

# **CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION, POLICING AND GOVERNANCE IN NIGERIA**

Etannibi E.O. ALEMIKA



Monograph series No. 18

First published in 2013 by:

CLEEN Foundation

Lagos Office: 21, Akinsanya Street  
Taiwo Bus-Stop  
Ojodu  
Ikeja, 100281  
Ikeja, Lagos, Nigeria  
Tel: 234-1-7612479, 7395498

Abuja Office: 26, Bamenda Street, off Abidjan Street  
Wuse Zone 3, Abuja, Nigeria  
Tel: 234-9-7817025, 8708379

Owerri Office: Plot 10, Area M Road 3  
World Bank Housing Estate  
Owerri, Imo State  
Tel: 083-823104, 08128002962, 08130278469  
  
E-mail: [cleen@cleen.org](mailto:cleen@cleen.org)  
Website: [www.cleen.org](http://www.cleen.org)

**ISBN: 978-978-51062-4-4**

© Whole or part of this publication may be republished, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted through electronic, photocopying, mechanical, recording or otherwise, with proper acknowledgement of the publishers.

*Typesetting: Blessing Aniche*

*Cover concept: Gabriel Akinremi*

The mission of CLEEN Foundation is to promote public safety, security and accessible justice through empirical research, legislative advocacy, demonstration programmes and publications, in partnership with government and civil society.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	1
Significance of Crime Statistics	1
Official Statistics	3
Self-Report Crime Survey	3
Victim Survey	4
Population, Sampling and Method	11
Social background of respondents	11
<b>Chapter II: Extent and pattern of crime victimization</b>	14
Extent of criminal victimization: 2011	14
Personal Victimization	15
Pattern of criminal victimization	19
Rape and kidnapping	20
Trend of crime victimization in states	21
Socioeconomic background and victimization	23
Gender and victimization	25
<b>Chapter III: Police and policing</b>	30
Nigeria Police Force: Functions and organisation	30
Crime reporting and satisfaction with police	31
Public assessment of police performance	33
Priority policing issues	34
Police powers to kill	36
Appointment of the Inspector-General of Police	38
Policing terrorism	39

<b>Chapter IV: Corruption and governance</b>	42
Extent and trend of corruption	42
Trend of corruption in States	44
Measures for controlling corruption	46
Obstacles to corruption control	46
<b>Chapter V: Fear of crime and feeling of safety</b>	48
Trend and fear of crime	48
Perpetrators and causes of crime	54
Choice of agency to report crime	54
Measures for reducing crime	55
Personal and household measures against crime	56
Possession and use of firearms	56
Road safety	57
<b>CHAPTER VI: Governance, security and welfare</b>	59
Neighbourhood welfare and security concerns	59
Corruption and trust in government agencies and officials	60
Satisfaction with state governments' performance	61
Human rights violations	63
Performance of the criminal justice agencies	64
<b>CHAPTER VII: Conclusion and Recommendations</b>	65
Summary of findings	65
Recommendations	71

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Socioeconomic background of respondents	12
Table 2: Victimization of respondents' household members	15
Table 3: Personal victimization: 2011	16
Table 4: Personal crime victimization 2010 and 2011	18
Table 5: Victimization of household members 2011	19
Table 6: Trend of safety from crime now compared to past years	21
Table 7: Socioeconomic background and victimization in 2011	23
Table 8: Comparison of Personal victimization by sex in 2011	25
Table 9: Gender victimization of household female members including respondents	27
Table 10: Reasons for rape in community	29
Table 11: Persons or Agencies to who victimization was Reported	31
Table 12: Reasons for dissatisfaction with police handling of case	32
Table 13: Public opinion on police performance in 2011	33
Table 14: Measures toward improving the police	34
Table 15: Issues to which Police should devote priority attention	36
Table 16: Public support or opposition to police power to kill suspects	37
Table 17: Public approval or disapproval of police check points	38
Table 18: Public view on criteria for appointing IGP	39
Table 19: Satisfaction with police and government performance in controlling terrorism	40
Table 20: Public recommendations for police and government counter-terrorism measures	41
Table 21: Contact for service and demand for bribe by public agencies' officials	43
Table 22: Trend of corruption in states	44
Table 23: Recommended anti-corruption measures	46
Table 24: Constraints and measures for improved performance of EFCC and ICPC	47
Table 25: Fear of Crimes	49

Table 26: feeling of safety	49
Table 27: Constraints Imposed by Level of Crime in the Neighbourhood	50
Table 28: Main crime and disorder problems in neighbourhoods and states in 2011	51
Table 29: Crimes most frequently committed in neighbourhoods	52
Table 30: Most feared crime in the neighbourhoods	53
Table 31: government spending priority to make community safer	55
Table 32: Reasons for possession of firearms	57
Table 33: issue of greatest concern in the neighbourhood	59
Table 34: Perceived corruption and trust in key government agencies and offices	61
Table 35: Satisfaction with state government performance	62
Table 36: Experience of human Rights violation	63
Table 37: Job performance of the criminal justice agencies within state in 2011	64

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The CLEEN Foundation wishes to acknowledge the following organizations and the individual for their contributions in the publication of this study. We thank the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation for their support in the research and publication of this report and continuing interest in the institutional growth of the CLEEN Foundation.

We are grateful to the Project consultant, Prof. Etanibi E.O Alemika, for leading the research and writing the final draft of the report for publication.

We commend the Practical Sampling International (PSI) and its personnel for their diligence in the field administration of the questionnaire in the 36 states of Nigeria and Abuja the Federal Capital Territory and in completing the interview of respondents on schedule.

The Research and Planning Program Officer of CLEEN Foundation Raphael Mbaegbu, led the monitoring team to ensure that quality control measures and ethical values were respected throughout the study. He also carried out the computer analysis of the survey data.

Finally we thank the 11,518 respondents who successfully completed the questionnaires, in spite of their busy schedules. Without their commitment to the study, this would not have been a success.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Crime victimization survey provides valuable information for understanding the extent, trend and pattern of crime victimization in a community or nation. It also provides data on the nature and perception of crime and disorder problems. Crime victimization surveys provide the government with information on citizens' perception of the quality and problems of security, policing and governance. The principal aim of this survey is to generate reliable data on crime victimization, fear of crime, feeling of safety, policing and governance in Nigeria that can be used to develop and implement policies and strategies that will promote effective security and criminal justice administration in the country. Crime survey using a national representative sample was pioneered in Nigeria by CLEEN Foundation. This survey in 2011 is a continuation of previous rounds of crime victim survey for 2005, 2006, 2007-2009; 2010 and published (Alemika, Igbo and Nnnorom 2006; Alemika and Chukwuma 2007; Alemika and Chukwuma 2011).

### *Significance of Crime Statistics*

Criminal statistics refer to numerical data or information on the incidence, prevalence, pattern, and trend of crime as well as the characteristics of crime victims and the actions or decisions of criminal justice agencies on cases reported and recorded by them. They provide data and evidence that can be used for law-making; policy formulation and programme design to prevent and control crime and disorder in society. However, two major problems impinge on the collection of reliable statistics on criminal activity and victimization (Alemika 2004)<sup>1</sup>. The first problem is referred to as the phenomena of 'dark' and 'grey' crime figures, which respectively imply 'unknown or undetected or unreported crime' and 'detected, reported but not

---

<sup>1</sup> Etannibi EO Alemika 2004. "Crime statistics and information management in Nigerian justice and security systems" in EEO Alemika and IC Chukwuma (Eds.) *Crime and Policing in Nigeria: Challenges and Options*, Lagos: Network on Police Reform in Nigeria (NOPRIN).

recorded' incidents of crimes and victimizations. These problems indicate that the crime statistics produced by the criminal justice agencies – police, courts, prosecutors and prisons – are not true or accurate reflection of the extent and pattern of criminal activities and victimization in society.

The second problem is associated with the collection of reliable crime and victimization statistics relates to national and organizational failures and capacity with respect to information management as tool of planning, decision making, monitoring and evaluation (Alemika 2004; Ojomo and Alemika 1993)). Nigerian government and organisations do not sufficiently appreciate the significance of grounding public policy and decision-making in reliable information and statistics. The police and other law enforcement, security and intelligence and judicial agencies in Nigeria neglect collection, analysis and utilization of crime, disorder and victimization data as essential input to their planning, operations and administrations.

Public agencies in the country do not make significant investment in the collection and utilization of vital statistics for planning and administration and as a result usually lack necessary capacity for the collection, analysis, utilization, storage and retrieval of essential data and information. In these circumstances, decisions are generally not based on or led by evidence in the form of systematically collected and analyzed information. This tends to produce a culture of planning and administration through experience, traditions and hunches, with attendant ineffectiveness and inefficiency.

Several attempts have been made to minimize the problems of dark and grey figures of crime. In the case of grey crime figures, several measures such as mandatory recording of complaints; better training of officers responsible for receiving and recording crime complaints, and adoption of automated crime record processing, storage and retrieval are implemented towards improved recording of complaints and accuracy of crime statistics. The critical problem of dark figures of crime remains largely unresolved. Over the past five decades, criminologists have attempted to minimize the problem by devising two alternative and independent measures of level of criminal activity and

victimization in a country. The three alternative measures of criminality and victimization are *official statistics*, *self-report crime survey* and *criminal victimization survey*. These alternative measures of criminal activity and victimization are discussed below.

#### *Official Statistics*

Official crime statistics are mainly produced by the police, prisons and the courts. Such statistics are the traditional indicators used to determine the level and pattern of criminality in country. However, official statistics are inaccurate due to dark figures (unreported crimes), grey figures (reported but unrecorded crimes) and manipulation of records to satisfy political and, or institutional interests (as when reported increase or decrease may be advantageous to regime in power or to a particular criminal justice agency, especially the police force). Official statistics are indicators of criminal activities brought to the notice of criminal justice agencies and the actions that they take in respect of reported incidents. While they are useful for the purpose of understanding the volume, variety, and distribution of crimes processed by the criminal justice institutions, official crime statistics are not accurate measures of the extent and pattern of crime in society due to differential levels of detection, reporting and official reactions associated with the various behaviours that violate the law. Globally, official statistics are known to suffer several weaknesses. Such weaknesses led criminologists to develop two methods of obtaining information on criminality, victimization, criminal justice administration and public attitudes to crime and criminal justice administration in society. The two approaches are self-report measures – crime survey (self-reported criminal behaviour) and victim survey (self-reported victimization). They complement official crime statistics produced by the police, judiciary and the prisons service.

#### *Self-Report Crime Survey*

Self-report crime survey involves the study of a sample of the population as regards the types and number of crimes, which they committed during a particular period, usually during the past year - whether or not detected or reported by or to the police. The method uses questionnaire to collect relevant information. The survey is characterized by many weaknesses: First, the

questionnaire tends to contain more questions on minor crimes with which the respondents are more comfortable while questions on more serious and sensitive crimes are avoided. Second, respondents may not accurately recall their criminal activities, and third, respondents also tend to underreport serious crimes that they may have committed. Notwithstanding the deficiencies, self-report crime surveys have provided broader view of the extent and pattern of crimes and social characteristic of offenders. In addition, self report crime survey provides public perceptions of crime; feeling of safety and perception of criminal law enforcement in society.

### *Victim Survey*

Victim survey is used to obtain data on the extent of criminal victimization. Unlike crime survey, which is used to obtain data on the extent and patterns of crimes committed by members of society, victim survey is used to measure the extent and pattern of victimization in a community or nation. Questionnaires are designed and administered to gather information on respondents' experience of criminal victimization; their household members' victimization experience, and public perception of crime and disorder as well as criminal justice administration. The method also suffers several deficiencies, including inability of the respondents to accurately report events during the period covered by the survey. However, several advantages have been attributed to victim survey. Principally, it provides rich data for understanding the distribution of criminal victimization and the socio-demographic characteristics of victims and criminals; offers better information for building theories on criminality and victimization. It also promotes understanding of the consequences of victimization and the extent of fear of crime among different groups in different locations<sup>2</sup>.

### **Theoretical perspectives on vulnerability to criminal victimization**

Traditionally, criminologists were pre-occupied with finding and explaining the causes of crime and the characteristics of criminals. Thus, criminology

---

<sup>2</sup> Cantor, D. and J. P. Lynch. 2000. "Self-Report Surveys as Measures of Crime and Criminal Victimization" *Criminal Justice*, 2000, vol. 4: 87-138 and Gottfredson, MR and MJ Hindelang (1981) "Sociological Aspects of Criminal Victimization"; *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 7: 107-128

largely focused on crime, criminals, and the criminal justice system. This pre-occupation of criminology and the criminal justice system stems from the state's pre-occupation with crime control. It was only in 1940s and 1950s that the idea that crime victims are sometimes active participants in the chain of events that lead to their victimization began to be taken seriously by criminologists (Von Hentig 1940, 1948; Wolfgang 1957, 1958; Ellenberger 1955). Several theories have been developed over the past 50 years to explain the relationships between victims and criminals as well as the variation in victimization (Meier and Miethe 1993; Schneider 2001). Some of the popular theories are the victim precipitated; lifestyle; deviant place and routine activities perspectives.

### **Victim precipitated perspective**

Wolfgang in his seminal book, *Patterns of Criminal Homicide*, published in 1958 used the term victim precipitated victimization to describe incidents in which the victims initiated or contributed to the onset of the behaviours of their attacker. The perspective draws attention to the dynamic interaction between offenders and victims. Wolfgang, in an article published in 1957, said that:

In many crimes, especially in criminal homicide, the victim is often a major contributor to the criminal act. Except in cases in which the victim is an innocent by-stander and is killed in lieu of an intended victim, or in cases in which a pure accident is involved, the victim may be one of the major precipitation causes of his own demise (Wolfgang 1957: 1)

Wolfgang's work was inspired by Von Hentig's earlier proposition of the complicity of victims in their victimization (Von Hentig 1940, 1948). According to him, there are instances in "we can frequently observe a real mutuality in the connection of perpetrator and victim, killer and killed, dupe and dupe" (Von Hentig 1940: 303). This observation has led to two lines of thought in victimology, a sub-discipline of criminology. First, it informs the idea that victim's action and behaviours may make them vulnerable to victimization or attractive to predators. This idea was later developed by lifestyle - exposure perspective. The second line of research focuses on the

similarity of victims and predators in terms of their socioeconomic and demographic backgrounds. Von Hentig's work points to the need to focus on the relationships between victims and crime perpetrators in theorization and research on criminality and victimization. His work also has implications for the determination of culpability in criminal justice administration and in the formulation of crime prevention and victim policies.

The criticism, especially by feminists, that the term victim-precipitated crime implies victim blaming or assignment of responsibility to the victim, does not validly apply to the use of the term by Von Hentig (1940, 1948) and Wolfgang (1958). As used by Wolfgang, the term is intended to draw attention to the understanding of victimization as a dynamic relational process between victims and predators. The term was also used by Wolfgang as a classificatory tool. Thus victimization can be classified into those in which the victims played a role in their occurrence and those in which they played no role. Wolfgang (1958), for example, found that 26% of the homicide victims in his study took the first aggressive steps. This implies that about three-quarters of the homicides were non-victim precipitated.

Criticisms of victim-precipitation have often come from its application to rape (Amir 1967). According to Amir:

Theoretically, victim precipitation of forcible rape means that in a particular situation the behavior of the victim is interpreted by the offender either as a direct invitation for sexual relations or as a sign that she will be available for sexual contact if he will persist in demanding it ... Victim behavior may consist of an act of commission (e.g., she agreed to drink or ride with a stranger), or omission (e.g., she failed to react strongly enough to sexual suggestions and overtures). This distinction is made in addition to the variety of interpersonal relationships which may exist between them. (1967: 493).

Amir defined victim precipitated rape as follows:

The term "victim precipitation" describes those rape situations in which the victim actually, or so it was deemed, agreed to sexual relations but

retracted before the actual act or did not react strongly enough when the suggestion was made by the offender(s). The term applies also to cases in risky or vulnerable situations,” marred with sexuality, especially when the victim uses what could be interpreted as indecency in language and gestures, or constitute what could be taken as an invitation to sexual relations (1967: 493).

It is clear that the term does not refer to all rapes. Some of the criticisms are borne out of activism rather than scholarship because Amir even in the context of rape introduced several caveats and attempted distinction between victim-precipitated rape and others. The term and approach do not argue that *all* rapes are victim precipitated but rather that some are. Whether this is the case or not or what proportion of total rape cases are victim-precipitated are empirical questions.

The victim-precipitated approach is not a comprehensive explanation of victimization. However, it provides insight for personal and community crime prevention strategies, including the introduction of target hardening strategies and reduction of attractiveness as target of crime. Criminologists recognize that wearing expensive jewellery and clothing, driving expensive cars, displaying expensive goods in parked vehicle and presence in particular locations at particular times may render an individual vulnerable to attack. It also offers insight into the roles of certain implements such as weapons and alcohol in victimization. Both the life-style exposure and routine activities perspectives incorporated insights from victim-precipitation approach.

### **Life style - exposure perspective**

People are differentially exposed to victimization. Differential exposures are due to lifestyles and individual socioeconomic and demographic backgrounds. Victimization is not an event that is randomly experienced by people with different backgrounds. On the contrary, the likelihood of different types of victimization is associated with different lifestyles. Different lifestyles are associated with varying degrees of exposure to victimization. According to Hindelang et al (1978), lifestyle refers to the routine or regular or recurrent or prevalent activities of individuals. From this perspective, there are high-risk

and low-risk lifestyles. Certain lifestyles engender violence while others attract theft. Rates and types of victimization are therefore associated the lifestyles of individuals. People involved in different lifestyles also experience different types of victimization. Individuals who work during the night, or patronize night clubs are more vulnerable to certain types of victimization compared to those who work during the day or do not patronize clubs. This approach explains the differences in the rates of victimization of different groups in terms of exposure to offenders that are associated with their life styles.

### **Victimogenic place perspective**

Social disorganisation theory points out that the rates of crime are highest in neighbourhoods characterised by poverty and unemployment; high population density, diversity and mobility; lack of dominant cultural values and social control mechanisms; absence or inadequate or deteriorated housing, health, educational and recreational infrastructures. This perspective implies that persons who reside in such neighbourhoods are more likely to be involved in deviant or delinquent or criminal behaviours. From the logic of the theory, such neighbourhoods are both crimogenic and victimogenic, being the two sides of the same coin. Thus, individuals who live in socially disorganised neighbourhoods are more vulnerable to victimization. This implies that victimization rates for different crimes vary across residential neighbourhoods.

### **Routine activity perspective**

Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson (1979) proposed that victimization is determined by the routine activity of individuals. Routine activity, according to them refers to “any recurrent and prevalent activities that provide for basic population and individual needs” (Cohen and Felson (1979: 593). They argue that crime and victimization occur when three necessary but not necessarily sufficient factors are present: availability of suitable or vulnerable targets, absence of capable guardians against crime and victimization (to serve as deterrence to intending offenders) and presence of motivated offenders.

The original proposition was aimed at explaining variation in crime rates as well as the impact of social, political, cultural and economic changes on patterns and trends of crime. Changes in pattern of economic activities and

opportunities will affect the rates of crime and victimization. Increased participation of women in the labour force increases female criminality and victimization in the workplace. In this sense, routine activity and life-style perspectives are similar because they focus on the exposure of individuals to the risk of victimization based on routine activity patterns or lifestyles. They both recognize that lifestyles and routine activities correlate with socioeconomic and demographic factors like age, sex, income, residence, etc.

### **Integrated perspective**

There have been attempts to integrate the life-style/exposure and routine activity perspectives on criminal victimization (Miethe and Meier 1990; Cohen, Kluegel and Land 1981). The two perspectives, according to Meier and Miethe “highlight the importance of physical proximity to motivated offenders, exposure to high risk environments, target attractiveness, and the absence of guardianship as necessary conditions for predatory crime” (1993: 475).

Structural-choice perspective is presented as the integration of the life-style/exposure and routine activity perspectives. The integrated approach “emphasizes both macrodynamic forces that contribute to a criminal opportunity structure (as identified by routine activity theory) and microlevel processes that determine the selection of particular crime victims (as implied by lifestyle-exposure theory)” (Meier and Miethe (1993: 475). Further, under the structural-choice model “proximity and exposure are considered ‘structural’ features (because they pattern the nature of social interaction and predispose individuals to riskier situations), whereas attractiveness and guardianship represent the ‘choice’ component (because they determine the selection of particular crime targets within a sociospatial context)” (Meier and Miethe (1993: 475).

Cohen, et al (1981) developed the ‘opportunity model of predatory victimization’. This approach ‘considers the time-space relationships in which victimization is greatest’. According to them:

The risk of criminal victimization is seen as largely dependent on the lifestyle and routine activities of persons that bring them and/or their

property into direct contact with potential offenders in the absence of capable guardians who could potentially prevent the occurrence of a crime ... In our judgment, the key to understanding why income, race, and age appear to affect the likelihood of victimization in the ways they do is to focus on the mediating role played by five factors: exposure, guardianship, proximity to potential offenders, attractiveness of potential targets, and definitional properties of specific crimes themselves (Cohen et al 1981: 507).

In their empirical test of the model, they “found that exposure, guardianship, and proximity all have significant partial effects on the risk of predatory victimization”(Cohen et al 1981: 520).

The concept of capable guardianship is very central to efforts at preventing crime and victimization. According to Meier and Miethe (1993: 483), the concept has “social (interpersonal) and physical dimensions”. “Social guardianship”, according to Meier and Miethe “includes the number of household members, the density of friendship networks in the neighborhood, and having neighbors watch property or a dwelling when the home is unoccupied”. They observed that “availability of others (e.g., friends, neighbors, pedestrians, law enforcement officers) may prevent crime by their presence alone or through offering physical assistance in warding off an attack” (Meier and Miethe 1993: 483). “Physical guardianship” according to them (Meier and Miethe 1993: 483):

... involves target-hardening activities (e.g., door/window locks, window bars, burglar alarms, guard dogs, ownership of firearms), other physical impediments to household theft (e.g., street lighting, guarded entrances), and participation in collective activities (e.g., neighborhood watch programs, home security surveys)”.

The significance of capable guardianship lies in “increased “costs” to would be offenders (e.g., greater effort, greater risk of detection and apprehension)” and contingent decrease in “the opportunity for victimization” (Meier and Miethe (1993: 483).

Theories of victimization attempt to explain the processes and conditions that expose individuals and groups to becoming victims of different crimes. The theories draw attention to the need to analyse rates of victimization in terms of specific crimes as aggregate rates conceal significant variances across age-groups, sexes, income levels, occupations, leisure and recreational patterns, neighbourhoods and rural-urban spaces.

#### *Population, Sampling and Method*

The population for the study consists of all adult Nigerian males and females aged 18 years and older. It was conducted in all the thirty six states of Nigeria (36) and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). The basic methodology employed for data collection was the in-home, face-to-face personal interview using a stratified multi-stage random selection procedure in order to achieve a nationally representative sample (proportional representative sample). Respondents for this study were adult Nigerian males and females aged, eighteen years and above and have stayed in the selected household for a period of not less than six months. Non-citizens of Nigeria, people who were younger than eighteen years and those living in institutionalized settings were not part of the respondents. A total of 11518 respondents were interviewed in July 2011.

The questionnaire was translated from English to Pidgin English, Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba languages. These were the local languages spoken predominantly in the country. The interview was conducted in five languages and the translation of the questionnaire to local languages was aimed at ensuring uniform translation of questions and proper administration of questionnaire by the field interviewers. Fieldwork for the survey was conducted by Practical Sampling International (PSI), a very competent private commercial company with wide experience in survey research.

#### *Social background of respondents*

The respondents were from different socio-demographic and economic backgrounds, which are presented in table 1. More than one-half of the respondents in the sample were 30 years old or younger. The survey was

designed with equal representation of male and female respondents. A disproportionately high proportion of 87% attended secondary school or higher, which is higher than the distribution in the general population (table 1).

Table 1: Socioeconomic background of respondents

Socio-economic background	N	%
<i>Age (years)</i>		
18-24	3390	29.4
25-30	3353	29.1
31-35	1538	13.3
34-40	1164	10.1
41-50	1186	10.3
51 and older	889	7.7
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	5757	50
Female	5761	50
<i>Religious Affiliation</i>		
Christianity	7039	61.1
Muslim	4365	37.9
Traditional	69	0.6
Others	45	0.4
<i>Education</i>		
No formal education	358	3.1
Koranic school	318	2.8
Literacy class	81	0.7
Primary	748	6.5
Secondary	6114	53.1
Tertiary	3899	33.9

<i>Personal income (per month)</i>		
Less than 10,000	4429	38.5
10,000-25,000	2157	18.7
25,000-50,000	1368	11.9
50,000 and higher	875	8.4
Don't know/refused to answer	2589	22.6
<i>Occupation</i>		
Working	5839	50.7
Looking for employment	1102	9.6
House-keeping/house-wife	1184	10.3
Pupil, student, apprentice	2751	23.9
Retired	276	2.4
Others	366	3.2

## CHAPTER II

### EXTENT AND PATTERN OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION

#### *Extent of criminal victimization: 2011*

The incidence of crime and criminal victimization varies over time. One of the principal goals of crime victimization survey is to track the extent and trend of different crime in a society or nation. In order to track the incidence of victimization, victim survey questionnaire contain questions on whether or not the respondents and/or their household members were victims of any crime or specific crimes within a particular period, usually a calendar year.

#### *Victimization of household members*

Respondents in the crime victimization survey in Nigeria for the year 2011 were asked “In the year 2011, did any member of your household other than yourself suffer any of the following crimes?” They were presented with a list of crimes and were required to indicate ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the questions. The responses obtained from the respondents showed different degrees of victimization for different crimes (table 2).

The most common form of criminal victimization suffered by household members of the respondents were theft of mobile phone handset, theft of money, domestic violence, physical assault, burglary and robbery. Overall, the most common forms of criminal victimization were property crimes – both violent and non-violent. Compared to 2010, more criminal victimization was recorded in 2011 for virtually all the common crimes (table 2).

Table 2: Victimization of respondents' household members

<b>Types of victimization</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Murder	1.3	2.2
Attempted murder	1.4	2.3
Robbery	6.7	10.2
Attempted robbery	3.5	5.9
Rape	1.0	1.3
Attempted rape	1.4	1.7
Sexual exploitation/trafficking	-	0.8
Kidnapping	0.8	1.4
Attempted kidnapping	0.8	1.6
Theft of car	2.0	3.7
Theft of motorcycle	4.0	6.0
Domestic violence	13.8	19.8
Forced same-sex intercourse	2.0	2.9
Physical assault	10.6	16.9
Theft of mobile phone handset	21.1	24.8
Burglary	9.3	11.0
Theft of money	16.2	19.8
Theft from car	3.1	6.3
Theft of agricultural product	6.9	8.5
Armed violence other than robbery	-	4.2

*Personal Victimization*

Besides the question on the victimization of household members, the respondents were also asked about their own personal experience of victimization. They were asked if they suffer any crime victimization in the year 2011. Nearly a third (31.0) of the respondents reported being a victim of

crime in 2011. The extent of criminal victimization varied considerably across states (table 3).

High levels of personal crime victimization were reported by respondents in many states such as Ebonyi, Enugu, Niger, Ondo, Kebbi, Gombe, Bayelsa, Anambra, Benue, Kogi and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) where more than 50% of the respondents said they were victims of crime in 2011. In contrast, relatively low levels of personal crime victimization were reported by respondents in some states such as Katsina, Nasarawa, Adamawa, Kano, Taraba, Sokoto and Osun where less than one-in-eight respondents reported being victims of crime during the year (table 3).

Table 3: Personal victimization: 2011

Any crime victimization?	
States	% yes
Abia	33.2
Adamawa	7.4
Akwa-Ibom	21.1
Anambra	54.9
Bauchi	20.6
Bayelsa	59.4
Benue	53.0
Borno	32.5
Cross-River	43.9
Delta	26.2
Ebonyi	95.1
Edo	16.0
Ekiti	36.8
Enugu	81.9
FCT	51.0
Gombe	62.1

Imo	30.3
Jigawa	17.8
Kaduna	13.0
Kano	8.8
Katsina	6.0
Kebbi	69.2
Kogi	52.1
Kwara	46.6
Lagos	22.7
Nasarawa	6.7
Niger	77.1
Ogun	19.6
Ondo	70.1
Osun	11.0
Oyo	40.1
Plateau	28.9
Rivers	26.6
Sokoto	10.6
Taraba	10.1
Yobe	32.4
Zamfara	20.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>31.0</b>

The respondents were asked whether or not they were victims of particular crime during the year. Their responses presented in table 4 indicated they were victims of several crimes. Many of the respondents were victims of theft of mobile phone handset, physical assault; theft of money, domestic violence and robbery. The level of personal victimization was higher in 2011 than 2010 (table 4).

Table 4: Personal crime victimization 2010 and 2011

Types of crime	2010		2011	
	% of Sample	% of Victims	% of Sample	% of Victims
Victim of any crime	23.7	-	31.0	-
Attempted murder	0.6	2.5	0.7	2.3
Robbery	3.2	13.5	5.3	17.0
Attempted Robbery	1.5	6.2	2.9	9.3
Rape	0.3	1.2	0.3	1.0
Attempted Rape	0.4	1.6	0.6	2.1
Kidnapping	0.2	0.9	0.2	0.8
Attempted Kidnapping	0.3	1.4	0.3	0.9
Theft of car	0.5	2.0	0.9	2.9
Theft of motor cycle	1.3	5.3	1.5	5.0
Domestic violence	5.0	21.0	9.5	30.6
Force same-set Intercourse	0.6	2.4	0.9	2.7
Physical assault	4.8	20.2	10.9	35.0
Theft of mobile phone handset	11.8	49.9	14.4	46.3
Burglary	3.2	13.7	4.9	15.7
Theft of money	8.3	34.8	9.8	31.7
Theft from car	0.9	3.8	2.4	7.7
Theft of Agricultural products	2.4	10.3	3.0	9.8
N	11,518	2729	11,518	3575

Respondent in the survey covering the year 2011 were asked if they were victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking for prostitution. Only 0.2% (26) of the entire sample (11,518) reported that they were victims

*Pattern of criminal victimization*

In addition to providing information on the extent of criminal victimization, victim survey is particularly useful for exploring and understanding the pattern (distribution) of different crimes across groups and regions in a country. The data presented in table 5 indicate the relative levels of victimization in respect of different crimes in different states in the country. The most common forms of criminal victimization (excluding theft of mobile phone handsets) suffered by respondents were robbery domestic violence, theft of money, assault, burglary and robbery. Table 5 presents data on the patterns of these crimes across the states in the country.

Table 5: Victimization of household members 2011

States	Robbery	Domestic Violence	Physical Assault	Theft of Money	Burglary	N
Abia	9.6	3.8	12.0	14.4	6.3	208
Adamawa	6.5	35.7	5.7	20.4	17.4	230
Akwa-Ibom	3.5	18.7	14.1	11.3	5.6	284
Anambra	46.4	34.5	28.9	34.2	15.8	304
Bauchi	2.9	17.9	8.8	27.4	17.4	340
Bayelsa	10.2	14.1	11.7	10.2	12.5	128
Benue	19.4	20.1	28.9	37.2	28.3	304
Borno	7.6	24.8	18.5	12.3	10.6	302
Cross-River	35.0	36.4	44.4	35.5	29.0	214
Delta	8.7	1.3	23.8	21.8	11.7	298
Ebonyi	29.9	67.7	56.7	51.8	24.4	164
Edo	20.6	18.1	25.2	27.3	18.9	238
Ekiti	17.8	13.8	10.3	27.8	14.4	174
Enugu	19.7	51.3	39.1	23.9	8.4	238
FCT	24.0	14.4	26.9	22.1	21.2	104

Gombe	18.4	22.4	14.4	25.3	14.4	174
Imo	8.8	4.2	9.5	7.0	3.2	284
Jigawa	0.0	20.7	13.1	21.7	6.4	314
Kaduna	4.6	14.4	8.7	13.8	8.4	438
Kano	5.5	19.1	11.4	14.4	9.9	674
Katsina	6.0	5.6	4.6	16.7	3.9	414
Kebbi	15.8	23.5	70.9	67.5	36.3	234
Kogi	16.0	16.0	13.9	30.6	8.8	238
Kwara	4.6	16.1	26.4	24.1	8.0	174
Lagos	3.4	11.6	8.8	7.7	4.9	2000
Nasarawa	9.0	26.9	11.9	14.2	9.0	134
Niger	3.1	52.4	43.1	16.7	14.9	288
Ogun	3.0	7.8	6.3	8.1	3.7	270
Ondo	34.5	40.9	10.2	37.8	16.1	254
Osun	2.4	5.1	0.8	2.4	1.6	254
Oyo	5.0	24.8	5.9	20.0	5.9	404
Plateau	6.9	8.2	11.2	22.8	16.8	232
Rivers	16.1	37.6	42.2	33.8	11.6	372
Sokoto	3.8	23.5	13.6	23.1	15.2	264
Taraba	0.6	13.7	3.6	26.8	8.9	168
Yobe	9.4	17.6	4.7	12.4	7.1	170
Zamfara	18.8	17.9	17.9	23.1	12.8	234
<b>Total</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11,518</b>

#### *Rape and kidnapping*

Rape and kidnapping are very serious crimes that have attracted serious concern among members of the public and the government in the country. 1.3% (153) of the total sample (11,518) reported that a member of their households (other than themselves) were victims of rape, in 2011. Highest level of victimization

were reported in the following states: Cross River (11.7%), Borno (4.6%), Gombe (4.6%), Zamfara (8.5%) and Anambra (3.6%) . In the case of kidnapping, 1.4% (160) of the total sample (11,518) reported that a member of their households (other than themselves) were victims of kidnapping in 2011. Highest levels of kidnapping of household members were reported in the following states: Anambra (8.2%), Cross Rivers (7.0%), Edo (4.6%), Ebonyi (4.3%), Borno (4.3%), Delta (2.3%), Gombe (2.9%), Enugu (2.1%), Ondo (4.3%) and Zamfara (4.3%)

*Trend of crime victimization in states*

Crime victimization surveys provide information for mapping the trends of crimes. More than a quarter (28.2%) of the respondents felt that crime increased while more than a half (52%) perceived decrease in the level of crime in their states. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not safety from crime and violence is worse or better than it was few years ago. Their responses presented in table 6 showed that perception of safety from crime and violence now compared to the past varied considerably across the states.

Table 6: Trend of safety from crime now compared to past years

<i>State</i>	Safety from crime and violence in 2011 compared to past years	
	Worse	Better
Abia	40.4	17.3
Adamawa	47.8	23.5
Akwa-Ibom	23.6	46.4
Anambra	58.0	15.8
Bauchi	50.0	29.4
Bayelsa	37.5	36.0
Benue	17.1	17.0
Borno	51.3	11.0
Cross River	39.2	17.3

Delta	49.3	12.0
Ebonyi	47.0	18.3
Edo	9.6	54.6
Ekiti	20.7	21,3
Enugu	30.6	36.1
FCT	61.5	17.3
Gombe	44.8	22.4
Imo	8.1	50.4
Jigawa	8.3	70.3
Kaduna	47.2	11.2
Kano	45.0	16.9
Katsina	27.3	40.3
Kebbi	24.8	25.6
Kogi	48.3	26.5
Kwara	23.6	31.0
Lagos	26.8	37.6
Nasarawa	35.1	35.8
Niger	43.4	13.1
Ogun	11.1	59.3
Ondo	14.6	55.9
Osun	3.5	89.8
Oyo	18.6	40.6
Plateau	44.4	21.6
Rivers	26,9	46.3
Sokoto	42.0	16.0
Taraba	30.4	40.5
Yobe	67.7	16.5
Zamfara	42.3	24.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>32.4</b>

Response category “remain the same” is excluded from the figure in the table

High levels of improvement in safety from crime and violence in 2011 were reported by respondents in Osun, Jigawa, Ogun, Ondo, Edo, Kano, Akwa Ibom, Oyo, Taraba and Katsina states where at least 40% of the respondents said safety from crime and violence was better now than few years ago. In contrast, lowest improvements in safety from crime and violence were reported by respondents in Borno, Kaduna, Delta, Niger, Anambra, Sokoto, Yobe, Kano and Benue states where 17% or less reported improved safety. More than one-half of the respondents in Benue state, however, reported that the level of safety from crime and violence the same in 2011 as was in the past.

*Socioeconomic background and victimization*

Several research findings in the literature indicate that the likelihood of being a victim of crime is determined by several socio-economic factors such as sex, age, education, income, marital status, and residence in rural or urban areas. Table 7 presents the relationships between socioeconomic status and crime victimization. No strong relationships were observed between socioeconomic factors and victimization. Analysis of the relationships between socio-economic status and specific crimes may yield a different result. Such analysis is beyond the scope of the aim of this work.

Table7: Socio-economic background and victimization in 2011

Socioeconomic background	N	% yes
<i>Age (years)</i>		
18-24	3390	29.6
25-30	3353	30.9
31-35	1536	31.4
34-40	1164	30.9
41-50	1186	34.1
51 and older	889	32.3
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	5757	30.7

Female	5761	31.3
<i>Marital status</i>		
Never married	5201	31
Married	5994	31
Divorced	117	36.8
Separated	52	30.8
Widow/widower	154	27.9
<i>Residence</i>		
Urban	7292	29
Rural	4226	34.5
<i>Religious Affiliation</i>		
Christianity	7039	33.9
Muslim	4368	26.5
Traditional	69	23.2
<i>Personal income (per month in naira)</i>		
Less than 5,000	2003	29.7
5,000-10,000	2426	32.4
10,000-25,000	2157	31
25,000 - 50,000	1368	29.1
50,000-75,000	512	27.5
75,000-100,000	280	29.6
<i>Education</i>		
No formal education	358	28.2
Koranic school	318	20.8
Literacy class	81	23.5
Some primary	172	32
Completed primary	576	35.4
Some secondary	1162	32
Completed secondary	4952	31.2
Post secondary	3899	31.1

### *Gender and victimization*

Literature consistently indicated that males commit more crimes and also suffer more criminal victimization. Researches as well as police, judicial and prisons statistics have generally upheld the findings of higher rate of criminality by men. However, there is less consistency in crime survey findings on higher victimization of males. The assumption of higher male crime perpetration stems from the proposition in the literature attributing crime propensity to several factors, including higher strain to succeed and cater for the family, masculinity and physical strength and opportunity to commit crime which is integral to higher male labour participation. Males were also considered to be more prone to victimization because they are deemed to be more likely to be involved in life styles and routine activities associated with high vulnerability. It has also been found that that males are more likely to be present in environments and places with high crime and victimization rates.

It may however, be argued that relative victimization between male and female will be determined by social, cultural, economic and political contexts. There are differential gender-based exposures to certain crime which may be mediated by socio-cultural and economic factors. Table 8 presents an analysis of sex and crime victimization, and no significant relationships were discovered.

Analysis of victimization of males and females across the states reveal significant differences. In Adamawa, Anambra, Benue, Edo, Enugu, Kano, Ondo, Rivers, Yobe and Zamfara states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT, Abuja), more females experienced victimization than males. In contrast, more males experienced victimization in Abia, Bauchi, Cross River, Ekiti, Gombe, Imo, Jigawa, Kaduna, Katsina, Kebbi, Kogi, Kwara and Taraba states (table 8).

Table 8: Comparison of Personal victimization by sex in 2011

<b>States</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Both Sexes</b>
Abia	35.6	30.8	33.2
Adamawa	5.2	9.6	7.4

Akwa-Ibom	20.4	21.8	21.1
Anambra	53.3	56.6	54.9
Bauchi	26.0	15.2	20.6
Bayelsa	60.9	57.8	59.4
Benue	47.0	58.8	53.0
Borno	31.3	33.6	32.5
Cross-River	54.2	33.6	43.9
Delta	25.5	26.8	26.2
Ebonyi	92.7	97.6	95.1
Edo	12.6	19.3	16.0
Ekiti	40.2	33.3	36.8
Enugu	68.9	95.0	81.9
FCT	48.1	53.8	51.0
Gombe	65.1	59.1	62.1
Imo	33.1	27.5	30.3
Jigawa	23.6	12.1	17.8
Kaduna	16.4	9.6	13.0
Kano	4.4	13.1	8.8
Katsina	12.1	0.0	6.0
Kebbi	72.0	66.4	69.2
Kogi	55.5	48.7	52.1
Kwara	51.7	41.4	46.6
Lagos	22.0	23.4	22.7
Nasarawa	9.0	4.5	6.7
Niger	77.1	77.1	77.1
Ogun	20.0	19.3	19.6
Ondo	63.0	77.2	70.1
Osun	10.3	11.7	11.0
Oyo	38.6	41.6	40.1

Plateau	29.3	28.4	28.9
Rivers	20.4	32.8	26.6
Sokoto	11.4	9.8	10.6
Taraba	13.1	7.1	10.1
Yobe	24.7	40.0	32.4
Zamfara	17.9	23.9	20.9

Research findings and official crime statistics indicate that a significant majority of cases of rape and other forms of sexual violence are perpetrated against women by males. The female respondents were asked if they or any female member of their households were victims of several forms of sexual deviance and crime. Their responses were presented in table 9. Cases of rape, attempted rape, indecent assault, offensive behaviour, domestic violence, incest and sexual exploitation against females by males were reported. Less than a quarter (22.9%) of the rape cases was reported to the police while three quarters (74.9) of the incidence were not reported to any agency or person by the victims.

Table 9: Gender victimization of household female members including respondents

Type of victimization	(N =5761) %
Rape of opposite sex	1.4
Attempted rape by opposite sex	9.8
Indecent assault by opposite sex	3.5
Offensive behavior by opposite sex	7.8
Domestic violence by opposite sex	9.4
Incest by opposite sex	1.2

Sexual exploitation or trafficking by opposite sex	0.3
<i>Report of rape and attempted rape by victims</i>	% (N=223)
Cases of rape and attempted rape reported to the police	22.9
Reported to other authority	0.7
Did not report to anyone or agency	74.9

Female respondents (51) who reported cases of to the police were asked if they were satisfied with the handling of their report. Their responses indicated that 33.3% were not satisfied; 7.8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 58.8% were satisfied. Reasons given for dissatisfaction by the dissatisfied respondents (n = 21 ) were (a) police did not do enough to apprehend offenders (38.1%); (b) police did not keep me properly informed of their actions (19.0%); (c) police did not treat me with respect (14.3%); (d) police were slow to arrive (19.0%); (e) police keep asking me for money (4.8%), and (f) police colluded with suspects (4.8%). Reasons given for not reporting cases of rape to the police by victims were fear of stigmatization; fear of disrespect or embarrassing questions by the police; police will not apprehend the rapist; police may not take report seriously; police may delay action and require frequent presence at the station, and there is no money to give to the police as bribe.

The opinions of the respondents on the extent of rape in their communities were sought. More than a half (53.6%) of the respondents said that rape was completely non-existent in their community; 27.3% said there were occasional or few cases of rape; 7.2% reported that rape was widespread and only 1.6% said cases of rape was widespread. They were asked about what they consider to be causes of rape in the community. Different reasons were provided by the respondents. The three most common reason given were provocative dressing by young women, lack of self-control by men and influence of alcohol (table 10)

Table 10: Reasons for rape in community

Reasons	(N=11,518) %
Provocative dressing by young women	75.6
Influence of media	26.4
Lack of self-control by men	53.4
Mental illness of men	25.1
Influence of alcohol	35.6
Walking late at night	0.9

## CHAPTER III

### POLICE AND POLICING IN NIGERIA

Police are the primary agency of government responsible for policing. The term policing refers to activities and measures purposively designed and introduced to guarantee public peace, order and security as well as personal safety and security. Nigeria currently has a national police, having abolished native authority and local government system of police in the late 1960s. Section 214(1) of the 1999 Constitution provided that:

There shall be a Police Force for Nigeria, which shall be known as the Nigeria Police Force, and subject to the provisions of this section, no other police force shall be established for the Federation or any part thereof.

The functions of the Nigeria Police Force were specified in section 4 of the Police Act (*Laws of the Federation 1990*)<sup>3</sup> as:

1. Prevention and detection of crime.
2. Apprehension of offenders.
3. Preservation of law and order.
4. Protection of life and property.
5. Enforcement of all laws and regulations with which they are charged.
6. Military duties within or without Nigeria as may be required of them.

The Nigeria Police Force is structured as 36 State Commands and FCT Command, each under the command of a Commissioner of Police. The State Commands are further organised as Area Commands; Divisional Commands, Police Stations and Police Posts. Police stations and police posts are the primary operational units of public policing in the country. The Nigeria Police Force has personnel strength of about 370,000 in 2012.

The relationships between the public and the police have historically been characterized by mutual distrust due to what has been attributed to the brutal,

---

<sup>3</sup> The Law was first enacted in 1943 and there had been only very minor modifications.

repressive and unaccountable police culture of the colonial police forces that has been strengthened by post colonial autocratic military and civilian regimes. Further, ineffectiveness, corruption within the police, and corruption by the police during official contacts with the citizens erode confidence in the law enforcement officials. Over the past six years, since 2006, the federal government has expressed its intention to reform the police and went ahead to set up reform panels in 2006, 2008 and 2012, all of which were tasked to do almost exactly the same thing – study the problems, inadequacies, structure and organization of the police force and make necessary recommendations. The recommendations of the panels have not been implemented with any serious commitment by the government.

*Crime reporting and satisfaction with police*

One of the strong indicators of public confidence in the police is the willingness of the citizens to report crimes and criminals to the police in their community. Motivations for reporting crimes to the police include desire to have the suspect arrested and tried; recovery of stolen property; assistance to obtain help from other agencies, protection from repeat victimization, etc. Victims in Nigeria are reluctant to report their victimization to the police because of fear of leakage of report and identity of the reporter to criminals, frequent demand for bribe; lack of sensitivity in handling victims, and ineffectiveness in recovering lost property and apprehending suspects. The respondents who reported being victims of crime in 2011 were asked about which agency or individuals they reported their last experience of criminal victimization. Their responses are presented in table 11.

Table 11: Persons or Agencies to who victimization was Reported

Persons or Agencies	N=3899 %
Family or Friend	63.6
Police	20.8
Traditional Ruler or Leader	2.9

Prosecutors	0.6
Vigilante Group or Ethnic militia	3.9
Religious Leaders	4.5
Armed Forces other than Police	0.8
Professional Bodies	0.3
Community Groups	1.4
NGOs and CBDs	0.4
Public Office Holders or politicians	0.4
Others	0.8

Only one-in five victims (20.8%) reported their victimization to the police. Victims who reported their victimization to the police express varied levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the handling of their reports. Out of the 810 victims who reported to the police, 7.4% were not at all satisfied; 31.1% were not satisfied; 13.8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 36.3% were satisfied and 11.4% were very satisfied. Those who were dissatisfied (312) gave several reasons (table 12)

Table 12: Reasons for dissatisfaction with police handling of case

Reasons for dissatisfaction	N = 312 %
Police did not do enough to apprehend offenders	26.3
Police did not do enough to recover property	32.7
Police did not keep me properly informed of actions	11.5
Police did not treat me with respect	4.5
Police were slow to arrive	12.2
Police kept asking me for money	4.8
Police colluded with suspect	0.6
Other reasons	

The responses in table 12 indicate that victims' dissatisfaction was caused principally by ineffectiveness, corruption and inadequate feedback on the handling of criminal complaints. Police can therefore enhance crime reporting by citizens by improving their effectiveness, integrity and relationships with victims.

*Public assessment of police performance*

Police effectiveness and integrity are critical determinants of public trust in the police. Police forces in Nigeria, since their emergence during the colonial rule have been criticized as ineffective and corrupt (Alemika 1988, 1993, 2003; Ohonbamu 1975; Odekunle 1979; Kayode 1976). Recent government panels established to reform the police have also reported that the performance of the Nigeria Police Force has not been satisfactory<sup>4</sup>. Table 13 presents the opinion of members of the public on the performance of the Nigerian police. Slightly less than a half (48.8%) of the respondents rated the performance of the police as good compared to slightly less than a third (32%) that described the performance of the police as poor (table 13).

Table 13: Public opinion on police performance in 2011

Performance of police	%
Very poor	13.0
Poor	19.0
Neither good nor poor	18.3
Good	40.4
Very good	8.4
Don't know	1.0

---

<sup>4</sup> Federal Government of Nigeria. 2006. Report of the Presidential Panel of Police Reform and Federal Government of Nigeria. 2008. Report of the Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Nigeria Police Force.

Several recommendations for the improvement of the police were made by the respondents. Most salient recommendations were more training, better equipment and facilities; more discipline and supervision by the government and better remuneration. In recent times, state governors and some vocal elites called for the decentralization of the police and the creation of state police as preconditions for effective policing in the country. Members of the public did not identify this action as a critical measure towards improving the Nigerian police (table 14)

Table 14: Measures toward improving the police

Measures for improving the police	(N = 11,518) %
More Training	28.3
Adequate funding	9.0
Better equipment and facilities	23.9
Better remuneration	9.8
More discipline and supervision by government	17.6
Greater autonomy from interference by government	5.5
Recruit more women	1.1
Adopt community policing approach	2.7
Create state police	0.9
Decentralize policing powers to local commanders	0.7

*Priority policing issues*

Crime surveys allow citizens to make input into government’s policy on crime prevention and control. The respondents identified several issues that should be given priority by the police for effective policing and performance. The major priority issues for the police identified by the public were control of terrorism, corruption in the Force, armed robbery and ethno-religious conflicts. These are core traditional police functions. Other priority areas identified by

the respondents were protection of human rights and apprehension and prosecution of offenders (table 15).

Members of the Nigeria Police Force are widely criticized for the violation of human rights (Alemika 1993, 2003; 2006a, 2006b, Alemika and Chukwuma 2000), including extra-judicial killings. Many of the allegations of extra-judicial killings (NOPRIN/OSJI 2010; Amnesty International 2012; Human Rights Watch 2005, 2009, 2012) lack reliable empirical substantiation as well as inadequate appreciation of the contextual and organizational factors that precipitate apparent excessive use of lethal force. Nonetheless, there is concern by the public, government and police authority over cases of extra-judicial killing in the country. Available statistics from the Nigeria Police Force showed that over five years from 2005 -2009:

1. 1,043 citizens were killed in armed robbery incidents;
2. 16,925 robbery suspects were arrested by the police;
3. 3,651 armed robbery suspects were prosecuted, which constitute only about 20% of robbery suspects arrested during the period;
4. 2,216 robbery suspects were killed in encounter with the police
5. 517 police officers were killed in encounter with robbers.

The high incidence and fear of armed robbery in the country and the use of sophisticated weapons by robbers precipitated high level of robbery-related fatality. The inefficiency of the police in apprehending and prosecuting suspects was given by victims as a reason for not reporting crime to the police or dissatisfaction with the police handling of complaints. Police ineffectiveness in respect of apprehension and prosecution of crime suspects breed impunity, fear of crime and lack of confidence in police. In order to overcome these challenges, the police should pay attention to the recommendations of members of the public presented in table 15.

Table 15: Issues to which Police should devote priority attention

Priority issues for the police	N = 11,518 %
Controlling ethno-religious conflicts	7.6
Controlling armed robbery	17.4
Controlling violent crimes	15.1
Controlling corruption	19.5
Apprehending and prosecuting offenders	9.6
Patrolling the streets	7.5
Prompt response to calls for assistance	5.2
Protect the human rights of citizens	7.9
Controlling terrorism	7.6
Protect children from violence	0.9
Protect women against domestic violence	0.7

*Police powers to kill*

Police in Nigeria are frequently accused of extra-judicial killings and use of excessive force. Respondents were asked whether or not they support police having power to kill under certain conditions. More than two-fifths (41.7%) supported granting police powers to kill persons caught engaging in armed robbery. Slightly less than a half of (48.1%) were not in support of such power. There was also strong support for granting police powers to kill person found committing serious crimes. More respondents (45.5%) supported granting such powers compared to 39.2% who opposed police being granting powers to kill persons found committing serious crimes (table 16). The high incidence and support for extra-judicial killings and use of excessive force may be attributed to high incidence of violent crimes in the society and culture of impunity engendered by ineffectiveness of the criminal justice system to apprehend, prosecute and convict offenders.

Table 16: Public support or opposition to police power to kill suspects

Police should have power to kill those involved in following crimes.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Caught in Armed Robbery	18.1	30.0	9.4	24.3	17.4	0.8
Armed robbery suspect in custody	25.5	44.4	13.0	11.7	4.5	0.8
Violent political, ethnic and religious conflict	20.8	39.4	14.5	16.3	8.0	1.0
Found committing serious crimes	12.4	26.8	13.9	29.5	16.2	1.3

One of the major crime control approaches adopted by the police in the country is the erection of check point on highways to screen vehicles for compliance with licensing requirements and detection of crime and suspects. Numerous abuses by police such as corruption, brutality and extra-judicial killings occur at check-points. As a result, police authorities sometimes direct that the check-points be dismantled but only for them to re-appear due to poor implementation of directives and sometimes due to public demand for them as a measure against highway robbery. The respondents were asked whether they support or oppose dismantling of check-points on the highway and major streets in the cities. Respondents were divided with 44.8% opposing dismantling compared to 42.6% supporting the action (table 17).

Table 17: Public approval or disapproval of police check points

Opposition to or support for removal of check points	(N = 11,518) %
Strongly oppose	21.7
Oppose	23.1
Neutral	11.4
Support	21.9
Strongly support	20.7
Don't know	1.2

*Appointment of the Inspector-General of Police*

The quality of leadership provided by the Inspector-General of the Police (IGP) is a major determinant of the effectiveness, integrity and legitimacy of the police. However, the quality of the IGP is dependent on the criteria and process employed for the appointment of an individual to the position. Under the current Constitution of Nigeria, the IGP is appointed by the President with the advice of the Police Council. The President is the Chairman of the Council. State governors, Chairman of the Police Service Commission (PSC) and IGP are members. There are no explicit criteria for the appointment of the IGP other than he/she should be a member of the Force. In addition, there is no provision on tenure for the IGP. As a result, the President exercises great influence over the appointment and tenure of an IGP, which is partly responsible for the rapid turnover of holders of the office of the Inspector-General of Police<sup>5</sup>. This has led to suggestion that police performance, professionalism and trustworthiness can be enhanced if the appointment of the IGP is made more transparent, competitive and merit-based through a democratic process and with a security of tenure (Alemika 2011). Respondents were asked to make suggestions about how IGP should be appointed. Nearly

---

<sup>5</sup> Between 1999 and 2012, the Nigeria Police Force had seven Inspectors-General of Police, an average tenure of less than two years.

a half (48.2%) of the respondents recommended that the IGP should be appointed based on joint-criteria of seniority and merit (table 18).

Table 18: Public view on criteria for appointing IGP

Criteria for selecting IGP	(N= 11,518) %
Selection by the president	15.0
Seniority and merits	48.7
Open advertisement for police officers to apply	12.0
Police officers voting for qualified officers (election)	16.3
Selection by National Assembly	6.4

### *Policing terrorism*

Over the past 13 years, since return to civil rule, Nigeria has experienced the emergence of ethnic and religious militias, criminal gangs, insurgents and terrorists (the latest being the *Boko Haram* insurgents) in different parts of the country. The activities of these groups have challenged the capacity of the state to maintain security.

The opinions of the respondents on police measures and performance in tackling terrorism as well as an assessment of government's measures aimed at curbing the activities of terror groups in the country were sought. Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with police performance in tackling terrorism in Nigeria. Majority (54.5%) were dissatisfied and 30.3% were satisfied (table 19) with the performance of the police in tackling terrorism in the country. Similarly, 56.3% of the respondents were dissatisfied with government's handling of terrorism (table 19).

Table 19: Satisfaction with police and government efforts in controlling terrorism

<i>Satisfaction with police anti-terrorism measures</i>	(N = 11,518) %
Very dissatisfied	30.4
Dissatisfied	24.1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13.3
Satisfied	25.7
Very satisfied	4.6
Don't know	1.8
<i>Satisfaction with government anti terrorism measures</i>	(N=11,518) %
Very dissatisfied	31.9
Dissatisfied	24.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	12.3
Satisfied	25.0
Very satisfied	4.9
Don't know	1.5

The main approach that the government has adopted in tackling armed revolts in the country is the establishment and deployment of joint task forces or special task forces (JTF/STF) consisting of personnel from the army, navy, air force, police and the state security services. As can be anticipated, the composition of the forces is often determined by the nature of conflict or threat; type of groups involved and the location of the revolts or insurgency. The success of this approach has been limited due to a range of factors including inadequate capability in intelligence, investigation and other operational functions; lack of political consensus among elites and distrust between the government and citizens.

Respondents were further asked about measures they consider necessary for effective control of terrorism in the country. Major measures recommended by them were close working relationships between the police and community residents; thorough investigation, inter-agency collaboration, and retraining of personnel to meet the emerging threats of terrorism (table 20). Dialogue with terrorists and strengthening of the capacity of the security agencies were the two major measures, which the public recommended to the government for tackling the nation's terrorism threats and attacks (table 20).

Table 20: Recommendations for police and government counter-terrorism measures

<i>Recommended measures for police control of terrorism</i>	(N=11,518) %
Through investigation	51.8
Working closely with the community	52.2
Constant patrol	38.7
Collaboration with other security agencies	46.5
Retraining personal	30.0
Satisfy the demands of terrorism	6.6
<i>Recommended measures for government</i>	(N=11,518) %
Dialogue with terrorists	33.4
Give money to terrorists to achieve peace	7.8
Use of force	18.7
Strengthen capacity of security agencies	31.2

- Percentages did not add up to 100 because the categories are separate questions.

## CHAPTER IV

### CORRUPTION AND GOVERNANCE

Corruption is an endemic problem in Nigeria. It manifests in public and private sectors as bribery, embezzlement, nepotism and abuse of power in misallocating resources, contracts and infrastructure to less deserving individuals and groups. Corrupt practices are serious obstacles to development, democracy and security in the nation. Although, several laws have been introduced and many agencies established for the control of corruption, their effectiveness have been insignificant due to failure to enforce the relevant laws thereby engendering impunity. Dozens of state governors, elected officials, senior public bureaucrats and technocrats, and corporate executives have been arrested and indicted since 1999 under elected civilian government. However, only an insignificant proportion of the cases have been effectively prosecuted. The cases are most often frustrated by the culprits using their political influence and wealth to obtain frivolous judicial orders and unending adjournments.

#### *Extent and trend of corruption*

There are widespread reports of corruption among public officials in the country. However, there is a dearth of reliable data on the extent of corruption in the various public agencies in the country. Public opinion on corruption was investigated. Respondents were asked if they had contacts with specified officials with a view to obtaining service and whether or not they were asked to pay bribe before being served. This provides a more reliable estimate of corruption than simply asking what proportion of officials were perceived as corrupt or asking the respondents about their opinion on the likelihood of having to pay bribe before being served by officials of public and private agencies. The data presented in table 21 indicate that perception of likelihood of being required to pay bribe by public law enforcement agencies grossly exaggerated the level of corruption by officials of the agencies. Nonetheless, more than a quarter of respondents who had demanded services from the Nigeria Police Force, Nigeria Immigration Service, Nigeria Customs Service, Federal Road Safety Commission, and Independent Corrupt Practices

Commission were asked to pay bribe by officials before being served (table 21)

Table21: Contact for service and demand for bribe by public agencies' officials

Agencies	Contact for service	Requested to pay bribe	Likelihood of officials demanding bribe
Economic and Financial Crime Control (EFCC)	1.3	19.6	49.1
Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC)	7.2	26.3	51.1
State Security Services (SSS)	1.9	18.6	46.9
Independent Corrupt Practices commission (ICPC)	1.2	30.1	-
Nigeria Customs Service (NCS)	4.0	26.9	65.4
Nigeria Immigration Service (NIS)	6.3	29.7	65.6
Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHN/NEPA)	51.7	24.2	62.3
National Security and Civil Defence Corps (NSCDC)	8.1	22.2	-
Nigeria Police Force	30.4	40.8	76.4
National Assembly (Elected offices)	2.5	12.8	57.8
State Assembly (Elected offices)	2.8	11.7	57.2
Local Government Councilors	4.0	9.5	62.8
Tax and Revenue Offices	8.8	21.2	60.8
Lower Court Offices	4.9	17.7	55.0
Higher Court Offices	3.8	13.8	52.1
Nigeria Prisons Services	10.8	8.3	51.8
Nigeria Postal Service	10.8	7.1	41.2

Nearly a quarter (23.8%) of the sample said they were asked to pay bribe by a government official before they rendered required services in 2011 (2741 out of 11,518). Most of the people who were asked to pay bribe did not report the incident to relevant authorities. Only 3.7% of those requested to pay bribe reported to the police; 0.8% reported to ICPC; 0.9% reported to EFCC and 3.9% reported to other agencies.

*Trend of corruption in States*

Respondents were asked if corrupt practices decreased, remained the same or increased in 2011 within their respective states. Their responses were distributed as follow: decreased a lot (7.1%); slightly decreased (21.8%); stayed the same (18.7%); slightly increased (23.4%) and increased a lot (23.4%). A half (50.4%) of the respondents reported that corruption increased in their states. The trend of corruption varied across the states (table 22). High levels of increase in corruption in the year 2011 compared to the past were reported by respondents in Yobe, FCT, Borno, Delta, Kano and Anambra states where at least two-thirds of the respondents said corruption increased. Comparatively, low levels of increase in corruption were reported in Jigawa, Oyo, Osun, Rivers, and Zamfara states where less than a third of the respondents reported increase in corruption.

Table 22: Trend of corruption in states

<i>State</i>	Trend of corruption	
	Decrease	Increase
Abia	32.7	48.6
Adamawa	10.0	64.8
Akwa-Ibom	28.5	42.6
Anambra	18.1	66.5
Bauchi	20.6	54.4
Bayelsa	25.8	44.5
Benue	27.7	33.9

Borno	4.9	79.2
Cross River	18.7	47.2
Delta	6.3	75.5
Ebonyi	31.7	40.9
Edo	27.8	47.0
Ekiti	32.7	51.7
Enugu	26.2	55.0
FCT	6.7	82.7
Gombe	43.7	50.6
Imo	40.1	44.1
Jigawa	66.2	18.1
Kaduna	13.9	50.7
Kano	17.9	69.0
Katsina	30.4	37.0
Kebbi	26.0	44.8
Kogi	25.2	50.4
Kwara	42.6	38.5
Lagos	27.6	57.8
Nasarawa	49.3	42.6
Niger	20.9	65.7
Ogun	50.4	39.6
Ondo	26.3	58.3
Osun	59.9	23.2
Oyo	52.9	23.1
Plateau	21.1	52.6
Rivers	54.6	27.2
Sokoto	31.8	39.0
Taraba	36.9	51.2
Yobe	3.0	85.3
Zamfara	23.5	29.1
<b>Total</b>	28.9	50.4

*Measures for controlling corruption*

Successive military and civilian governments in the country since 1975 identified corruption as a major impediments to the country's social, economic and political development. In response, they introduced anti-corruption laws, programmes and agencies. These measures failed to ensure significant reduction in corrupt practices in the country. Respondents were asked to recommend anti-corruption measures that the government should introduce or implement. Several measures, especially good leadership by example; introducing tougher laws, and better education and upbringing for children were recommended (table 23).

Table 23: Recommended anti-corruption measures

<i>a. Recommended anti-corruption measures</i>		<i>N = 11,518</i>
b. Tougher law and sentences	-	66.1 %
c. Better education and upbringing of children	-	69.2 %
d. More regulation and control of public offices	-	58.4%
e. Greater Publicity of problems of corruption	-	56.8%
f. Good example of leadership	-	71.1%
g. Better salaries for public servants and officials	-	57.3%
h. Social Security provision for aged, unemployed etc	-	45.6%

%<sup>s</sup> did not add to 100 because each response is a separate item

*Obstacles to corruption control*

Several factors were identified as constraints against the performance of the country's major anti-corruption agencies (EFCC and ICPC). Some of the major constraints identified were interference by the government, corruption by the anti-corruption officials, lack of good leadership examples by political leaders, poor facilities and inadequate fund (table 24).

Several recommendations for improved performance by EFCC and ICPC were also made by the crime survey respondents. The major recommendations for the improvement of the effectiveness were provision of better training, more discipline and supervision of anti-corruption officials and adequate facilities and equipment (table 24).

Table 24: Constraints and measures for improved performance of EFCC and ICPC

<i>Observed Constraints against EFCC and ICPC performance</i>		N = 11,518
a. Inadequate fund	-	12.5%
b. Poor Facilities	-	15.9%
c. Interference by the government	-	27.0%
d. Inefficiency of the Courts	-	7.1%
e. Corruption of EFCC and ICPC officials	-	20.3%
f. Lack of personal examples by political leaders	-	12.7%
g. Corruption of Judges	-	3.9%
<i>Recommended measures for improved performance by ICPC and EFCC</i>		
• Better training	-	24.4%
• Adequate funding	-	12.6%
• Adequate facilities and equipment	-	14.7%
• More discipline and supervision	-	19.1%
• Stricter laws	-	7.4%
• Establishment of Anti-corrupt courts	-	7.6%
• Greater autonomy from government interference	-	13.8%

## CHAPTER V

### FEAR OF CRIME AND FEELING OF SAFETY

Previous national crime victimization surveys in Nigeria indicate widespread fear of crime (Alemika, Igbo and Nnorom 2006; Alemika and Chukwuma 2007-; Alemika and Chukwuma 2011). However, researches have shown that fear of crime often exceed the prospect of being victimized. This discrepancy between fear of crime and risk of victimization has been attributed to several factors, including media amplification of crime. The literature has also shown that fear of crime varies among groups in population. Several findings indicated disproportionately high level of fear of crime among women and the elderly, although compared to males and young persons; they are generally less likely to be victims of crime.

#### *Trend and fear of crime*

The perception of the residents on the trend of crime in their area or community in 2011 compared to 12 months ago was investigated. More than a half (53.7%) said crime decreased in their areas during 2011 while 27.5% felt that crime increased. With reference to the trend of violent crimes, 55.8% felt that such crime decreased in their area compared to 26.5% that said violent crimes increased. Similarly, 54.6% reported that property crimes decreased in their community while 25.7% felt that such crimes increased within their area. Different crimes evoke varied levels of fear. Respondents were asked about their fear of being a victim of several crimes. Analysis of the survey data indicated high levels of fear of being a victim of several crimes, especially murder, robbery, burglary, theft, assault, ethnic and religious violence (table 25).

Table 25: Fear of Crimes

Types of crime	Not at all fearful	A little fearful	Fearful	Very fearful
Murder	15.9	7.9	22.3	53.0
Armed robbery	13.2	10.7	31.7	43.7
Burglary	15.3	15.1	36.5	32.3
Theft	16.3	17.3	37.2	28.5
Assault	19.6	19.1	33.8	26.4
Rape	24.7	13.0	26.7	33.9
Domestic violence	22.7	20.4	31.9	23.7
Kidnapping	20.2	13.9	28.7	36.0
Fraud	21.2	18.0	33.0	26.4
Unlawful arrest and detention	19.1	18.0	35.8	25.8
Political, ethnic and religious violence	15.0	15.4	37.1	31.2
Armed violence (other than robbery)	15.2	15.0	36.1	31.5

In spite of widespread fear of crimes among the respondents, they express high levels of feeling of safety at home and in the neighbourhood (table 26). Most of the respondents (at least 85%) felt safe in their homes during the day and at night. They also felt safe walking in their neighbourhoods during the day and at night (table 26).

Table 26: feeling of safety

Locations and activities	Very	Unsafe	Safe	Very
Walking in neighbourhood during the day	1.2	3.9	51.4	39.4
Walking in neighbourhood at night	3.5	11.9	51.0	25.0
At home during the day	1.3	4.1	51.2	39.1

At home during the night	3.0	9.0	51.3	29.4
At work	1.9	5.7	55.4	28.4
In public places	4.1	8.9	51.0	23.9

Fear of crime has adverse social and economic effects. The adverse economic effects include diversion of resources from productive ventures to the purchase of security gadgets and procurement of security services. It is also a disincentive to late evening business activities and night economy. The adverse social effects include restriction on the use of recreation, sporting and entertainment facilities as well as attendance at religious and social ceremonies. Fear of crime therefore has debilitating effects on individuals and communities. In spite of the high level of fear reported, the respondents were generally not constrained from carrying out most of their routine daily activities (table 27). However, a significant proportion was prevented from walking or strolling in the night and using public recreational facilities by the level of crimes in their communities.

Table 27: Constraints Imposed by Level of Crime in the Neighbourhood

Constrained by level of crime from doing the following	% Yes
Using public transport	5.8
Walking to shops and market	5.6
Walking to work	6.6
Walking and strolling in the night	16.1
Walking to fetch water or firewood	7.1
Using public recreational parks/ spaces	11.0
Allowing children to play around	7.7
Allowing children to walk to school	6.6

Fear of crime is linked to perceptions of significant incidence and prevalence of particular crimes as well as manifestations of disorder or incivility in specific neighbourhoods or areas. The respondents were asked to indicate the main crime and disorder problems in their communities and state. Armed robbery, theft of mobile phone handset, burglary, drug abuse, domestic violence and theft of money were identified as the common crime and disorder problems in the communities. Similarly, armed robbery, kidnapping and burglary were perceived by the respondents as the major crime and disorder problems in their states (table 28). Armed robbery has remained the dominant representation of Nigeria's crime problem due to its high incidence, prevalence, persistence and failure of law enforcement agencies, in most cases, to detect, apprehend, prosecute and convict the perpetrators.

Table 28: Main crime and disorder problems in neighbourhoods and states in 2011

Perceived main crimes and disorder problems (N =11,518)	Neighbourhoods %	States %
Armed robbery	18.8	36.9
Burglary	11.5	6.0
Sexual harassment	1.4	1.5
Car theft & theft from car	2.6	2.6
Theft of mobile phone handset	13.9	4.9
Theft of money	6.9	3.1
Child trafficking	0.9	1.2
Drug abuse	7.8	5.3
Robbery in traffic	1.7	2.3
Traffic accident	2.1	2.9
Homicide	1.3	4.1

Car snatching	0.6	0.9
Rape	0.7	0.6
Kidnapping	1.6	9.7
Domestic violence	9.1	3.2
Assault	3.9	1.4
Political violence	9.1	2.7
Bombing/Boko Haram	1.6	2.2

Perception of the main crime and disorder problems in the neighbourhoods is partly driven by the types of criminal victimization that are frequently experienced and reported. The respondents were asked to indicate the crimes that are most frequently committed in their neighbourhoods. Property crimes such as theft, robbery and burglary as well as crimes against the person like domestic violence and assault were identified as the crimes that are most frequently committed in the neighbourhoods (table 29).

Table 29 Crimes most frequently committed in neighbourhoods

Type of crime	N = 11518 %
Robbery	15.7
Theft of property	21.7
Assault	6.1
Theft of motor vehicle	3.5
Crop theft	2.7
Livestock theft	3.9
Pick pocketing and bag snatching	4.3
Burglary	6.8
Murder	2.8
Sexual assault/rape	1.1

Land grabbing and dispute	1.2
Kidnapping	1.4
Domestic violence	9.0
Armed violence (other than robbery)	3.8
Area boys	1.1

Respondents were fearful of several crimes in their neighbourhoods. Fear of crime is often engendered by the frequency and trend of the incidence of particular crimes in a community. The crimes that were most feared were murder, robbery, theft and kidnapping (table 30). Fear of crime can be drastically reduced by taking measures to reduce the incidence of crimes that are prevalent in communities and by enhancing effectiveness of the security agencies in the areas of crime prevention and the apprehension, prosecution and conviction of offenders within reasonable time and to the knowledge of crime victims and community residents.

Table 30: Most feared crime in the neighbourhoods

Type of crime	N = 11518 %
Theft of motor vehicle	3.7
Theft of property	9.6
Crop theft	1.2
Burglary	4.0
Murder	17.3
Sexual assault/Rape	2.6
Robbery	25.6
Assault	2.6
Kidnapping	7.3
Domestic violence	4.2
Armed violence (other than robbery)	6.1

### *Perpetrators and causes of crime*

Criminologists, law-makers and criminal justice officials as well as lay persons have their explanations of causes of crime, circumstances in which crimes are more likely to occur and the types of persons who are most likely to commit different types of crimes. Respondents were asked about persons responsible for property and violent crimes in their neighbourhoods. More than two-fifths (41.1%) said that property crimes in their neighbourhood were committed by those who live within the area while 38% felt that they were committed by outsiders. Violent crimes in the neighbourhood of the respondents were attributed to two major groups. More than a third (36.2%) of the respondents identified people born and living in the area as the perpetrators of violence in the community while 27.5% identified people born elsewhere but living in the area as the perpetrators. Several other groups were also identified as perpetrators of crime crimes in the community. Respondents identified several causes of property crimes. The major causes identified were - real need and poverty (39.6%); greed (32.2%), and non-financial motives (13.1%). Respondents were asked if they knew someone who is resident in their neighbourhood who earned a living from crime. 7.9% of the respondents reported knowing someone within the community who makes a living from crime.

### *Choice of agency to report crime*

Victims of crime can make several choices. They can decide to report their experience and can also determine who to inform or from whom to request assistance. Literature reveals that the decision to report crime to the police is influenced by the seriousness of injury or losses associated with the crime; desire to recover lost property; desire that the offender be apprehended, tried and punished, and the need to obtain police report in order to obtain a court document to cover the lost property or for insurance claim. However, confidence in the police to either recover property or apprehend offender has been found in the literature to be a major factor influencing victim's decision to report crime victimization.

Respondents were asked to indicate which individuals, groups and agencies they will report crime. The identified several individuals and groups, including

family members (14.6%); police (65.9%); community leader (6.1%); traditional leader (3.0%); religion leader (2.6%), and vigilante group (2.0%). Overall, about two-thirds of the respondents will report crime to the police if they were victims. These responses are significant departure from what was found in this survey whereby only 20.8% of the victims reported to the police and 63.6% reported to family members.

*Measures for reducing crime*

The respondents offered suggestions on government spending priorities that will have positive impact on community safety. The major recommendations presented in table 31 were that government should spend more on job creation (24.6%), poverty reduction (15.9%); better education and vocational training (14.5%) and electricity supply (10.6%). These recommendations correspond to usual policy prescriptions by liberal criminologists and social welfare policy experts. They also reflect a perspective that community insecurity is precipitated by poverty and lack of opportunities. Community safety can therefore be enhanced by improved access to employment, education and public utilities.

Table 31: government spending priority to make community safer

Spending priority	N = 11518 %
Creation of more employment opportunity	24.6
Reduction of poverty level	15.9
Create better educational and vocational training	14.5
Fix the roads	9.4
Increase capacity of the police	6.4
Harsher punishment for offenders	3.5
Provide stable electricity	10.6
Control terrorism	7.5
Improve emergency services	4.2

#### *Personal and household measures against crime*

Respondents adopted several methods to enhance their safety. The measures used by the respondents include physical target hardening such as locks, barriers, fences, and electronic monitoring at home (44.7%); installation of security gadgets in cars (10.5%); acquisition of firearms (4.2%); employment of private security guards (6.1%) and vigilante members and night guards (21.7%). Several non-public security delivery actors existed in the neighbourhoods. Respondents reported the existence of the following groups in their areas: vigilante groups (32.4%); night guards (10.6%), and neighbourhood watch (6.1%). However, 45.7% of the respondents said that non-public security actors were absent in their neighbourhoods. More than two-thirds of the respondents said they pay for services rendered by these groups. Respondents (N = 6249) who reported the presence and use of private guards and vigilante members observed the following practices by the non-state security providers: apprehension of suspects (45.7%) and physical or corporal punishment of suspects (57.7%).

#### *Possession and use of firearms*

Nigeria has recorded several violent ethno-religious conflicts in which weapons of various levels of sophistication were used. Further militant groups; militias and criminal gangs have used sophisticated weapons to pursue their aims. Proliferation of arms is a serious problem that has not been successfully controlled. The extent of firearms possession in the country was examined by asking the respondents whether or not they possess guns and similar weapons. 2.5% (289) of respondents reported that they or members of their household possessed firearms. The Nigerian law has no provision for the possession of firearms for personal protection by citizens. Firearms license is granted mainly for gaming. The respondents were asked about the reasons for acquiring firearms. Contrary to the provision of the law, nearly a half (49.8%) of the owners of firearms intended to use them for self protection and 38.8% for hunting (table 32). Overall, most firearms owners acquire them for personal protection from criminals and animals and protection of property.

Table 32: Reasons for possession of firearms

Reasons	% of firearms owners
Personal protection	49.8
Protection from wild animal	18.7
Protection of property	24.6
Protection of village	15.2
Fear of violent conflict and war	17.6
Protection at work	10.7
Hunting	38.8
Part of tradition	7.3
Valued family possession	12.5

*Note: Responses do not add up to 100% because of multiple responses*

#### *Road safety*

Nigeria has a record of very high rates of death and injury from road accidents. The major causes of road accidents in the country are bad roads; reckless driving; old and poorly maintained vehicles, and weak enforcement of road safety laws and regulations due to inadequate resources and corruption by officials. Respondents were asked a range of questions on road safety. Analysis of the data revealed the following:

1. Nearly three quarters (73.9%) of the respondents said they felt safe on roads within their states
2. More than one-tenth of the respondents (11.1%) reported that a member of their household (including themselves) were involved in a road accident in 2011.
3. Most of the accidents involved commercial motorcycle (42.4%) and commercial mini-buses (28.9%)

4. The accidents were described as not serious by 41.8%, serious by 45.2% and fatal by 13.0%).
5. The accidents occurred at various times: morning rush hours (13.4%); mid-morning (16.4%); afternoon (35.7%); evening rush hours (24.0%) and night (10.5%)
6. Slightly more than a third (36.9%) of the accidents were reported to the police; while less than a quarter (23.4%) of the accidents were reported to the Federal Road Safety Corps
7. About a quarter (24.5%) of the respondents felt that FRSC was effective in reducing road accidents
8. Notwithstanding the high accidents attributed to commercial motorcycles, 67.6% of the respondents opposed banning the use of the mode of commercial transportation

## CHAPTER VI

### GOVERNANCE AND SECURITY

The primary reason for the existence of government is the need for a mechanism to promote and protect the security and welfare of citizens. The Nigerian Constitution, in chapter two (section 14), required the government to guarantee the security and welfare of citizens as its primary duty. Citizens' concerns and their perception of corruption by public officials were investigated. The levels of trust in government agencies and departments as well as satisfaction with government delivery of services were also investigated.

#### *Neighbourhood welfare and security concerns*

The concerns of the residents of the communities in the country were investigated by asking respondents to enumerate the issues that were of great concerns in their neighbourhoods. Security and electricity supply ranked highest on the list of concerns (table 33).

Table 33: issue of greatest concern in the neighbourhood

Issues	N = 11518 %
Environmental satisfaction and pollution (flooding)	6.6
Flooding	3.2
Poor state of public school	2.5
Bad roads	9.9
Security matters	36.9
Electricity problems	17.9
Touts/area boys/unruly juvenile gangs	4.3
Rent and taxes	2.3
Welfare of the community	2.0

*Corruption and trust in government agencies and officials*

Corruption is a major problem in Nigeria. It is widespread and endemic within the public and private sectors. In spite of several laws and agencies established to prevent and control corruption, no significant success has been recorded. The perception of the respondents on the extent of corruption in several public agencies and their officials was investigated. In each case, at least 40% of the respondents perceived most or all officials in the various agencies as corrupt.

Trust In public institutions and officials is inhibited or eroded by several factors. The term trust refers to the confidence that an individual has in the reliability or credibility, performance, integrity, and conduct of officials of a government or organization. According to Miller and Listhaug (1990: 358), trust judgement:

...reflects evaluations of whether or not political authorities and institutions are performing in accordance with normative expectations held by the public. Citizen expectations of how government should operate include among other criteria, that it be fair, equitable, honest, efficient, and responsive to society's need. In brief, an expression of trust in government (or synonymously political confidence and support) is a summary judgment that the system is responsive and will do what is right even in the absence of constant scrutiny (Miller and Listhaug 1990: 358).

Giddens (1990: 34) defines trust as "confidence in the reliability of a person or system, regarding a given set of outcomes or events ...". He made a very significant observation that has policy and operational implications for building public trust in government agencies. According to him, (a)ttitudes of trust, or lack of trust, toward specific abstract systems are liable to be strongly influenced by experiences at access points – as well as, of course, by updates of knowledge which, via the communication media or other sources are provided for the laypersons ..." (1990: 90-91). Data from the survey indicate very low levels of trust in public agencies and officials in Nigeria. None of the officials, including the president and his cabinet or agencies such as the police, courts and national assembly were trusted more than a third of the

respondents (table 34). This reflects a major crisis of confidence in Nigerian government and governance system. Vigilante group members trusted by 37.0% and 41.7% said most or all of their members were corrupt.

Table 34: Perceived corruption and trust in government agencies and officials

Agencies/Offices	% that trusted somewhat or a lot	% that perceived most or all officials as corrupt
President and his cabinet	31.0	45.5
Governors and cabinet	33.4	48.7
National Assembly	28.1	54.1
Elected LGA chairmen	27.3	54.6
Elected LGA Councilors	27.2	55.1
Local government Officials	26.5	56.4
Police	24.8	65.9
Courts	32.8	48.9
Political appointment	29.3	52.9
Federal Road Safety Commission	32.0	47.0
State Electoral Commissions	31.2	49.9
Independent National Electoral Commission	32.1	50.4
State Revenue officials	30.0	50.1

*Satisfaction with state governments' performance*

Governments exist to guarantee public order and personal security, and provide services. The performance of government enhances its legitimacy and trustworthiness. Respondents were asked to assess the performance of the government of the state in which they reside, with respect to several responsibilities. The data indicated that the performance of the government

can be rated as average. With the exception of construction and maintenance of drainages, less than three-fifths of the respondents were satisfied with the performance of their state government in discharging their responsibilities (table 35).

Table 35: Satisfaction with state government performance

Extent of Satisfaction with government performance	% satisfied
Road construction and maintenance	66.5
Environmental beautification	58.8
Construction of drainage	56.0
Refuse disposal	58.2
Crime control	50.9
Traffic control	55.4
Responsiveness to public opinion	45.9
Improvement of public school	57.5
Improvement of health facilities	59.0
Payment of public servants' salaries	51.0
Controlling problems by commercial motorcycles	49.8
Traffic decongestion	52.7
Removal of abandoned vehicles	54.2
Environmental sanitation	53.9
Controlling extortion by law enforcement agencies	47.4
Controlling the activities of the area boys	46.2
Controlling noise from places of worship	48.8
Controlling terrorism	44.7
Removal of street gates and barriers	46.4

*Human rights violations*

Public and private agencies and actors are involved in human rights violation in Nigeria. However, attention is often focused on the security agencies. A total of 477 respondents (4.1% ) of the total sample said they or members of the household experienced violation of human rights by security agencies in 2011. The most common forms of human rights violations reported were physical assault and verbal abuse (table 36).

Respondents who reported violation of their human rights were asked to indicate the security agencies responsible for the actions. The respondents identify the following agencies: Army (14.9%); Navy (3.8%); Air Force (2.9%); Nigeria Police Force (69.4%); State Security Services (1.9%); Security and Civil Defence Corps (5.9%); Custom Service (3.1%); Immigration Service (0.6%) and Federal Road Safety Corps (4.6%). Police were identified as the agency responsible for rights violation by more than two-thirds of the respondents. The information should however be interpreted with caution taken into account the roles and size of the agencies and contact between citizens and their officials. These factors partly explain the high incidence attributed to the police relative to other agencies.

Table 36: Experience of human Rights violation

Types of violation	(N= 15518) % of sample
Any human rights violation by security officials in 2011	4.1
Extra-judicial killing	0.1
Torture	0.8
Physical assault	1.7
Rape	0.1
Detention without arrangement within 48 hours	0.8
Force eviction	0.4
Verbal abuse	1.4

Sexual harassment	0.3
Extortion	0.8
Abuse of power	0.9

*Performance of the criminal justice agencies*

Fear of crime and feeling of safety are influenced by the level of crime and the effectiveness of the criminal justice agencies in tackling the incidence of crime and administration of justice. Respondent were requested to assess the performance of the core criminal justice agencies. More than two-fifths of the respondents rated the agencies – police, courts, prisons and public prosecution as doing a good job. Police were rated as doing a poor job by more than a third of the population. A significant proportion of the respondent rated the agencies as neither good nor bad, that is average (table 37).

Table 37: Job performance of the criminal justice agencies within state in 2011

Agencies	% Poor Job	% Good Job
Police	35.8	44.7
Courts	18.9	51.2
Prisons	18.2	47.4
Prosecution (Office of Director of Public Prosecution)	19.4	43.5

The data on governance presented in this chapter indicated that public officials were generally perceived as corrupt and untrustworthy. State governments were also perceived as ineffective in tackling the problems that constitute serious concerns to the citizens.

## CHAPTER VII

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

#### Summary of findings

Crime victimization survey is a useful approach for obtaining information on criminality, victimization, and public attitudes to crime and criminal justice administration in society. The analysis of the information obtained from 11,518 respondents in the national crime victim survey for 2011 conducted in all the states and the Federal Capital territory of Nigeria yielded the following findings.

#### *Extent, pattern and trend of criminal victimization*

1. The most common form of criminal victimization suffered by household members of the respondents were theft of mobile phone handset, theft of money, domestic violence, physical assault, burglary and robbery.
2. Compared to 2010, higher rates of criminal victimization were recorded in 2011 for virtually all the common crimes.
3. Nearly a third (31.0) of the respondents reported being a victim of crime in 2011.
4. High levels of personal crime victimization were reported by respondents in many states such as Ebonyi, Enugu, Niger, Ondo, Kebbi, Gombe, Bayelsa, Anambra, Benue, Kogi and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) where more than 50% of the respondents said they were victims of crime in 2011. In contrast, relatively low levels of personal crime victimization were reported by respondents in some states such as Katsina, Nasarawa, Adamawa, Kano, Taraba, Sokoto and Osun where less than one-in-eight respondents reported being victims of crime during the year.
5. The most common forms of personal victimization (excluding theft of mobile phone handsets) suffered by respondents were robbery, domestic violence, theft of money, assault, burglary and robbery.
6. 1.3% (153) of the total sample (11,518) reported that a member of their households (other than themselves) were victims of rape, in 2011.

High levels of victimization were reported in the following states: Cross River (11.7%), Borno (4.6%), Gombe (4.6%), Zamfara (8.5%) and Anambra (3.6%) .

7. In the case of kidnapping, 1.4% (160) of the total sample (11,518) reported that a member of their households (other than themselves) were victims of kidnapping in 2011. Highest levels of kidnapping of household members were reported in the following states: Anambra (8.2%), Cross Rivers (7.0%), Edo (4.6%), Ebonyi (4.3%), Borno (4.3%), Delta (2.3%), Gombe (2.9%), Enugu (2.1%), Ondo (4.3%) and Zamfara (4.3%)
8. More than a quarter (28.2%) of the respondents felt that crime increased while more than a half (52%) perceived decrease in the level of crime in their states.
9. No significant relationships were found between victimization and socio-economic characteristics of respondents such as sex, age, education, income, marital status, and residence in rural or urban areas.
10. Analysis of victimization of males and females across the states reveal significant differences. In Adamawa, Anambra, Benue, Edo, Enugu, Kano, Ondo, Rivers, Yobe and Zamfara states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT, Abuja), more females experienced victimization than males. In contrast, more males experienced victimization in Abia, Bauchi, Cross River, Ekiti, Gombe, Imo, Jigawa, Kaduna, Katsina, Kebbi, Kogi, Kwara and Taraba states.
11. Less than a quarter (22.9%) of the rape cases was reported to the police while three quarters (74.9) of the incidence were not reported to any agency or person by the victims.
12. Female respondents (51) who reported cases of rape to the police were asked if they were satisfied with the handling of their report. Their responses indicated that 33.3% were not satisfied; 7.8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 58.8% were satisfied. Reasons given for dissatisfaction by the dissatisfied respondents (n = 21 ) were (a) police did not do enough to apprehend offenders (38.1%); (b) police did not keep me properly informed of their actions (19.0%); (c) police did not treat me with respect (14.3%); (d) police were slow to

- arrive (19.0%); (e) police keep asking me for money (4.8%), and (f) police colluded with suspects (4.8%).
13. More than a half (53.6%) of the respondents said that rape was completely non-existent in their community; 27.3% said there were occasional or few cases of rape; 7.2% reported that rape was widespread and only 1.6% said cases of rape was widespread. They were asked about what they consider to be causes of rape in the community.
  14. The major reasons for the incidence of rape provided by the respondents were provocative dressing by young women, lack of self-control by men and influence of alcohol.

*Police and policing*

15. Only one-in five victims (20.8%) reported their victimization to the police.
16. Victims who reported their victimization to the police express varied levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the handling of their reports. Out of the 810 victims who reported to the police, 7.4% were not at all satisfied; 31.1% were not satisfied; 13.8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 36.3% were satisfied and 11.4% were very satisfied. Those who were dissatisfied (312) gave several reasons (table 12)
17. Slightly less than a half (48.8%) of the respondents rated the performance of the police as good compared to slightly less than a third (32%) that described the performance of the police as poor.
18. Major recommendations for the improvement of the police were more training, better equipment and facilities; more discipline and supervision by the government and better remuneration, and less than a percent (0.9) identified creation of state police.
19. Respondents were divided with 44.8% opposing dismantling of police check-points compared to 42.6% supporting the action.
20. Nearly a half (48.2%) of the respondents recommended that the IGP should be appointed based on joint-criteria of seniority and merit.
21. Majority (54.5%) of the respondents was dissatisfied and 30.3% were satisfied with the performance of the police in tackling terrorism in

the country. Similarly, 56.3% of the respondents were dissatisfied with government's handling of terrorism.

22. The major measures recommended to enhance the effectiveness of counter-terrorism operations and other responses by the police were close working relationships between the police and community residents; thorough investigation, inter-agency collaboration, and retraining of personnel to meet the emerging threats of terrorism. The government was also advised to engage in dialogue with the insurgents and should also strengthen the capacity of the security agencies.

#### *Corruption and governance*

23. Nearly a quarter (23.8%) of the sample said they were asked to pay bribe by government officials before they rendered required services in 2011 (2741 out of 11,518). Most of the people who were asked to pay bribe did not report the incident to relevant authorities. Only 3.7% of those requested to pay bribe reported to the police; 0.8% reported to ICPC; 0.9% reported to EFCC and 3.9% reported to other agencies.
24. A half (50.4%) of the respondents reported that corruption increased in their states. The trend of corruption varied across the states. High levels of increase in corruption in the year 2011 compared to the past were reported by respondents in Yobe, FCT, Borno, Delta, Kano and Anambra states where at least two-thirds of the respondents said corruption increased. Comparatively, low levels of increase in corruption were reported in Jigawa, Oyo, Osun, Rivers, and Zamfara states where less than a third of the respondents reported increase in corruption.
25. Several measures, especially good leadership by example; introducing tougher laws, and better education and upbringing for children were recommended as effective measures against corruption.
26. Some of the major constraints against the effectiveness of the EFCC and ICPC identified by the respondents were interference by the government, corruption by the anti-corruption officials, lack of good leadership examples by political leaders, and poor facilities and inadequate fund.

27. Recommendations for improved performance by EFCC and ICPC were provision of better training, more discipline and supervision of anti-corruption officials and adequate facilities and equipment.

*Fear of crime and feeling of safety*

28. More than a half (53.7%) said crime decreased in their areas during 2011 while 27.5% felt that crime increased. With reference to the trend of violent crimes, 55.8% felt that such crime decreased in their area compared to 26.5% that said violent crimes increased. Similarly, 54.6% reported that property crimes decreased in their community while 25.7% felt that such crimes increased within their area.
29. Analysis of the survey data indicated high levels of fear of being a victim of several crimes, especially murder, robbery, burglary, theft, assault, ethnic and religious violence.
30. In spite of widespread fear of crimes among the respondents, they express high levels of feeling of safety at home and in the neighbourhood. Most of the respondents (at least 85%) felt safe in their homes during the day and at night. They also felt safe walking in their neighbourhoods during the day and at night.
31. Armed robbery, theft of mobile phone handset, burglary, drug abuse, domestic violence and theft of money were identified as the common crime and disorder problems in the communities. Similarly, armed robbery, kidnapping and burglary were perceived by the respondents as the major crime and disorder problems in their states.
32. Property crimes such as theft, robbery and burglary as well as crimes against the person like domestic violence and assault were identified as the crimes frequently committed in the neighbourhoods.
33. The crimes that were most feared were murder, robbery, theft and kidnapping.
34. Respondents recommended that government should spend more money in the following areas in order to prevent and reduce crime: job creation (24.6%), poverty reduction (15.9%); better education and vocational training (14.5%) and electricity supply (10.6%).

35. Respondents adopted several methods to enhance their safety. Common methods were physical target hardening such as locks, barriers, fences, and electronic monitoring at home (44.7%); installation of security gadgets in cars (10.5%); acquisition of firearms (4.2%); employment of private security guards (6.1%) and vigilante members and night guards (21.7%).
36. Several non-public security delivery actors existed in the neighbourhoods. Respondents reported the existence of the following groups in their areas: vigilante groups (32.4%); night guards (10.6%), and neighbourhood watch (6.1%). However, 45.7% of the respondents said that non-public security actors were absent in their neighbourhoods. More than two-thirds of the respondents said they pay for the services rendered by these groups. Respondents (N = 6249) who reported the presence and use of private guards and vigilante members observed the following practices by the non-state security providers: apprehension of suspects (45.7%) and physical or corporal punishment of suspects (57.7%).
37. 2.5% (289) of respondents reported that they or members of their household possessed firearms. The Nigerian law has no provision for the possession of firearms for personal protection by citizens. Nearly a half (49.8%) of the owners of firearms acquired them for self protection and 38.8% for hunting.

#### *Road safety*

38. Nearly three quarters (73.9%) of the respondents said they felt safe on roads in their states. More than one-tenth of the respondents (11.1%) reported that a member of their household (include themselves) were involved in a road accident in 2011. Most of the accidents involved commercial motorcycle (42.4%) and commercial mini-buses (28.9%) Slightly more than a third (36.9%) of the accidents were reported to the police; while less than a quarter (23.4%) of the accidents were reported to the Federal Road Safety Corps. A quarter (24.5%) of the respondents felt that FRSC was effective in reducing road accidents.

*Governance and security*

39. Security and electricity supply ranked highest on the list of concerns of the communities.
40. Data from the survey indicated very low levels of trust in public agencies and officials in Nigeria. None of the officials, including the president and his cabinet or agencies such as the police, courts and national assembly were trusted by more than a third of the respondents.
41. Less than three-fifths of the respondents were satisfied with the performance of state governments in the discharge of their responsibilities.
42. A total of 477 respondents (4.1%) of the total sample of 11518 respondents said they or members of the household experienced violation of their human rights by security agencies in 2011. The most common forms of human rights violations reported were physical assault and verbal abuse.
43. The respondents identify the following agencies: Army (14.9%); Navy (3.8%); Air Force (2.9%); Nigeria Police Force (69.4%); State Security Services (1.9%); Security and Civil Defence Corps (5.9%); Custom Service (3.1%); Immigration Service (0.6%) and Federal Road Safety Corps (4.6%). Police were identified by more than two-thirds of the respondents as the agency responsible for human rights violations. The information should, however, be interpreted with caution and take into account the roles and size of the agencies and the extent of contact between citizens and their officials. These factors explain the high incidence attributed to the police relative to other agencies.

**Recommendations**

1. The government should develop and implement national security policy and strategy to address the various social, political and economic sources and dimensions of crime, disorder, insurgency and terrorism in the country.
2. The capability and capacity of the police and other intelligence and security agencies should be strengthened on sustainable basis, especially in core policing areas of intelligence, surveillance, investigation,

prosecution and judicial decision-making through the provision of adequate and appropriate staffing, training, funding, equipment and facilities in order to promote personal safety, public order and national security.

3. Government should introduce sustainable policies and programmes that will promote or stimulate job creation; poverty reduction: better education and vocational training; and electricity supply as a deliberate policy towards the creation of socio-economic opportunities, and prevention and control of crime.
4. The most feared crimes by the respondents were murder, robbery, theft and kidnapping. Police and other relevant law enforcement agencies should develop appropriate and effective strategies and operations to bring these crimes under control.
5. Inter-agency collaboration and coordination as well as strong cooperation between security agencies and the citizens should be established and sustained in order to enhance the effectiveness of security and criminal justice agencies. Both vertical and horizontal collaboration and coordination committees for security agencies should be established at the national, state and local levels.
6. Public security forum comprising representatives of security agencies, National Orientation Agency, religious and traditional institutions and civil society organizations should be established at the local and state levels to determine major security challenges and concerns, assess and mobilize required resources and support policing operations towards safe, democratic and developed Nigerian society.
7. Corruption is a very strong obstacle to national integration, economic development, democratic consolidation, human welfare, national security and public institutional efficacy in Nigeria. Government should introduce effective legal framework, including non-conviction asset forfeiture law, and establish strong, transparent, professional and highly effective prevention, investigation, prosecution and adjudication agencies.
8. Fear of crime should be drastically reduced by taking effective measures aimed at reducing the incidence of crimes that are prevalent in communities and by enhancing effectiveness of the security agencies

in the areas of crime prevention; apprehension, prosecution and conviction of offenders, with feedback to crime victims and community residents, and building effective partnership between the community members and the security agencies.

9. There is need for appropriate framework for the regulation of firearms in order to curb the proliferation of arms which are being widely used during violent conflicts and for crimes. Border control should be strengthened, corruption by officials at the borders should be curbed through effective surveillance and intelligence; the identity and activities of sponsors of insurgents, militias, terrorists, violent ethno-religious conflict planners and perpetrators, and criminal gangs should be determined and brought under effective surveillance in order to contain their threat and activities in the nation.
10. Proliferation of unregulated non-state security providers and actors poses great dangers to public security and order, rule of law, and human rights in the community. An effective framework for the registration, regulation and oversight of these groups should be established at the community and local levels. A local government security forum to be chaired by the Divisional Police Officer and comprising the Head of the Nigeria Police, Department of State Services, Nigerian Security and Civil Defence Corps and National orientation Agency at the local government level, and representatives of the local government council, religious and traditional institutions should be established. The state security committee should have overall oversight over the groups within the state.
11. Officials of state agencies, including the presidency, legislators, judges and police were generally perceived as corrupt and untrustworthy. This is a major crisis of legitimacy and there is need to improve the quality of governance by curbing official or public corruption, introducing policies and programmes to satisfy the needs and aspirations of citizens and ending impunity by government officials.
12. There is need for reliable statistics and information for planning, management, administration, operation, monitoring and evaluation by all government agencies, including the security agencies. Government

should introduce and sustain annual surveys on different aspects of Nigeria's social, political and economic systems, relations and conditions. In particular, an annual crime and victimization survey should be introduced and undertaken on sustainable basis. The National Bureau of Statistics or the Nigeria Police Force Research Department may be charged with the responsibility and appropriately equipped. In addition, the government should as a matter of priority develop a comprehensive policy on record keeping, analysis, storage, retrieval, publication and dissemination as prerequisite to good governance and as an element of democratic and transparent system of governance.

## References

Ahire, P. T. 1991. *Imperial Policing* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Alemika, EEO. 2011. "Leadership Qualification and Appointment Procedure in the Nigeria Police Force: A critical analysis"; in "Kemi Okenyodo (ed.). *The Leadership Question in the Nigeria Police Force*. CLEEN Foundation Monograph Series No. 16. Lagos and Abuja: CLEEN Foundation.

Alemika, EEO. 2004. "Crime statistics and information management in Nigerian justice and security systems" in EEO Alemika and IC Chukwuma (Eds.) *Crime and Policing in Nigeria: Challenges and Options*, Lagos: Network on Police Reform in Nigeria (NOPRIN).

Alemika, EEO. 2003. "Police Corruption and Insecurity in Nigeria", in S. Einstein and M. Amir (Eds.) *Police Corruption: Paradigms, Models and concepts – Challenges for Developing Countries*, Huntsville, Texas: Office of International Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University, Chapter 18 (445-494).

Alemika, EEO. 1993. "Colonialism, State and Policing in Nigeria" *Crime, Law and Social Change: An International Journal* 20: 187 - 219.

Alemika, E. 1988. "Policing and Perceptions of Police in Nigeria" *Police Studies: International Review of Police Development* 11(4): 161 - 176.

Alemika, EEO; EU Igbo and CP Nnorom. 2006. *Criminal Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria – 2005*. Lagos: CLEEN Foundation.

Alemika, EEO and IC Chukwuma (eds.) 2011. *Crime Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited and CLEEN Foundation.

Alemika, EEO and IC Chukwuma. 2007 *Criminal Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria – 2006*. Lagos: CLEEN Foundation.

Alemika EEO and I. C. Chukwuma (Eds.). 2003. *Civilian Oversight and Accountability of Police in Nigeria* Centre for Law Enforcement Education, Lagos and Police Service Commission, Abuja

Alemika, E. E. O. and Chukwuma, I. 2000. *Police-Community Violence in Nigeria* Lagos: Centre for law Enforcement Education

Amir, M. 1971. *Patterns of Forcible Rape*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press  
Amnesty International 2009 Killing at Will: Extrajudicial Executions and Other Unlawful Killings by the Police in Nigeria. London: AI

Amnesty International. 2012. Nigeria: Trapped in the Cycle of violence. London: AI

Cantor, D. and J. P. Lynch. 2000. "Self-Report Surveys as Measures of Crime and Criminal Victimization" *Criminal Justice*, 2000, vol. 4: 87-138 and Gottfredson, MR and MJ Hindelang (1981) "Sociological Aspects of Criminal Victimization"; *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 7: 107-128

Cohen, LE and M. Felson 1979. "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44: 588-608

Cohen, LE., JR Kluegel, and KC Land. 1981 "Social Inequality and Predatory Criminal Victimization": An Exposition and Test of a Formal Theory." *American Sociological Review* 46: 505-524

Coomassie, A.I. 1990. Discipline: Superior Police Officer, (SPOs)". Paper delivered at the Seminar for Area Commanders and Assistant Commissioners of Police held at The Police Staff College, Jos, March 19-23, 1990.

Curtis, L. 1974. "Victim-Precipitation and Violent Crimes." *Social Problems* 21: 594-605

Ehinderero, SG and EEO Alemika (Eds.), 2005. *Human Rights and Law Enforcement in Nigeria*. Abuja: Nigeria Police Force.

Ellenberger, T. 1955. "Psychological Relationships between the Criminal and His Victim." *Archives of Criminal Psychology* 2: 257-290

Felson, M. and L. Cohen. 1980. "Human Ecology and Crime: A Routine Activity Approach." *Human Ecology* 8: 389-406

<sup>1</sup>Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA. Stanford University Press

Gottfredson, M. 1981. "On the Etiology of Criminal Victimization." *Journal of Law and Criminology*, 72: 714-726

Hindelang, MS.; M. Gottfredson, and James Garofalo. 1978. *Victims of Personal Crime*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger

Human Rights Watch, 2005. "Rest in Pieces": Police Torture and Deaths in Custody in Nigeria, vol. 17, no. 11(A).

Human Rights Watch. 2009 Arbitrary Killings by Security Forces Submission to the Investigative Bodies on the November 28-29, 2008 Violence in Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria. New York: HRW

Human Rights Watch. 2012 Spiraling Violence: Boko Haram Attacks and Security Force Abuses in Nigeria. New York: HRW

Kayode, O. 1976. "Public Expectations and Police Role Concepts: Nigeria" *Police Chief* (May): 58-59.

Meier, RF and TD Miethe 1993. "Understanding the Theories of Criminal Victimization" *Crime and Justice*. Vol. 17: 459-499

Miethe, TD and RF Meier. 1990. "Criminal Opportunity and Victimization Rates: A Structural-Choice Theory of Criminal Victimization". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 27: 243-266

Miethe TD, MC Stafford and J. Scott Long. 1987. "Social Differentiation in Criminal Victimization: A Test of Routine Activities/Lifestyle Theory." *American Sociological Review* 52: 184-194

Miethe, TD; M. Stafford and D. Sloanne. 1990. "Lifestyle Changes and Risks of Criminal Victimization." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 6: 357-376

Miller, AH. And Listhaug, O. 1990. "Political Parties and Confidence in Government: A Comparison of Norway, Sweden and the United States". *British Journal of Political Science*, 20: 357-386.

Network on Police Reform in Nigeria. 2012. Civil Society Panel on Police Reform Panel Report. Lagos: NOPRIN

NOPRIN and Open Society Justice Initiative (2010) *Criminal Force: Torture, Abuse and Extrajudicial Killings by the Nigeria Police Force*. Network of Police Reform in Nigeria, Lagos & Open Society Institute, New York

Odekunle, F. 1979. "The Nigeria Police Force: A Preliminary Assessment of Functional Performance" *International Journal of Sociology of Law* (7): 61-83.

Ohonbamu, O. 1972. "The Dilemma of Police Organization under a Federal System: The Nigerian Example" *The Nigerian Law Journal* (6): 73-87.

Ojomo, AJ and EEO Alemika. 1993. "Information Management and Policing" in T. N. Tamuno, *et al.* (Eds.) *Policing Nigeria: Past, Present and Future* (Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.) pp. 609 - 629.

Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Nigeria Police (2008) *Main Report of the Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Nigeria Police*

Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Police (2006). *Main Report of the Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Police*.

- Sampson, R.J. and JD Wooldredge. 1987. "Linking the Micro- and Macro-Level Dimensions of Lifestyle-Routine Activity and Opportunity Models of Predatory Victimization." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 3: 371 -393
- Sampson, R.J. and J.L. Lauritsen. 1990. "Deviant Lifestyles, Proximity to Crime, and the Offender-Victim Link in Personal Violence." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 27: 110-139
- Schafer, S. 1968. *The Victim and His Criminal: A Study in Functional Responsibility*. New York: Random House
- Schneider, H.J. 2001. "Victimological Development in the World during the Past Three Decades (I): A Study of Comparative Victimology." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 45(4): 449-468
- Schultz, L. 1968. "The Victim-Offender Relationship." *Crime and Delinquency* 14: 135-141
- Tamuno, T. N. 1970. *The Police in Modern Nigeria: 1861-1965*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Von Hentig, Hans. 1940. "Remarks on the Interaction of Perpetrators and Victim." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 31: 303-309
- Von Hentig, Hans. 1948. *The Criminal and His Victim*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University
- Wolfgang M. 1958. *Patterns of Criminal Homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Wolfgang, M. 1957. "Victim-Precipitated Criminal Homicide." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 48: 1-11

## **CLEEN FOUNDATION'S PUBLICATIONS**

**JOURNEY TO CIVIL RULE**  
A Report on the Presidential Primaries of the All Peoples Party (APP) & Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) February 13-15, 1999 Published in 1999

**POLICING A DEMOCRACY**  
A Survey Report on the Role and Functions of the Nigeria Police in a Post-Military Era, Published in 1999

**LAW ENFORCEMENT REVIEW**  
Quarterly Magazine, Published since the first quarter of 1998

**CONSTABLE JOE**  
A Drama Series On Police Community Relations In Nigeria, Published in 1999

**POLICE-COMMUNITY VIOLENCE IN NIGERIA**  
Published in 2000

**JUVENILE JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION IN NIGERIA**  
Philosophy And Practice, Published in 2001

**GENDER RELATIONS AND DISCRIMINATION IN NIGERIA POLICE FORCE**  
Published in 2001

**FORWARD MARCH**  
A Radio Drama Series on Civil Military Relations In Nigeria, Published in 2001

**HOPE BETRAYED**  
A Report on Impunity and State-Sponsored Violence in Nigeria,  
Published in 2002

**CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF POLICE IN NIGERIA**  
Published in 2003

**POLICE AND POLICING IN NIGERIA**  
Final Report on the Conduct of the Police In the 2003 Elections,  
Published in 2003

**CIVIL SOCIETY AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT IN THE NIGER DELTA**  
Monograph Series, No. 2, Published in 2006

**CRIMINAL VITIMIZATION SAFETY AND POLICING IN NIGERIA: 2005**  
Monograph Series, No. 3, Published in 2006

**CRIMINAL VITIMIZATION SAFETY AND POLICING IN NIGERIA: 2006**  
Monograph Series, No. 4, Published in 2007

**BEYOND DECLARATIONS**  
Law Enforcement Officials and ECOWAS Protocols on Free Movement of Persons and Goods in West Africa, Published in 2007

**POLICE AND POLICING IN WEST AFRICA**  
Proceedings of a Regional Conference Published in 2008

**IN THE EYES OF THE BEHOLDER**  
A Post-Election Survey Report, Published in 2009

**CRY FOR JUSTICE**  
Proceedings of a Public Tribunal on Police Accountability in Nigeria  
Published in 2009

**GOOD PRACTICE GUIDE**  
Establishing a School-Based Crime Prevention Programme  
Published in 2009

**ANOTHER ROUTINE OR FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE?**  
Police Reform in Nigeria 1999 till date, Published in 2009

**POLICING WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN NIGERIA**  
Training Manual, Published in 2009

**CITIZENSHIP AND IDENTITY POLITICS IN NIGERIA:**  
**Conference Proceedings**, Monograph Series, No. 5  
Published in 2009

**CRIMINAL VITIMIZATION SAFETY IN LAGOS STATE**  
Monograph Series, No. 6, Published in 2010

**CORRUPTION AND GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES IN NIGERIA:**  
**Conference Proceedings**, Monograph Series, No. 7  
Published in 2010

**POLICING ELECTION IN NIGERIA**  
**Assessment of the Role of Nigeria Police in Election**  
in Nigeria, Published in 2010

**ENHANCING ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS IN THE**  
**NIGERIA POLICE FORCE**  
Conference Proceedings Monograph series 8  
Published in 2010

**EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE**  
**AND ROAD ACCIDENTS**, Conference Proceedings  
Monograph series No. 9, Published in 2010

**POLICE STATION VISITORS WEEK REPORT 2010**  
CLEEN Foundation

**POLICING ELECTIONS IN NIGERIA:**  
Assessment of the Role of the Nigeria Police force  
in elections in Nigeria, Published in 2010

**TRAINING MANUAL ON PEACE AND HUMAN**  
**RIGHTS FOR SECURITY INSTITUTIONS**  
**IN NIGER**  
CLEEN Foundation Published in 2010

**REPORT OF CONFERENCE ON MAKING DEMOCRACY**  
**WORK FOR NIGERIA PEOPLE**  
Monograph Series No. 11, Published in 2011

**YOUNG PEOPLE AND THE POLICE IN LAGOS**  
Monograph Series No. 12, Published in 2011

**PROVIDING EFFECTIVE POLICING DURING**  
**THE 2011 GENERAL ELECTIONS:**  
Conference Proceedings,  
Monograph Series No. 13, Published in 2011

**RESPONDING TO EMERGENCY TRENDS  
OF TERRORISM IN NIGERIA**

Conference Proceedings,  
Monograph Series No.16, Published in 2011

**POLICE INTERNAL CONTROL SYSTEMS  
IN WEST AFRICA**, Published in 2011

**CRIME VICTIMIZATION, SAFETY AND POLICING  
IN NIGERIA**, Published in 2011

**OPERATIONALISING INTELLIGENCE-LED  
POLICING IN NIGERIA**

Conference Proceedings  
Monograph Series 17, Published in 2012

**GOVERNANCE AND INSECURITY IN  
SOUTH EAST NIGERIA** Published in 2012

**POLICE REFORM IN NIGERIA  
CIVIL SOCIETY FINAL REPORT CSO PANEL**  
Published in 2012