Xu, 2022). Inappropriate usage of social networks places a special emphasis on trust and human relationships. Even in societies with highly developed institutional frameworks, people claim to place greater faith in informal networks of locals than in formal institutions. Some interaction contexts may be "criminogenic" because of how simple it is to abuse interpersonal relationships and conceal instances of misconduct within countless other legitimate interactions (Burnes et al. 2017). They noted that the trust fostered by personal relationships presents an increased opportunity for wrongdoing by its very nature. The desire and willingness of most people to assume that others are trustworthy unless given cause to doubt it may assist fraud.

(c) Institution

In the sense that they cannot be explained by the actions of identifiable persons, the frauds that perhaps pose the biggest risks to the stability of the economy and the government are essentially faceless. Institutional fraud puts the entire financial system at danger, from political "machines" that live on bribes and kickbacks to corporate cultures that use rigged bidding procedures and faked accounting. This is due to the fact that institutions offer routines on which expectations might be established and that economic actions are based on exceptions (Chuchuen et al. 2015).

Fraud can destabilize economic institutions and bring down the entire financial system. Institutional contexts can support fraud by offering very alluring structural conditions with lots of possibilities and rewards and few risks. The scale, legitimacy, and complexity of these institutions' structures are all present (Gavett et al. 2017). The first two elements make it difficult to identify who is responsible for acts or make it simple to conceal wrongdoing; the third component offers cover by exempting some institutions from suspicion or subjecting them to little regulatory oversight. (European Commission 2020).

Hypothesis

Three hypotheses were developed for the study, and these served as the research's direction:

H1: The relationship between the perpetrator capability and its psychosocial behaviours is not significantly positive.

H2 There is no discernible link between the risk of a desire to continue a particular lifestyle and its psycho-social behaviours.

H3 There is no discernible relationship between psycho-social behaviours and enticing potential for fraud in vulnerable contexts.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a survey research design. This design is considered suitable and appropriate because of its ability to view comprehensively the major questions raised in the research. The population of this study was the 274 auditing firms in South- South geo political region of Nigeria. However, of interest is focused on the auditing staff based on their practical knowledge on the subject matter. Using Taro Yamane 1967 a sample of 162 were selected from the target population. Simple random sampling technique was employed and a 95% confidence level is assumed.

The sample for the study was; firstly, by applying statistically the Taro Yamane formula in determining the sample for the study as follow:

$$\frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where N= Population

e= Limit of tolerable error is 0.5%

n= Sample size

l= constant

To get a sample from the population

$$n = 274 \frac{\quad}{1 + 274 (0.5)^2}$$

n = 162

The study made use of the questionnaire to collect the data. Two hundred and seventy-four (274) copies of questionnaire were administered out of which one hundred and sixty-two (162) copies were returned representing 59.12%

Model specification

The functional form of our model is here by expressed

$$PSB = f(\text{PERCA}, \text{LIFESTYLE}, \text{ENVIRO}) \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

The multiple regression with an error term (μ) is expressed in equation.....(2)

$$PSB = a_0 + \beta \text{PERCA} + \beta \text{LIFSYLE} + \beta \text{ENVIRO} + \mu$$

Where:

PSB = Psycho-social behaviours

PERCA = perpetrator capability

LIFSYLE= lifestyle

ENVIRO = vulnerable environments

ESTIMATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDING

Data Analysis and results

The data collected were analyses as show in the tables

Table 1. Spearman Rank Correlation

	PSB	PERCA	LIFSYLE	
PSB	1			
Sig.	.0			
PERCA	0.121*	1		
Sig.	0.002	.0		
LIFSYLE	0.561*	-0.71	1	
Sig.	0.000	0.452	.0	
ENVIRO	0.108*	-0.278*	0.34	1
Sig.	-0.007	0.003	-0.097	.0

Source: Researchers computation 2022

Analysis of result and Findings

From table 1 above the correlation coefficients of the variables were examined. However, of particular interest to the study is the correlation of PSB Psycho-social behaviour with PERCA (perpetrator capability), LIFSYLE (lifestyle) and ENVIRO (vulnerable environments).

The finding from the study to hypotheses 1 show that PSB is positively and significantly corrected with PERCA @ ($r= 0.121$ $p< 0.05$) which suggest that the perpetrator capability could be a strong indicator of the Psycho-social behaviour of a fraudster in aiding fraud occurrence in firms and that large firms are open to many of these frauds. This shows that there is a significant positive correlation between the perpetrator capability and its Psycho-social behaviours.

The research found in hypotheses 2 a positive and significant association between PSB and LIFSYLE @ ($r= 0.561$ $p< 0.05$). This implies that the perpetrator lifestyle due to the desire to attain and maintain certain lifestyle standards is a danger from the Psycho-social behaviours of fraudulent person.

From hypotheses 3 ENVIRO was observed to be positively and significantly correlated with PSB @ ($r= 0.108$ $p< 0.05$) meaning that the Psycho-social behaviours of a perpetrator make him to identify vulnerable environment for fraudulent reward.

Table 2. Questionnaires administers to the population

Please tick where appropriate in the space provided using any of these options below;

S/N	Questions	Options
1	The estimate of opportunity, including the low probability of being apprehended, depends on the criminal's psychological and behavioral calculus.	(1) Strongly agree () (2) Agree () (3) Undecided () (4) Strongly disagree () (5) Disagree ()
2	When trusted individuals believe they have a financial issue that cannot be discussed and are aware that this issue may be covertly remedied by breaching the position of financial trust, they turn into trust violators.	(1) Strongly agree () (2) Agree () (3) Undecided () (4) Strongly disagree () (5) Disagree ()
3	Vulnerable settings and opportunistically interpretable events that individuals and organizations see as presenting alluring possibility for illegal reward with little apparent risk of detection or punishment present fraud chances.	(1) Strongly agree () (2) Agree () (3) Undecided () (4) Strongly disagree () (5) Disagree ()
4	The urge to preserve or acquire a particular lifestyle is fueled by the fact that wealth and success have become markers of social status.	(1) Strongly agree () (2) Agree () (3) Undecided () (4) Strongly disagree () (5) Disagree ()
5	Psycho-social behavioural factors present in fraud triangle are not necessary and sufficient conditions for the occurrence of fraud unless the perpetrator has the capability.	(1) Strongly agree () (2) Agree () (3) Undecided () (4) Strongly disagree () (5) Disagree ()

Source: Researchers computation 2022

Implications for Today Accounting Profession

The psychological and sociological behaviours of the fraudster as affecting accounting profession has been receiving attention in the public domain. The society and the public keep asking a particular question ‘ where are the professional accountant where fraud is committed?’ this implies that they the public expect so much from the accounting profession which is one of the major stakeholder in fraud management, detection and prevention. The profession has a role to play by way of implication and adherence of ethical, accounting and professional standards. The effect of an action that fraud has occurs or will likely not occurs is an indication on the society confidence on the integrity of the accounting profession, so the professional accountant should refrain from engaging in or supporting any activities that would discredit the profession. It was professor Osisoma who once said “Accountants who lack integrity destroy standards; they destroy the profession and ultimately they destroy the nation”. The accounting professions need to strengthen her professional codes of ethics, accounting standards, auditing standard guiding the accounting discipline. Engage in training, workshop and retraining of professional, the forensic accountants, auditors, and fraud examiners on the latest, new and contemporary issues emanating in the profession. (Kadoyo, Khan, Narumoto, & Watanabe, 2021). keeping up

with various fraud-fighting strategies, including the efficient implementation of internal control systems, an ethical corporate governance structure, a whistleblower policy, the use of internal and external auditors, an audit committee, and forensic accountants. To effectively supply their services and perform their obligations, professional auditors should exercise necessary caution and professional scepticism, as doing so will enable them to identify fraud and disclose serious misstatements.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Fraud has been one of the greatest dangers to economic and political stability in several countries and the behaviour of identifiable actors is still faceless, in the sense that the perpetrators seem getting away with the crime even those caught is been let off the hooks. The psychological and sociological aspects of fraud and the behavioural factors present in fraud triangle are not necessary and sufficient conditions for the occurrence of fraud unless the perpetrator has the capability. The study findings also agreed that lifestyle and environment are correlation of the Psycho-social behaviours of the perpetrators.

The study recommended that an active, strong and proper supervision of internal control system will put to serious check action of fraudulent activities ‘a stitch in time saves the nine’.

REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, R. & Mansor, N. (2015) Fraud Triangle Theory and Fraud Diamond Theory. Understanding the Convergent and Divergent For Future Research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences* Vol. 5, (4), pp. 38–45
- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE). (2016). “Report to the Nation on Occupational Fraud and Abuse,” Austin, TX.
- Awang, Y., Ismail, S., Rahim, A., & Rahman, A. (2016). “Measuring the Potential for Financial Reporting Fraud in a Highly Regulated Industry,” *The International Journal of Accounting and Business Society* (24:1), pp. 81–95.
- Azam, M. R. (2018). Theory Application: Why People Commit Fraud. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, 5 (1), 54-65.
- Bassem, I. & Yustrida, B. (2019) How Can Psychology and Religious Aspects Affect on Fraud Tringle? *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting* vol. 10(1) p 46- 50
- Bonita, K., Michael, S., & Georgiy, B. (2017). Current opinions on forensic accounting education, *Accounting Research Journal*, Vol. 30 Issue: 3, pp.249-264.
- Brown, O., Hays, J., & Stuebs, M. (2016). “Modeling Accountant Whistleblowing Intentions: Applying the Theory of Planned Behaviour and the Fraud Triangle,” *Accounting and the Public Interest* (16:1), pp. 28–56.
- Burnes, D., Henderson, C.R., Sheppard, C., Zhao, R., Pillemer, K., & Lachs, M.S. (2017). Prevalence of financial fraud and scams among older adults in the United States: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Public Health* 107(8):13–21
- Button, M., & Cross, C. (2017) Technology and fraud: the ‘Fraudogenic’ consequences of the internet revolution. In: McGuire M, Holt T (eds) *The Routledge handbook of technology, crime and justice*. Routledge, London, pp 1–5

- Cho, J.H., Cam, H., & Oltramari, A. (2016) Effect of personality traits on trust and risk to phishing vulnerability: modeling and analysis. Presented at the Proceedings of the IEEE CogSIMA 2016 International Multi-Disciplinary Conference on Cognitive Methods in Situation Awareness and Decision Support, San Diego, CA, (pp. 7–13)
- Chuchuen, C. & Chanvarasuth, P. (2015) Relationship between phishing techniques and user personality model of Bangkok Internet users. *Kasetsart Journal Social Sciences* 36(2):322–334
- Ehioghiren, E. E. & Atu, O. O. K. (2016) Forensic Accounting and Fraud Management: Evidence from Nigeria. *Igbinedion University Journal of Accounting* Vol. 2 pp 245- 283
- European Commission. (2020). Survey on scams and fraud experienced by consumers. Final report. Brussels: European Commission.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2018) Internet crime report 2018. Washington: Internet Crime Complaint Center. Available at: https://www.ic3.gov/media/annualr eport/2018_IC3Report.pdf (5/6/19)
- Gavett, B.E., Zhao, R., John, S.E., Bussell, C.A., Roberts, J.R., & Yue, C. (2017) Phishing suspiciousness in older and younger adults: the role of executive functioning. *PLoS One* 12(2):e0171620
- Huber, W.D. (2016). “Forensic Accounting, Fraud Theory, and the End of the Fraud Triangle,” *Journal of Theoretical Accounting Research* (12:2), pp. 28–48.
- Iuga, C., Nurse, J.R., & Erola, A. (2016) Baiting the hook: factors impacting susceptibility to phishing attacks. *Hum-Cent Comput Info* 6(1):8
- Judges, R.A., Gallant, S.N., Yang, L., & Lee, K. (2017) The role of cognition, personality, and trust in fraud victimization in older adults. *Front Psychol* 8:588
- Kadoyo, Y., Khan, M. S., Narumoto, J., and Watanabe, S. (2021). Who is next? A study on victims of financial fraud in Japan. *Front. Psychol.*12:649565.doi:10:3389/fpsyg.2021.649565
- Kalana, M. (2019) Application of Underutilized Theories in Fraud Research: Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Forensic and Investigative Accounting* Volume 11: Issue 1, January–June 2019
- Kramer, B. (2015). Trust, but verify: fraud in small businesses. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*.22 (1), 4-20. doi: 10.1108/JSBED-08-2012-0097
- Lokanan, M.E. (2015). “Challenges to the Fraud Triangle: Questions on Its Usefulness,” *Accounting Forum* (39:3), pp.201–224.
- Md Abdul, B. (2022) the importance of forensic accounting education; a survey in bangladesh. *Review of Business, Accounting & Finance*, Vol 2, (1), 79 - 92
- Murphy, P.R. & Free, C. (2016). “Broadening the Fraud Triangle: Instrumental Climate and Fraud,” *Behavioral Research in Accounting* (28:1), pp. 41–56.
- Novita, P. (2016) Fraud theory evolution and its relevance to fraud prevention in the village government in Indonesia. *Asia Pasific Fraud Journal*, 1,(2) 177-188
- Omar, M., Nawawi, A., & Salin, A.S.A.P. (2016).The causes, impact and prevention of employee fraud: A case study of an automotive company. *Journal of Financial Crime*. 23(4), 1012-1027. Retrieved October, 2017, from Pro Quest database.
- Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2015) Emotion and persuasion: cognitive and meta- cognitive processes impact attitudes. *Cognit Emot* 29(1):1–26
- Ramamoorti, S. (2016). The Psychology and Sociology of Fraud. <https://doi.org/10.2308/iace.2008.23.4.521>
- Sridharan, U. & Hadley, L. (2018). “Internal Audit, Fraud and Risk Management at Wells Fargo,” *Journal of the Academic Business World* (12:1), pp. 49–53.
- Xiao, J., J., and Porto, N. (2021). Financial capability and wellbeing of vulnerable consumers. *J. Consum. Aff.*56, 1004-1018.doi: 10:1111/joca.12418

- Xu, L., Wang, J., Xu, D., and Xu, L. (2022). Integrating individual factors to construct recognition models of consumer fraud victimization. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 19:461. Doi:10.3390/ijerph19010461
- Yang, S., Su, K., Wang, B., and Xu, Z. (2022) A coupled mathematical model of the dissemination route of short-term funding fraud. *Mathematics* 10:1709. doi:10.3390/MATH10101709
- Young, T. R. (2020) *Drama of Social Life: Essays in Post-Modern Social Psychology*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.