

**Criminal  
Victimization,  
Safety And  
Policing  
In Nigeria: 2005**



MONOGRAPH  
SERIES, NO. 3

**Etannibi E. O. Alemika  
Emmanuel U. Igbo  
Chinyere P. Nnorom**

**CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION, SAFETY AND POLICING IN  
NIGERIA: 2005**

Etannibi E. O Alemika  
Emmanuel U. Igbo  
Chinyere P. Nnorom

**CLEEN FOUNDATION**  
**MONOGRAPH SERIES**

NO 3  
October 2006

# **Criminal Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria: 2005**

Etannibi EO Alemika  
Emmanuel U. Igbo  
Chinyere P. Nnorom

**CLEEN FOUNDATION,**  
*Lagos, Nigeria*

**First published in 2006**

**By:**

**CLEEN Foundation**  
1, Afolabi Aina Street  
Ikeja 100281  
Lagos, Nigeria

**Tel: 234-1-4933195**

**Fax: 234-1-4935339**

**E-mail: [cleen@cleen.org](mailto:cleen@cleen.org)**

**Website: [www.cleen.org](http://www.cleen.org)**

**ISBN:**

© All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, photocopying, mechanical, recording or otherwise, without the prior approval of the CLEEN Foundation.

CLEEN Foundation  
IA Flab Ana Street,  
Off Allen Avenue  
Ikea, Lagos  
Nigeria

Tel: +234-1-4933195

[www.cleen.org](http://www.cleen.org)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

Preface

### **Chapter**

I Measurement of Crime and Victimization

II Extent of Criminal Victimization

III Patterns of Criminal Victimization

IV Safety and Fear of Crime

V Victims and the Police

VI Perceptions of Crime and Police

VII Summary and Conclusion

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Socioeconomic characteristics of respondents
2. Geographical distribution of respondents
3. Incidence, types and resolution of disputes
4. victimization of households members
5. Theft of livestock belong to household member
6. Theft of agricultural products
7. Types of agricultural products stolen
8. destruction of farmland
9. seriousness of damage to farmland by herdsmen and community members
10. personal victimization over the past 12 months
11. officials who solicited bribe from respondents
12. likelihood that bribe will be paid to obtain services
13. trend of corruption since 1999
14. respondents proposals for control of corruption
15. self reported offences of household members
16. context and types of cheatings
17. location of crimes against household and individuals
18. time or period of day when reported crime occurred
19. weapons used in criminal victimization
20. theft within the household
21. assault within the household
22. assault outside the home
23. relationship between victims of sexual violence and offenders
24. rape within the home
25. rape outside the home
26. murder within the home
27. robbery within the home
28. robbery outside the home
29. age and criminal victimization
30. gender and criminal victimization
31. religious affiliation and victimization
32. regional variation in criminal victimization
33. residential neighbourhood and criminal victimization
34. rural-urban variation and criminal victimization
35. feeling of safety
36. perceptions of crime trend in respondents communities
37. most common and feared crime in respondents community
38. types of crime most talked about in community
39. feeling of safety at home (day)
40. Feeling of safety at home (night)
41. fear of crime at home
42. fear of crime in neighbourhood
43. fear of crime and socioeconomic activities
44. measures taken to protect households against crime

45. report of crime victimization to the police by victims
46. differential crime victimization reporting
47. reasons for reporting victimization to the police
48. satisfaction with police handling of report
49. reasons for not reporting victimization to police
50. comparison of victims satisfaction with police
51. comparison of reasons for dissatisfaction with police
52. perception and assessment of the police
53. criminal motivations
54. respondents assessment of law enforcement agencies
55. contact with the police
56. perception of crime trend
57. perception of police performance
58. age and perception of police
59. gender and perception of police performance
60. religion and perception of police performance
61. regional variation in public perception of police performance
62. residential neighbourhood and perception of police performance
63. rural-urban residents and perception of police performance
64. public evaluation of police effectiveness
65. respondents recommendations for ensuring safety in their community

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

The CLEEN Foundation wishes to acknowledge the following organisations and individuals 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 Consultants Prof. Etannibi E.O. Alemika, Dr. Emmanuel U. Igbo and Dr. Chinyere P. Nnorom for leading the research and writing the report for publication. We particularly thank Prof. Alemika, the lead research consultant and our vice chairman, for writing the final draft of the report.

We commend the Practical Sampling International (PSI) and its personnel for their diligence in the field administration of the questionnaires 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 Manager of the CLEEN Foundation, Mohamed Yahaya, led the monitoring team to ensure that quality control measures and ethical values were respected throughout the study. He also carried out computer analysis of the survey data. Other members of the CLEEN Foundation research team that took part in the study were Geoffrey Anyanwu and Chukwuka Ehighibe.

Finally, we thank the 10,036 respondents who successfully completed the questionnaires, in spite of their busy schedules. Without their commitment to the study, this report would not have seen the light of the day.



## PREFACE

The significance of reliable data and statistics on the extent and pattern of crimes and victimization has long been recognized by criminologists, criminal justice officials and criminal justice policy-makers. However, the production of accurate crime and victimization data has been characterized by many problems. Some of the problems of collection and production of accurate crime and victimization are inherent in the nature of criminal activities, including efforts by criminals to conceal their actions and evade detection and arrest, capacity and practices of criminal justice agencies (police, courts and prisons).

Information on crimes and victimization are obtained from three different sources: official statistics produced by criminal justice agencies (police, courts, prosecutors, prisons, etc.); self-report surveys which collect information (through questionnaire and interviews) from individuals on their involvement in any criminal activities, usually during the preceding twelve months; and victim surveys which obtain information from individuals and households (through questionnaires and interviews) on their criminal victimization experience during the preceding twelve months. The three sources provide indicators of level of victimization and criminality and complement each other, though they do not fully resolve the problems of incomplete information on crime and victimization.

Until now, large scale national representative self-report and victim surveys have not been conducted in Nigeria. The first large scale state-wide crime victim survey of 2,100 households was conducted in Lagos only recently in August 2004 by the CLEEN Foundation<sup>1</sup>. This study, which was conducted between October and December 2005 is therefore a follow up to the Lagos survey and its first national crime victimization survey to be conducted in Nigeria. It is a contribution towards developing capacity for the conduct of crime and victims surveys and their utilisation for crime prevention and control planning and programmes in the country. It is also a modest contribution towards the collection of reliable data on crime, victimization, fear of crime and perceptions of the police through a social scientific survey in Nigeria.

This publication presents the analysis and findings of the survey. It is divided into seven chapters. Chapter I is on measurement of crime and victimization and its importance to criminologists, criminal justice policy makers and law enforcement officials. The chapter discusses three alternative measures of criminality and victimization (official statistics, self-report studies and criminal victimization surveys) as well as the research design and methodology used in the study.

Chapter II focuses on extent of criminal victimization in Nigeria and shows that slightly over one fifth of respondents (21.5%) experienced criminal victimization in the 12 months preceding the survey. Other statistics provided in the chapter includes the extent of disputing and dispute resolutions, theft of livestock and agricultural products, cheating, officials who solicited bribe before delivery services, perception of corruption within government agencies, trends in corruption and control of corruption.

Chapter III dwells on patterns of criminal victimization and indicates the locations and context where different types of crimes such as theft, assault, rape, robbery and murder are more committed in the 36 states of Nigeria and Abuja the Federal capital.

---

<sup>1</sup> The fieldwork for that study was conducted by the Federal Office of Statistics under contract from the CLEEN Foundation

Chapter IV is on safety and fear of crime and shows that most respondents feel safe while at home in the community during the day than at night. It argues that feeling of safety from criminal victimization is affected by several factors including personal experience, information from acquaintances and the press, reports and advice by law enforcement agencies, and observed deterioration of infrastructure and quality of life and civil association in the neighbourhood.

Chapter V discusses victims and the police and argues that the likelihood of victims reporting their victimization to the police is dependent on several factors, including the seriousness of the crime, likelihood of apprehension of offenders, prospect of recovering stolen items, requirements for compensation by insurance companies, perceived efficiency of the police. Data analysed in the chapter indicate that murder and robbery which are regarded as serious crimes have higher rate of reporting to the police.

Chapter VI is on perception of crime and police and argues that public perceptions of crime influence the evaluation of police performance. The survey data analyzed in the chapter show that perceptions of police performance were lowest in Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Edo, Enugu, Rivers and Plateau States where crime levels were seen to be going up the most.

Chapter VII presents the summary and conclusion of the study. The highlights of the findings are as follows:

- The most common forms of crime victimization in Nigeria are theft and assault.
- Robbery, rape and other sexual crimes, automobile theft and assault occur more at home or near the home of the victims.
- Machete and handgun are the most common weapons used in robbery and murder
- There are no substantial differences in the experience of victimization across age groups, sexes and residents of different neighbourhoods.
- Majority of rape victims (64%) know the rapists by name and/or sight and only in slightly less than one-third (29.2%) of the cases are the culprits total strangers.
- Only one-third (29.7%) of crime victims report their victimization to the police.
- More than three-fifths (64.1%) of the respondents said the incidence of corruption has increased a lot in the country since 1999 when the military handed over power to an elected government led by Olusegun Obasanjo.
- Creation of employment, poverty reduction and improved educational and vocational training opportunities are rated higher in recommendation of measures for the prevention and control of crime.

Our hope is that this publication will be of assistance to policy makers in crime prevention and control planning and programming in Nigeria.

**Innocent Chukwuma**  
**Executive Director**

## CHAPTER I

### MEASUREMENT OF CRIME AND VICTIMIZATION

#### **Introduction**

Crime and victim statistics are required by various audiences for different purposes. The efforts by criminologists to study criminals, crimes and victims as well as responses or reaction of government and non-governmental agencies to them will be greatly impaired by the absence of reliable crime and victimization statistics. Similarly, criminal justice policy-makers cannot plan properly for effective control of crime and insecurity if they do not have reliable statistics on criminality and criminal victimization. The law enforcement officials can also not offer effective service if they do not know the extent and pattern of crime and victimization in their commands. Given the importance of crime and victimization statistics, the need for every country to develop adequate capacity and to deploy enough human, financial and infrastructural facilities to the collection and analysis of the incidence, prevalence, trends and patterns of criminal activities and victimization in order to acquire necessary knowledge and ability for crime prevention and crime control cannot be overemphasized. However, the measurement of crimes and victimization through the collection of reliable crime and victimization statistics has remained a major problem, to varying degrees, in most countries, though continuous advancement is being made.

#### **Measurements of Crime and Victimization**

There are several difficulties that impinge on the collection of reliable statistics on criminal activity and victimization<sup>2</sup>. Some of the most important difficulties are associated with the collection of crime and victimization information. The following are the major difficulties.

- Some crimes occur without anyone realizing it;
- Many victims of crimes do not report them to formal law enforcement officials such as the police to enable them record such events;
- Law enforcement agents may resolve some crimes brought to their notice without recording them and invoking the criminal process.

These are often acknowledged as the problems of 'dark' and 'grey' crime figures, which imply 'unknown or undetected or unreported crime' and 'detected, reported but not 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 set of problems 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. With specific reference to crime and victimization statistics, the following problems are observed:

- Some countries, including Nigeria, do not appreciate the significance of grounding public policy and decision-making in reliable information and statistics;
- Police forces in many countries, including Nigeria, neglect collection, analysis and utilization of crime and victimization surveys as essential input to their planning, operations and administrations;

---

<sup>2</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).

- Countries and police forces that have previously ignored the collection and utilization of vital statistics for planning and administration usually lack necessary capacity for the collection, analysis, utilization, storage and retrieval of essential data and information.

In these circumstances, decisions are not based on 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.

The third set of problems requires political will and change of orientation or attitudes toward crime and victimization statistics. Although, by no means easy, these problems can be more easily resolved than the first set of problem relating to knowledge, reporting and recording of incidents of criminal activities and victimization. Several attempts have been made to minimize the problems of dark and grey figures of crime. In the case of the lesser difficulty of grey crime figures, measures like mandatory recording of complaints, and better training of officers responsible for receiving crime complaints and recording, improved – including automated – crime record processing, storage and retrieval are implemented. The critical problem of dark figures of crime remains largely unresolved. So far criminologists have in the past five decades 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 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 of the level and pattern of criminality. 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 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, they 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. These are the 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.

Official crime statistics in Nigeria suffer many weaknesses, in addition to the more universal problems of dark and grey crime figures. Some of the sources of the weaknesses have been aptly identified in the following passage.

There are several reasons why the Nigerian criminal justice and security agencies lack capacity for effective information management for planning, operations, monitoring and evaluations. The more significant ones are: (a) a historical legacy that views crime statistics as mere product of activities without additional values; (b) emphasis on operational performance as basis for promotion meant that officers outside general duty do not really commit themselves to the job, and lack of appreciation and supervision by superiors compound the apathy; (c) inadequate understanding and appreciation of the role of criminal statistics and intelligence management in effective and efficient delivery of services by the police, judicial and prisons; (d) institutional apathy towards information

management by government agencies in the country generally, and (e) lack of necessary skills and resources for statistical and information management. But even more fundamental than these reasons is that successive governments in the country loathe accountability and therefore do not develop statistical and information management system that will enable the public to assess their performance. As a result, even when data and statistics are collated, they are treated as secret documents, locked up and rarely used for evaluating and improving performance<sup>3</sup>.

The Nigerian criminal justice and intelligence systems need to address these failures if they are to become effective and efficient public instruments for guaranteeing and enhancing safety and security.

### **Self-Report Survey**

Crime survey involves the study of a sample of the population as regards the types and number of crimes that they committed during a particular period, usually during the past year - whether or not detected or reported to the police. The method uses questionnaire to collect relevant information. Crime survey as well is characterized by many weaknesses: First, the questionnaire tends to contain more questions on minor crimes with which the respondents are more comfortable and 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, crime surveys have provided a broader view of the extent and pattern of crimes and public perceptions of crime and 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, among members of groups and in a nation. Questionnaires are designed and administered to gather information on respondents' experience of criminal victimization. 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>4</sup>. The research reported in this publication is a victim survey and the research design and methodology are described below.

### **Research Design and Methodology**

The study employed survey research methodology. Its principal aim was to determine the views of Nigerians on the extent, trends and patterns of crime in the society in order to develop and implement effective administration of criminal justice.

---

<sup>3</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).

<sup>4</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

The study was conducted in all the thirty six states of Nigeria (36) and the Federal Capital Territory. 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.

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 aged less than eighteen years and people living in institutionalized settings were not part of the respondents.

The questionnaire was translated to Pidgin English, Yoruba, Igbo and Hausa languages, as these were the local languages spoken predominantly in the study locations. This was done to ensure uniform translation of questions and proper administration of questionnaire.

#### *Sampling Procedure*

Respondents' selection followed a stratified multi-stage random selection process thus:

- Selection of urban locations
- Selection of rural locations
- Selection of sectors
- Selection of dwelling structure
- Selection of household
- Selection of respondent

#### *Selection of urban and rural locations*

State capital of each state was automatically selected as urban locations. All the Local Government Areas (LGAs) outside the state capitals were listed alphabetically and one of them selected using a ballot system. In all the selected LGAs, all the rural locations were listed alphabetically and one of them selected through a ballot system.

#### *Selection of sector*

Sectors were divided into high, medium and low density areas. Each of the sectors was randomly selected from each division using the available street maps already sectorized into different density areas. Where this was not available, an exhaustive list of sectors containing low, medium and high-density areas was used. Thereafter, a simple ballot system was used to randomly select sectors where interviews were conducted.

Within each sector, the team randomly selected sampling Start Point (SSP). This enabled the team to know where to start the random walk pattern within the sector. In each of the sectors, Group Interviewing Technique (GIT) was adopted. By this design, a team of interviewers and one supervisor moved as a group to each sector before jointly moving to another sector. This design afforded the supervisors the opportunity to closely monitor the interviewers under them.

#### *Selection of Dwelling Structure*

In each of the sectors, the "Days Code" was used to randomly determine each interviewer's starting point i.e. (the first house or dwelling structure to enter). A dwelling structure was defined as a floor of a distinct residential building within a sector of a town/village. Where only one household occupies a multi-storey building, the entire building (and not the floor) constituted a dwelling structure. Where it is a multi storey building with multiple occupants, counting of floors was carried out consistently from the upper floor to the ground floor in an unbroken chain from floor to floor. A fixed sampling gap of one in three (1:3) and one in five (1:5) were observed after each successful call in low and high density areas respectively.

### *Selection of Households*

On entering a selected dwelling structure, the interviewer determined the number of household within the structure. Having done that, the interviewer then used the household selection grid to determine the household where the interviews took place. A household was defined as the individuals living under the same roof and having a common arrangement for feeding. However, members of the household were also expected to have stayed together for a period of not less than six months. In line with this definition, households did not include domestic servants and house-helps as well as family members who lived elsewhere for the purpose of work or schooling.

### *Selection of respondents*

To select the person to interview within a household, all the adult males and females (depending on the sex to be interviewed) aged, 18 years and above, in the selected household were listed by name on the respondents' selection grid table from the oldest to the youngest. Members of the selected household not at home at the first time of call were also listed. Interviewers then randomly select the respondent.

### *Call back/ Substitution*

In a case where the randomly selected adult was not available at the time of call, interviewers were instructed to enquire about the whereabouts of the selected respondent (they may perhaps be at work) and if nearby, the interviewer walked to that place to conduct the interview but where the selected respondent was not at home, the interviewer booked an appointment to meet them at a time the respondent will be available.

## **Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

The sample consists of 10036 respondents drawn from all the states of the Federation and the Federal Capital Territory. Table 1 presents the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the respondents. There were nearly equal representation of men and women in the sample. Slightly more than two-thirds (68%) of the respondents were 34 years old or younger, reflecting the preponderance of youth in the Nigerian population. More than one-half were married. However, more than two-fifths were never married, understandably because of the nation's age structure reflected in the sample. Respondents were largely literate (84.3%). For example 45.3% and 28.3% respectively had secondary and post-secondary education, much higher than the literacy levels in the country's general population. More than four-fifths of the respondents earned less than 50,000 naira per month, reflecting the general poor income levels and high poverty in the country. Estimates from both government and non-governmental sources indicate that more than two-thirds of Nigerian lived below poverty level during the past decade. About two-fifths were working while 25.7% and 8.5% respectively were students or apprentices and unemployed. Respondents were predominantly adherents of Christianity and Islam, the two major religions in the country.

**Table 1: Socioeconomic Characteristics of Respondents**

	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
1.	<b>Sex</b> Male Female	5075 4960	50.6 49.4
2.	<b>Age (Years)</b> 18 – 24 25 – 34 50 and older Mean (average) = 31.4 years Median = 28.0 years	3366 3464 2214	33.5 34.5 22.1
3.	<b>Marital status</b> Never Married Married Divorced/Separated Widow/Widower	4429 5350 129 127	44.1 53.3 1.3 1.3
4.	<b>Education</b> No formal education Koranic school Literacy class Primary Secondary Tertiary (Post secondary)	691 772 112 1072 4548 2840	6.9 7.7 1.1 10.7 45.3 28.3
5.	<b>Employment status</b> Working Unemployed (Looking for work) House maker/housewife Schooling or learning trade Retired or disabled Others	3970 854 1698 2577 214 722	39.6 8.5 16.9 25.7 2.1 7.2
6.	<b>Estimated household monthly income</b> Less than N5000 5000 < 10000 10,000 < 25,000 25,000 < 50,000 50,000 < 75,000 75,000 and higher Refused / don't know	661 2146 3172 2135 880 637 404	6.6 21.4 31.6 21.3 8.8 6.4 4.0
7.	<b>Religion</b> Christian Muslim Traditional Others Atheists/none	5854 4099 52 11 19	58.3 40.8 0.5 0.1 0.2
Total sample size = 10036			

**Geographical Distribution of Respondents**

The data on the geographical distribution of the respondents (table 2) indicate that 70% of the respondents were urban residents. The estimated urban/rural ratio for the early 2000s was 60:40. However, the sample is skewed in favour of urban areas because of higher reported incidents of crime by both the law enforcement agencies and the mass media. Congruent with the pattern observed in respect of income in table 1 above, nearly three-fifths of the respondents lived in low socio-economic status neighbourhoods.



Table 2: Geographical Distribution of Respondents

1.	<b>Residence</b> Urban Rural	7080 2955	70.6 29.4
2.	<b>Neighbourhood status</b> Higher Status Middle Status Low Status	1583 2592 5860	15.8 25.8 58.4
3.	<b>ZONES</b> Lagos South-West South-South South-East North-West North-East North-Central	640 1351 1443 1204 2493 1706 1198	6.4 13.5 14.4 12.4 24.8 17.0 11.9

The characteristics of the sample (respondents) indicate to a very large extent that the respondents are generally representative of the general population and the findings can be reasonably generalized.

## CHAPTER II

### EXTENT OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION

Criminal victimization may be a result of dispute among people in society. Although not all forms of dispute are criminal, an understanding of the extent of dispute and mechanism for their resolution can assist in understanding the extent to which disputants involve official social control agencies (police and courts) in dispute resolution. To some extent, this may clarify the extent to which official statistics reflect the level of dispute manifested as criminal victimization.

#### **Incidence and Resolution of Disputes**

Different types of dispute are witnessed in the country during the period covered by the survey. The data collected also reveal that the disputes were resolved through diverse dispute resolution mechanisms in the communities. Table 3 below presents data on the sources of disputes and mechanisms for their resolution by the respondents.

#### **Disputing and Dispute Resolution**

Nearly one quarter (24.9%) of the respondents reported that at least a member of their household was involved in a dispute during the past twelve months. The most common types of dispute are land, marital conflict, financial matters and physical assault. More than one-half of the disputes is referred to and solved by the family and friends.

**Table 3: Incidence, Types and Resolution of Disputes**

	<i>Types and resolution of disputes involving any household member</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>1.</b>	<i>Any household member involved in dispute</i>		
	Yes	2496	24.9
	No	7485	74.6
	Don't know	55	0.5
<b>2.</b>	<i>Nature and cause of last dispute</i>		
	Land related	578	23.2
	Marital	548	22.0
	Money/Finance related	415	16.6
	Physical Assault	308	12.3
	Work related	216	8.7
	Male and Female relationship	189	7.6
	Inheritance (excluding land)	88	3.5
	Rape/Sexual Harassment/Assault	39	1.6
	Others	115	4.6
<b>3.</b>	<i>Major institutions employed for dispute resolution</i>		
	Family and Friends	1325	53.1
	Traditional ruling institutions	331	13.3
	Police	324	13.0
	Law courts	139	5.6
	Religious leaders	90	3.6
	Community groups (unions, trade association)	36	1.4
	Office holders and politicians	59	2.4
	Vigilante/militias	7	0.3
	NGO/CBO/CSO	6	0.2
	Others	169	6.8
<b>4.</b>	<i>% of Respondents satisfied with the dispute resolution mechanisms</i>		
	Family and friends (n = 1325)	1215	91.7

	Traditional Ruling Institutions (n = 331)	264	79.8
	Police (n = 324)	210	64.6
	Law Courts (n = 139)	112	80.5
	Religious Leaders (n = 90)	83	91.2

### **Extent of Victimization of Household Members**

Typically, victim survey attempts to measure the extent of victimization by asking respondents if a member of their household had been a victim of crimes during a specified period, usually a year. The information obtained in this respect pertains to household members and not just the experience of the respondent. Valuable as it is in many respects, the approach does not capture all incidents for at least two reasons. First, respondents may not have full knowledge of victimization suffered by household members. Second and related, only serious victimization both within and outside the household are likely to be discussed among members. Thus knowledge of respondents about victimization of household members may be more accurate for serious crimes. Forgetfulness is another problem.

In table 4, the reported incidents of victimization are presented. The data showed that more than 4/5 (81.1%) of households covered did not report any occasion warranting fear of crime by their members while at home. However, slightly more members of the households (77.7%) feared crime in the neighbourhood than at home. Generally, the rate of victimization is higher outside the household than within the households.

**Table 4: Victimization of Household Members**

	<i>Over the past 12 months anyone in the household</i>	<i>Never %</i>	<i>Once %</i>	<i>Twice or more %</i>	<i>Don't know %</i>
1	Feared crime at home	81.1	9.7	8.3	0.9
2	Feared crime in neighbourhood	77.7	10.1	10.9	1.4
3	Had something stolen at home	83.6	10.2	5.7	0.5
4	Physically attacked at home	95.4	3.1	1.1	0.4
5	Physically attached outside home	93.9	4.2	1.4	0.5
6.	Raped at home	98.5	0.8	0.2	0.4
7.	Raped outside home	98.5	0.9	0.2	0.4
8.	Killed at home	98.8	0.6	0.2	0.4
9.	Killed outside home	98.3	1.0	0.2	0.4
10	Robbed at home	95.8	2.6	1.1	0.4
11.	Robbed outside home	94.6	3.8	1.0	0.5
12.	Kidnapped	98.6	0.8	0.2	0.4
13	Had vehicle/cycle snatched with use of gun or force (owners n = 3873)	97.7	1.8	0.4	0.2
14	Had something stolen from vehicle/cycle parked at home	94.5	3.9	1.3	0.3
15	Had something stolen from vehicle/cycle parked away from home	93.6	4.9	1.1	0.3
16	Had vehicle/cycle deliberately damaged or vandalized	97.0	2.0	0.7	0.3

### **Livestock theft**

A substantial number of Nigerians own livestock, raised either for personal consumption or sale. In rural areas, livestock constitutes one of the major properties owned by residents. Table 5 presents the data on theft of livestock belonging to members of the household. Theft of chicken and duck were reported in nearly one-half (48.3%) of the households. Other livestock belonging

to household members that were widely stolen involves goats (40.8%), sheep (26.8%) and dogs (17.1%). As reflected in the data on ownership in table 5, these are the livestock and domestic animals widely reared by Nigerians. Theft of livestock is often a source of conflict in the rural areas.

**Table 5: Theft of Livestock Belonging to Household Member**

	<i>Types of Livestock belonging to household members that were stolen over past 12 months</i>	<i>None %</i>	<i>Yes, one or more %</i>
1	Sheep (Sheep owners = 1666)	73.2	26.8
2	Goat (Goat owners = 2480)	59.2	40.8
3	Horse (Horse owners = 648)	95.2	4.8
4	Donkey (Donkey owners = 638)	94.4	5.6
5	Camel (Camel owners = 618)	95.0	5.0
6	Cow (Cow owners = 834)	86.6	13.4
7	Pig (Pig owners = 741)	86.5	13.5
8	Chicken and ducks (Owners – 3028)	51.3	48.7
9	Rabbit (Owners = 729)	90.3	9.7
10	Dog (Owners = 1123)	82.9	17.1
11	Pigeon (Owners = 777)	88.7	12.3

#### **Theft of Agricultural Products**

Table 6 presents the data on theft of agricultural products owned by members of the households. More than four-fifths (N = 8,078, 80.3%) of the respondents in the sample reported ownership of agricultural products by household members. This is understandable because most rural residents engage in farming while urban residents consume agricultural products, with more affluent people engaging in bulk purchases of agricultural food products for household consumption. Theft may be by outsiders, household members and house helps and other domestic employees in the urban areas. Overall, 11.2% of the entire sample and 13.9% of the households with members owning agricultural products, respectively, reported theft of various products.

**Table 6: Theft of Agricultural Products**

<i>Any agricultural products belonging to a members of your household stolen over the 12 months</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	1125	11.2
No	6953	69.3
Had no agricultural products	1922	19.2
Don't know	36	0.4

The total number of household with agricultural products was 8078 (80.5% of the sample) out of which 1125 (13.9%) reported theft of products.

#### **Types of Stolen Agricultural Products**

Attempt was made to determine the types of agricultural products that were more frequently stolen. The data on stolen agricultural products presented in table 7 revealed that cereals, tubers and vegetables were the most frequently stolen. Thus on first responses, tubers (yam, cassava,

potato, etc.) and cereals (maize, millet, corn, rice, etc.) were the most common agricultural products belonging to household members that were stolen.

**Table 7: Types of Agricultural Products Stolen**

<i>Types of Agricultural Products (N = 1125)</i>	<i>First Response</i>	<i>Second Response</i>
1. Tubers (Yam, Cassava, Potato, etc)	41.5	5.0
2. Cereals (Maize, Millet, Corn, Rice, etc)	38.7	49.4
3. Fruits (Orange, Guava, Pawpaw, Banana, etc)	7.3	14.5
4. Vegetables (Tomato, Spinach, Pepper, etc)	6.4	22.8
5. Tree crops (Cocoa, Coffee, Kola, Palm fruits, etc)	2.6	5.4

**Destruction of Farmland**

A major source of one form of conflict in rural Nigeria is the destruction of farm land by nomadic herdsmen and members of the community. Farmland and crops are destroyed by livestock (cattle, goat, and sheep) which are reared and taken around for grazing by herdsmen. On many occasions, such destruction resulted in violent conflicts involving loss of lives. Further, because most of the herdsmen are generally of particular ethnic backgrounds located in Northern Nigeria where such conflicts occurred in the central and southern states, they tend to invoke ethnic resentment. Data in table 8 indicate that farmlands are destroyed more often by nomadic herdsmen. Farmland destruction by community members tend to occur when there is dispute over land ownership, a fairly widespread problem as reflected by data in table 3.

**Table 8: Destruction of Farm Land**

<i>Any member of household had their farm destroyed by nomadic herdsmen or community member</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes, nomadic herdsmen	967	9.6
Yes, community members	356	3.5
No / no farmland	7138	71.1
Don't know	1575	15.7

**Seriousness of Damage to Farmland**

Destruction of farmland by nomadic herdsmen is more serious than destruction by members of the community or their livestock (Table 9). The difference may be attributed to the large number of livestock that herdsmen rear and which graze on farmland, entirely destroying crops on fairly large scale.

**Table 9: Seriousness of Damage to Farmland by Herdsmen and Community Member**

<i>Extent of damage by:</i>	<i>Not at all serious</i>	<i>Not serious</i>	<i>Somewhat serious</i>	<i>Very serious</i>
Nomadic herdsmen	7.5	14.4	31.5	43.5
Community members	10.5	18.6	34.9	29.3

**Personal Criminal Victimization**

Overall, 21.5% (2,162) of the 10,036 respondents in the sample reported that they were victims of crime during the preceding twelve months. In contrast to the data on household criminal victimization, personal victimization data relate to the experience of individuals rather than those of the household members generally. Personal criminal victimization data are more useful than household victimization statistics, because they are less likely to be inaccurate due to lack of knowledge of victimization of other household members. The data presented in table 10 show that the major types of victimization experienced by the respondents were burglary (17.9%), theft of GSM handsets (9.5%), verbal abuse by husbands (9.5%) and purse snatching (8.1%).

Sexual assault (rape and attempted rape) was reported by a fairly significant proportion (8.2%). Physical assault by husbands and boyfriends were also significantly reported (11.5%).

**Table 10: Personal Victimization over the past 12 months**

	<i>Over the past 12 months how often, if ever, did you experience:</i>	<i>Never %</i>	<i>Once %</i>	<i>Twice or More %</i>	<i>Refused/No response</i>
1	Someone entered your home and stole something?	81.9	12.1	5.8	0.1
2	Someone unsuccessfully tried to enter your home, damage locks and windows, in order to steal your property?	92.5	5.8	1.5	0.2
3	Someone took your property by using force, or threat of force?	94.8	3.9	1.0	0.2
4	Someone stole your purse, money, etc at public places?	91.6	5.7	2.4	0.2
5.	Someone stole your mobile phone or GSM handset?	90.1	8.1	1.4	0.4
6.	Someone forced you to have sex with him (female only = 4941)	96.6	2.5	0.5	0.3
7	Someone attempted to force you to have sex with him?	94.4	4.0	1.2	0.4
8	Someone denied you promotion employment, admission or pass in an examination because you refuse his demand for sex	95.5	3.1	1.0	0.4
9	Verbal abuse by your husband (married female n = 3718)	88.9	4.7	4.8	0.2
10	Beaten by your husband (n = 3704)	93.1	3.3	1.9	1.7
11	Beaten by your boyfriend or date partner & spouse (n = 4933)	90.5	4.2	2.1	3.1

**Corruption as Criminal Victimization**

Corrupt practices like bribery and extortion are criminal victimization. Bribery and extortion are widespread in the country and cause serious socio-economic and political problems. More than one-fifth, 21.6% (2172) of the 10036 respondents reported that they were asked by government officials to pay bribe for their services during the past three years. Police personnel accounted for nearly two-thirds (65.4%) of the officials who allegedly demanded bribe from the respondents. They were distantly followed by the officials (8.1%) of the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) formerly called National Electric Power Authority (NEPA). The figures do not necessarily mean that the police were more corrupt than any other agencies or officials but rather that because most citizens come in more frequent contact with them, they are likely to record higher cases of demand for bribes. Among the listed officials, the Police have the most contact with the members of the public and in different contexts. Thus, while some police officials are corrupt (in the light of media reports and disciplinary actions of the police authorities), the percentages of officials demanding bribes reported in table 10 may be partly attributed to contacts, nature of services provided and powers exercised by the officials. Only 5.5% (119) of those who reported that they were required to pay bribes by officials reported such to the police, Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC).

**Table 11: Officials who solicited bribe from Respondents**

	<i>Officials who demanded bribe</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
1	Police personnel	1425	65.4
2	NEPA/PHCN Officials	177	8.1

3	Teachers, lecturers and Professors	164	7.5
4	Diverse government officials	96	4.4
5	Customs officials	32	1.5
6	Immigration official	23	1.1
7	Security guard	20	0.9
8	Municipal/local government officials	34	1.6
9	Tax/revenue officials	25	1.1
10	Court officials	22	1.0

### Perception of Corruption within Agencies

The perception of respondents as to the likelihood that they have to offer bribe before obtaining services from officials and institutions is an indicator of the level of corrupt practices (bribery and extortion) in a country. Such perception is however determined by several factors - personal experience and information from public and private domains (media reports, law enforcement activities, experiences of friends and relations, etc.). Therefore, because perception is not determined solely by personal experience, it is important to caution that there may be no perfect correspondence between it and reality. Although perception is a useful and reliable indicator of conditions, it is sometimes either an exaggeration or under-estimation of the manifestation of particular conditions in society, and may also persist for a while even when the condition has ceased to exist.

Table 12 presents the data on respondents' perception of the likelihood of bribery being solicited by officials of various agencies. Police personnel were perceived by 84.3% as likely to demand for bribe, in comparison to NEPA/PHCN (74.3%). Customs officials (67.7%); ministry officials (58.4%); legislators (56.4%); teachers and lecturers (56.6%) and elected local government officials (58.9%). The agencies and officials which were perceived as less likely to demand for bribes were doctors and nurses (32.7%), bank officials (36.7%); private sector officials (42.8%) and traditional leaders (42.8%). Based on public perception, the likelihood of demand for bribe before service is rendered is high in many public and private agencies.

**Table 12: Likelihood that bribes would be paid to obtain services**

<i>Likelihood of demand for bribery to obtain services in the following organizations</i>	<i>Most likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Not likely</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Legislature	25.2	31.2	26.2	17.4
Ministry officials	25.2	33.2	25.5	16.1
Elected local government official	26.0	32.9	26.0	15.1
NEPA/PHCN	41.2	33.1	16.9	8.8
Police personnel	58.9	25.4	10.3	5.4
Customs officials	35.2	32.5	19.2	13.2
Court officials	24.9	32.8	26.9	15.4
Tax/revenue officials	24.2	33.7	26.6	15.5
Water Board officials	16.6	30.5	35.9	17.0
Doctors/Nurses	11.1	21.6	51.5	15.8
Bank Officials	13.3	23.4	46.4	16.9
Teachers/Lecturers/Professors	27.5	31.1	28.2	13.1
Security guards	17.1	32.8	34.7	15.4
Traditional authorities	14.4	28.4	40.1	17.1
Private sector officials	13.5	29.3	35.8	21.4
No. of respondents = 10036				



### **Trend of Corruption**

Successive governments in the country since the mid-1970s have introduced series of measures to tackle corruption in the country. But these measures have been largely ineffective as corrupt practices became widespread. When General Olusegun Obasanjo assumed office as elected President of Nigeria in May 1999, he promised to introduce anti-corruption measures. In fulfilment of the promise, the Government established the ICPC with wide powers and later the EFCC with even more powers and resources. While a few senior government officials have been arrested and prosecuted by the two agencies, critics argue that government's efforts are ineffective, and that the enforcement of anti-corruption laws is selective and manipulated to suppress opposition to government policies. Some researches have determined that corruption is widespread in the public and private sectors of the country<sup>5</sup>. A very significant proportion (78%) of the respondents in this survey said that corruption has increased in the country since 1999 (table 13). Nearly two-thirds (64.1%) of respondents said corruption has 'increased a lot' since 1999; while another 13.9% said it has 'increased slightly'. Only 12% said it has decreased.

**Table 13: Trend of Corruption Since 1999**

<i>Has corruption increased or decreased since 1999</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Increased a lot	6431	64.1
Slightly increased	1398	13.9
Stayed the same	704	7.0
Slightly decreased	902	9.0
Decreased a lot	302	3.0
Don't know	299	3.0

### **Control of Corruption**

Three major recommendations were proposed by the respondents as solutions to the problem of corruption in the country. These were tougher laws and sentences; better education and proper upbringing of children, and good leadership (table 14).

**Table 14: Respondents' proposals for control of corruption**

<i>Measures</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Tougher laws and sentences	2241	22.3
Better education and proper upbringing of children	2246	22.4
Providing a good example of leadership	2084	20.0
More regular and control of public officials	901	9.0
Greater publicity of problems of corruption	791	7.9
Better salaries for public officials	700	7.0
Others	695	6.9

### **Self-Reported Criminality**

An alternative measure of the extent of criminality is self-report approach which asks individuals whether or not they or any member of their household had been involved in specified crimes over the past twelve months. Criminological researches have shown that people under-report their criminal behaviours, and are more likely to report less serious criminality. The reported

---

<sup>5</sup> P. Lewis, et al 2001. *Down to Earth: Changes in Attitudes Toward Democracy and Markets in Nigeria*. Afrobarometer Network ([www.afrobarometer.org](http://www.afrobarometer.org)); and E. Alemika. 2004. *Corruption, Governance Performance and Political Trust in Nigeria*. University of Cape Town: Centre for Social Science Research, Working Paper No. 77

involvement of household members in crime is presented in table 15. The members of the household of the respondents were more involved in physical assault (5%), theft of mobile telephone/GSM handset (2.3%) and robbery (1.9%) and attempted robbery (1.0%). The low figures of reported criminality by household members may be aptly attributed to problem of disclosure of offences even to relatives, resulting in inadequate knowledge of respondents about the extent of criminality by their household members.

**Table 15: Self-Reported offences of Households members**

Over the last 12 months, were you or any member of your household accused or arrested for:	Number and % reporting <b>Yes</b>	
	Number	% of total respondents
Murder	50	0.5
Attempted murder	37	0.4
Robbery	195	1.9
Attempted Robbery	99	1.0
Rape	40	0.4
Attempted rape	39	0.4
Kidnapping	24	0.2
Attempted kidnapping	22	0.2
Vehicle theft	32	0.3
Motorcycle theft	49	0.5
Bicycle theft	60	0.6
Forced same – sex intercourse	29	0.3
Physical assault	498	5.0
Theft of mobile telephone/GSM handset	234	2.3
Total respondents = 10036		

### **Cheating**

Nigerians are cheated by individuals and organizations involved in service delivery, trade and manufacture. A total of 3,054 (30.5%) of the sample reported being cheated over the past twelve months in different circumstances. The data in table 16 indicate that respondents were cheated more frequently through such means like fake products (20%), false pretences or deception (18.5%), purchases from traders (16.3%) and substandard construction and repair work (13.5%).

**Table 16: Context and types of cheating**

	<i>Context and types of cheating experienced by victims</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
1	Substandard construction or repair work	416	13.5
2	Poor work in a automobile garage	121	3.9
3	Poor service at a hotel, restaurant or pub	76	2.5
4	Purchase in shops or from traders	502	16.3
5	Fake products	616	20.0
6	False pretences or deception	570	18.5
7	Tampering with petrol dispensing meters	74	2.4
8	Other means	679	22.1

## CHAPTER III

### PATTERNS OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION

#### Introduction

Crime prevention and crime control require knowledge of where criminal victimizations are most likely to occur. Criminologists have found that criminal victimization is not random. Crimes are likely to occur in some places than others. According to Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo:

Victimization is not a phenomenon that is uniformly distributed; it occurs disproportionately in particular times and places; it occurs disproportionately by offenders with particular demographic characteristics; it occurs disproportionately under certain circumstances (e.g. according to whether or not the person is alone); it occurs disproportionately according to the prior relationship between the potential victim and the potential offender; and so forth. Because different lifestyles imply different probabilities that individuals will be in particular places, at particular times, under particular circumstances, interacting with kinds of persons, lifestyles affects the probability of victimization (1978: 251)<sup>6</sup>.

Table 17 presents the data on the locations of the victimizations reported by the respondents. Murder and attempted murder occurred more near the victims' residence or elsewhere, further away from home. Robbery and attempted robbery occurred more at home and elsewhere further away from the victims' residence. Rape occurred more often at the victims' home and near the victims' residence. Attempted rape occurred more frequently near the victims' residence, at work place and elsewhere, in the state. The pattern exhibited by the data in table 17 indicated that different crimes are likely to be perpetrated in different locations and contexts. This in part supports the proposition of the victimization and criminal opportunity theory, which states that "while potential offenders may take advantage of information about living quarters, crime rates, police protection, and neighbourhood surveillance in judging the risk of a violation, potential victims may likewise use such information to judge the threat of being victimized" (Ferraro 1995: 16)<sup>7</sup>.

**Table 17: Location of Crimes against Household and Individuals**

	<i>Types of Crime</i>	<i>No Reporting Victimization</i>	<i>Places where crime occurred</i>				
			<i>At own home</i>	<i>Near own home</i>	<i>At work or school</i>	<i>Elsewhere in state</i>	<i>Elsewhere in Nigeria</i>
1	Murder	126	18.3	24.6	11.9	31.7	13.5
2	Attempted murder	99	31.3	24.2	6.1	26.3	12.1
3	Robbery	1071	42.2	16.2	5.1	26.5	10.0
4	Attempted robbery	463	43.0	18.6	6.5	26.5	10.0
5	Rape	119	36.1	32.8	14.3	14.3	2.5
6	Attempted rape	159	18.9	35.2	20.0	21.4	3.8
7	Kidnapping	40	12.5	35.0	10.0	32.5	10.0

<sup>6</sup> MJ Hindelang; MR Gottfredson and J. Garofalo, 1978. *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger

<sup>7</sup> Ferraro, KF. 1995. *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization* (New York: State University of New York Press).

8	Attempted kidnapping	34	20.6	26.5	20.6	32.4	-
9	Vehicle theft	155	27.7	25.8	9.0	34.8	2.6
10.	Motorcycle theft	104	38.5	24.0	11.5	23.1	2.9
11.	Bicycle theft	90	44.4	28.9	11.1	11.1	4.4
12	Forced Same-Sex Intercourse	57	21.1	33.3	24.6	17.5	3.5
13	Physical assault	1506	26.3	36.7	17.7	17.1	2.3
14	Theft of mobile phone and GSM handset	1056	24.0	20.4	19.9	32.0	3.8

### **Time of criminal victimization**

Crimes do not occur randomly over the twenty-four hours of the day. Some crimes occur more during the day and others during the night. Information about where and when crimes are likely to occur can assist law enforcement agencies to undertake optimal deployment of resources for crime prevention and control.

The data in table 18 show that crimes such as murder and attempted murder, robbery and attempted robbery, and rape occurred more in the evening and at night. Physical assault occurred more during afternoon and evening. More than one-half (56.4%) of the reported 55 cases of forced or coerced same-sex intercourse (homosexuality and lesbianism) occurred in the afternoon.

**Table 18: Time or Period of Day when Reported crime Occurred**

	<i>Types of Crime</i>	<i>No Reporting Victimization</i>	<i>Time or Period of Day</i>			
			<i>Mornin g</i>	<i>Afternoon</i>	<i>Evening</i>	<i>Night/Mid Night</i>
1	Murder	125	10.4	18.4	20.8	50.4
2	Attempted murder	99	9.1	25.3	24.2	41.4
3	Robbery	1069	10.5	13.1	24.6	51.8
4	Attempted robbery	463	12.1	14.5	23.3	50.1
5	Rape	118	4.2	16.9	39.8	39.0
6	Attempted rape	158	5.1	29.7	38.0	27.2
7	Kidnapping	40	10.0	35.0	37.5	17.5
8	Attempted kidnapping	33	9.1	42.4	27.3	21.2
9	Vehicle theft	155	7.1	16.8	35.5	40.6
10	Motorcycle theft	104	8.7	16.3	29.8	45.2
11	Bicycle theft	88	13.6	19.3	28.4	38.6
12	Forced Same-Sex Intercourse	55	3.6	56.4	20.0	20.0
13	Physical assault	1504	21.3	38.9	32.4	7.4
14	Theft of mobile phone and GSM handset	1053	14.5	33.2	33.5	18.7

### **Weapons used in Criminal Victimization**

Police and other law enforcement agencies will be better equipped to handle various violent crimes if they know the weapons that the perpetrators are likely to use. The most serious violent crimes in which firearms and other weapons are used are murder, robbery, rape and assaults. Table 19 presents the data on weapons used in the reported cases of violent crimes.

Guns were used in 46.6% of cases of robbery in comparison to 8.2% in rapes, 6.6% in assaults, and 32.2% in murder. It is important to note that knife and machete were widely used in perpetrating the crimes of robbery (28.6%); rape (14.2%), assault (13.1%) and murder (39.1%).

**Table 19: Weapons used in Criminal Victimization**

<i>Types of weapon used in criminal victimization</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
---	-----------	----------

<i>ROBBERY</i>		
Knife/Cutlass/Machete	270	28.6
Hand gun (pistol, revolver)	367	38.8
Long gun (rifle, machine gun)	74	7.8
Clubs, iron bars, screw	11	1.2
Bow and arrow	6	0.6
Broken bottles	6	0.6
Others	11	1.2
No weapon	154	16.3
Others	11	1.2
<i>RAPE</i>		
Knife/cutlass/machete	33	14.2
Handgun (pistol, revolver)	19	8.2
Bow and arrow	3	1.3
Others	165	71.1
<i>ASSAULTS</i>		
Knife/cutlass/machete	263	13.1
Handgun (pistol, revolver)	93	4.6
Clubs, iron bars, screw	41	2.0
Broken bottles	101	5.0
Others	1485	73.8
<i>MURDER</i>		
Knife/cutlass/machete	68	39.1
Handgun (pistol, revolver)	48	27.6
Long gun (rifle, machine gun)	8	4.6
Clubs, iron bars, screw	4	2.3
Broken bottles	4	2.3
Others	19	10.8

### **Incidence of Theft in States**

Incidence and prevention of crimes vary across the state. The figures in table 20 show that theft within the house was highest in Taraba Kogi, Rivers, and Bayelsa States while lowest in Ogun, Osun, Yobe, Zamfara, Kwara and Ekiti States. Multiple victimizations, which is the incidence of theft within household on two or more occasions, was highest in Rivers, Bayelsa, Benue, Gombe, Plateau, Taraba and Ebonyi States and lowest in Ogun, Osun, Yobe and Niger States.

**Table 20: Theft Within the Household**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>THEFT WITHIN THE HOUSEHOLD</i>			
		<i>Never</i>	<i>Once</i>	<i>Twice or More</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Abia	260	78.1	13.5	7.7	0.8
Adamawa	120	80.8	14.2	4.2	0.8
Anambra	301	83.4	9.6	6.3	0.7
Akwa Ibom	260	84.2	12.3	3.5	0.0
Bauchi	480	81.7	10.8	7.5	0.0
Bayelsa	220	66.4	18.6	14.1	0.9
Benue	300	75.0	12.0	12.7	0.3
Borno	293	86.0	9.2	4.4	0.0
Cross River	212	86.8	8.0	5.2	0.0
Delta	292	87.0	11.3	1.7	0.0
Ebonyi	182	78.6	11.0	10.4	0.0

Edo	240	80.8	12.9	6.3	1.4
Ekiti	219	93.2	2.3	3.3	0.6
Enugu	181	91.2	6.1	2.2	0.0
Gombe	121	81.0	6.6	12.4	0.4
Imo	280	86.6	8.6	4.3	2.8
Jigawa	320	84.7	9.7	2.8	0.2
Kaduna	452	73.5	17.0	9.3	0.4
Kano	477	75.1	17.0	7.5	0.2
Katsina	440	89.3	6.1	4.3	0.3
Kebbi	300	90.0	7.3	2.3	0.8
Kogi	240	65.0	25.8	8.3	0.0
Kwara	180	93.9	2.2	3.9	1.7
Lagos	640	91.9	2.3	4.1	0.0
Nasarawa	180	82.2	10.6	7.2	0.0
Niger	280	95.4	2.9	1.8	0.8
Ogun	259	96.5	1.9	0.8	0.0
Ondo	220	89.5	8.2	2.3	0.8
Osun	260	96.2	2.3	0.8	0.3
Oyo	393	87.0	10.2	2.5	0.0
Plateau	180	72.2	15.6	12.2	0.5
Rivers	219	65.3	19.2	15.1	0.0
Sokoto	252	83.7	10.3	6.0	0.0
Taraba	172	65.7	22.7	11.6	0.0
Yobe	160	94.4	5.0	0.6	0.0
Zamfara	252	94.0	3.6	2.4	0.0
Federal Capital Territory	198	72.2	19.2	7.6	1.0

### **Assault within Household**

Assault within household was highest in Rivers, Ebonyi, Abia and Bayelsa States and lowest in Sokoto, Yobe, Niger, Katsina, Zamfara, Ogun, Kebbi and Borno States. Multiple victimizations were most prevalent in Rivers, Abia States and Federal Capital Territory (table 21).

**Table 21: Assault Within the Household**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>ASSAULT WITHIN THE HOUSEHOLD</i>			
		<i>Never</i>	<i>Once</i>	<i>Twice or More</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Abia	260	88.1	6.9	4.6	0.4
Adamawa	120	94.2	3.3	1.7	0.8
Anambra	301	96.7	3.0	0.0	0.3
Akwa Ibom	260	93.1	6.2	0.8	0.0
Bauchi	480	99.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Bayelsa	220	94.5	5.0	0.5	0.0
Benue	300	93.3	3.0	3.7	0.0
Borno	293	98.6	0.7	0.3	0.3
Cross River	212	91.5	6.1	2.4	0.0
Delta	292	93.5	4.8	0.7	1.0
Ebonyi	182	89.6	7.7	2.7	0.0
Edo	240	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Ekiti	219	96.3	1.4	0.5	1.8
Enugu	181	95.6	2.8	1.7	0.0
Gombe	121	97.5	2.5	0.0	0.0
Imo	280	93.9	3.9	1.8	1.8
Jigawa	320	95.3	2.5	0.0	0.0

Kaduna	452	98.0	1.1	0.7	0.0
Kano	477	96.6	2.3	0.6	0.4
Katsina	440	99.3	0.7	0.0	2.2
Kebbi	300	98.3	1.0	0.3	0.2
Kogi	240	92.5	5.8	0.8	0.4
Kwara	180	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0
Lagos	640	95.3	1.4	1.6	0.3
Nasarawa	180	95.3	2.8	1.7	0.8
Niger	280	99.3	0.4	0.4	0.0
Ogun	259	98.1	0.4	0.8	0.8
Ondo	220	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Osun	260	98.1	0.8	0.4	0.0
Oyo	393	95.7	3.8	0.5	0.0
Plateau	180	95.6	4.4	0.0	0.0
Rivers	219	74.0	16.9	9.1	0.0
Sokoto	252	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0
Taraba	172	92.4	7.0	0.6	0.0
Yobe	160	99.4	0.6	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	252	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Federal Capital Territory	198	89.4	6.1	3.5	1.0

### **Assault Outside Household**

Assault outside the household was highest in Rivers, Ebonyi, Abia, Bayelsa and Kogi States while lowest in Katsina, Ogun and Yobe States. The highest prevalence of multiple victimization was recorded in Rivers, Ebonyi, Abia and Imo States and the, Federal Capital Territory (table 22).

**Table 22: Assault Outside the Home**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>ASSAULT OUTSIDE THE HOME</i>			
		<i>Never</i>	<i>Once</i>	<i>Twice or More</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Abia	260	85.4	10.4	3.1	1.2
Adamawa	120	95.0	4.2	0.0	0.8
Anambra	301	93.0	5.0	2.0	0.0
Akwa Ibom	260	93.1	6.5	0.4	0.0
Bauchi	480	97.7	3.3	0.0	0.0
Bayelsa	220	86.8	11.4	1.8	0.0
Benue	300	92.7	3.7	3.7	0.0
Borno	293	95.6	2.4	1.7	0.3
Cross River	212	92.5	5.7	1.9	0.0
Delta	292	89.7	4.5	2.7	3.1
Ebonyi	182	85.7	11.0	3.3	0.0
Edo	240	92.9	6.3	0.4	0.4
Ekiti	219	96.3	0.9	0.9	1.8
Enugu	181	91.7	7.7	0.6	0.0
Gombe	121	96.7	3.3	0.0	0.0
Imo	280	91.1	5.7	2.9	0.4
Jigawa	320	94.1	3.4	0.3	2.2
Kaduna	452	97.6	1.8	0.4	0.2
Kano	477	95.6	3.4	0.4	0.6
Katsina	440	99.5	0.2	0.2	0.0
Kebbi	300	97.6	2.0	0.4	0.0
Kogi	240	87.9	10.0	1.3	0.8
Kwara	180	96.1	2.8	1.1	0.0

Lagos	640	94.7	2.3	1.3	1.7
Nasarawa	180	96.1	3.9	0.0	0.0
Niger	280	97.5	1.4	0.7	0.4
Ogun	259	98.1	0.4	0.8	0.8
Ondo	220	92.3	7.3	0.5	0.0
Osun	260	94.7	2.3	1.3	1.7
Oyo	393	95.9	4.1	0.0	0.0
Plateau	180	96.1	3.9	0.0	0.0
Rivers	219	73.5	15.1	11.4	0.0
Sokoto	252	97.6	3.4	0.4	0.6
Taraba	172	91.3	5.2	3.5	0.0
Yobe	160	98.1	1.9	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	252	97.3	2.0	0.3	0.3
Federal Capital Territory	198	90.4	4.5	3.5	1.5

### **Sexual Violence**

Rape devastates its victim. Girls and Women are the victims of rape in most cases. Criminological literature has demonstrated that rapists and their victims are more likely to be acquaintances and these are likely to take place in the homes of either the victim or offender<sup>8</sup>. Over the immediate past three years, 232 (4.7%) of the 4960 female respondents, reported that they were victims of rape.

More than one-half (51.3%) knew the rapist by name, and 12.7% knew the offender by sight alone and only 29.2% of the rapist were strangers to the victims. The relationships between the victims and the offenders are presented in the box 1 below.

**Table 23: Relationships between victims of sexual violence and offenders**

Spouse or partner at the time	(3.7%)
Ex-spouse/partner	(3.7%)
Boyfriend at the time	(10.5%)
Ex-boyfriend	(13.6%)
Relative &	(3.1%)
Close friend	(14.8%)
Work mate or room mate	(8.0%)
Other acquaintances	(3.1%)
Somebody within the neighbourhood	(22.8%)
Somebody in authority (boss, teachers, traditional/religious)	(2.5%)
Robber criminals	(4.3%)
Others	(8.0%)

<sup>8</sup> Sue Titus Reid, 2000. *Crime and Criminology*. 9<sup>th</sup> Edition. Boston: McGraw Hill and Menachir Amir, 1978. Op. cit.



Overall, the rape incidents involved mostly one rapist (60.9%), two rapists (23.5%) and three or more rapists (12.3%). The nature of the relationships between the victims and offenders support the fairly general findings in criminology that rapists and rape victims were often acquaintances<sup>9</sup>.

### **Rape within Household**

The incidence of rape within the household was highest in Bayelsa, Rivers, Akwa Ibom and Abia states while lowest in Bauchi, Ebonyi, Katsina, Kwara Niger, Sokoto and Yobe States. The incidence of multiple victimizations was highest in Bayelsa, Rivers, Akwa Ibom, Anambra and Taraba States, and the Federal Capital Territory (table 23).

**Table 24: Rape Within the Home**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>RAPE WITHIN THE HOME</i>			
		<i>Never</i>	<i>Once</i>	<i>Twice or More</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Abia	260	96.2	2.7	0.4	0.8
Adamawa	120	97.5	0.8	0.0	1.7
Anambra	301	97.7	0.3	2.0	0.0
Akwa Ibom	260	96.9	3.1	0.0	0.0
Bauchi	480	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bayelsa	220	95.9	3.6	0.5	0.0
Benue	300	99.0	0.7	0.3	0.0
Borno	293	99.7	0.0	0.0	0.3
Cross River	212	98.1	1.4	0.5	0.0
Delta	292	99.0	0.7	0.0	0.3
Ebonyi	182	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Edo	240	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0
Ekiti	219	97.7	0.5	0.0	1.8
Enugu	181	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0
Gombe	121	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0
Imo	280	99.3	0.4	0.0	0.4
Jigawa	320	97.2	0.6	0.0	2.2
Kaduna	452	99.8	0.0	0.0	0.2
Kano	477	98.5	0.6	0.2	0.6
Katsina	440	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kebbi	300	99.3	0.3	0.0	0.3
Kogi	240	98.8	0.0	0.0	1.3
Kwara	180	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lagos	640	96.3	0.9	0.9	1.9
Nasarawa	180	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0
Niger	280	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ogun	259	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
Ondo	220	98.6	1.4	0.0	0.0
Osun	260	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
Oyo	393	99.0	0.8	0.3	0.0
Plateau	180	99.4	0.6	0.0	0.0
Rivers	219	96.8	2.3	0.9	0.0
Sokoto	252	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taraba	172	97.1	1.7	1.2	0.0

<sup>9</sup> Wolfgang, 1958 and Amir, 1971; op. cit and also EEO Alemika and IC Chukwuma, 2004. *Criminal Victimization and Fear of Crime in Lagos*. Lagos Nigeria: CLEEN Foundation

Yobe	160	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	252	98.8	1.2	0.0	0.0
Federal Capital Territory	198	94.4	3.0	1.0	1.5

### **Rape Outside the Victims' Residence**

The incidence of rape outside the victims' residence was highest in Rivers, Bayelsa, Abia and Lagos States while lowest in Yobe, Niger, Katsina, and Bauchi States. Incidence of multiple victimizations for rape outside the victims' residence was rare, though recorded in Taraba, Lagos, Bayelsa, Kano, Edo, Ebonyi, Cross River and Bayelsa States, and the Federal Capital Territory.

**Table 25: Rape Outside the Home**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>RAPE OUTSIDE THE HOME</i>			
		Never	Once	Twice or More	Don't know
Abia	260	96.9	2.7	0.0	0.4
Adamawa	120	98.3	0.0	0.0	1.7
Anambra	301	99.3	0.7	0.0	0.8
Akwa Ibom	260	96.5	3.5	0.0	1.8
Bauchi	480	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bayelsa	220	95.9	3.2	0.9	0.0
Benue	300	99.3	0.7	0.0	0.0
Borno	293	99.7	0.0	0.0	0.3
Cross River	212	97.6	1.9	0.5	0.0
Delta	292	99.3	0.3	0.0	0.3
Ebonyi	182	97.3	2.2	0.5	0.0
Edo	240	99.2	0.4	0.4	0.0
Ekiti	219	97.7	0.5	0.0	1.8
Enugu	181	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0
Gombe	121	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0
Imo	280	98.9	0.7	0.0	0.4
Jigawa	320	96.9	0.6	0.0	2.5
Kaduna	452	99.6	0.2	0.0	0.2
Kano	477	98.5	0.4	0.4	0.6
Katsina	440	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kebbi	300	99.0	0.7	0.0	0.3
Kogi	240	97.9	0.8	0.0	1.3
Kwara	180	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lagos	640	96.7	0.5	0.9	1.9
Nasarawa	180	99.4	0.6	0.0	0.0
Niger	280	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ogun	259	98.8	0.4	0.0	0.8
Ondo	220	98.2	1.8	0.0	0.0
Osun	260	98.8	0.4	0.0	0.8
Oyo	393	98.7	1.3	0.0	0.0
Plateau	180	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0
Rivers	219	95.4	4.1	0.5	0.0
Sokoto	252	99.6	0.0	0.0	0.4
Taraba	172	97.1	1.7	1.2	0.0
Yobe	160	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	252	98.8	1.2	0.0	0.3
Federal Capital Territory	198	97.0		1.0	1.0

### **Murder within the Victims' Households**

Murder is fairly a rare event in Nigeria. Less than two percent of the respondents reported the murder of a member of their households within their residence (table 4). Incidence of murder within the victims' households was rare or non-existent in Ebonyi, Edo, Katsina, Nasarawa, Niger, Sokoto and Yobe States but highest in Rivers, Abia, Lagos, Taraba, Plateau, Anambra, Ondo, Zamfara and Enugu States, and the Federal Capital Territory. There were very few incidences of repeated homicide victimization within households (table 26).

**Table 26: Murder within the home**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>MURDER WITHIN THE HOME</i>			
		Never	Once	Twice or More	Don't know
Abia	260	96.9	2.7	0.0	0.4
Adamawa	120	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
Anambra	301	98.3	1.3	0.3	0.0
Akwa Ibom	260	98.8	1.2	0.0	0.0
Bauchi	480	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.0
Bayelsa	220	99.5	0.5	0.0	0.0
Benue	300	99.0	0.3	0.7	0.0
Borno	293	99.3	0.0	0.0	0.8
Cross River	212	98.6	0.9	0.5	0.0
Delta	292	99.7	0.3	0.0	0.0
Ebonyi	182	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Edo	240	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ekiti	219	97.7	0.5	0.0	1.8
Enugu	181	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.0
Gombe	121	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0
Imo	280	99.3	0.4	0.0	0.4
Jigawa	320	96.6	0.9	0.0	2.5
Kaduna	452	99.1	0.4	0.2	0.2
Kano	477	98.7	0.4	0.4	0.4
Katsina	440	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kebbi	300	99.3	0.3	0.0	0.3
Kogi	240	98.8	0.4	0.0	0.8
Kwara	180	99.4	0.6	0.0	0.0
Lagos	640	96.7	0.5	0.9	1.9
Nasarawa	180	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Niger	280	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ogun	259	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
Ondo	220	98.6	1.4	0.0	0.0
Osun	260	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
Oyo	393	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0
Plateau	180	97.8	1.7	0.6	0.0
Rivers	219	97.3	2.3	0.3	0.0
Sokoto	252	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taraba	172	97.7	1.7	0.6	0.0
Yobe	160	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	252	98.8	1.2	0.0	0.0
Federal Capital Territory	198	97.0	1.5	0.5	1.0

**Robbery within the Victims' Residence**

Robbery remains the most widespread violent crime in Nigeria. It has caused tremendous fear among members of the public. Indeed it appears that the efforts and performance of the countries' police is assessed in terms of the incidence and prevalence of robbery and murder (some of which were considered to be politically motivated or business related). Table 27

presents reported robbery victimization. Robbery within household was highest in Abia, Rivers, Akwa Ibom, Cross River, Ebonyi, Kogi, Delta, Lagos and Edo States and the Federal Capital Territory. Multiple victimizations were highest in Rivers, Ebonyi, Abia, and Akwa Ibom States.

**Table 27: Robbery Within the House**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>ROBBERY WITHIN THE HOUSE</i>			
		Never	Once	Twice or More	Don't know
Abia	260	85.8	10.0	3.8	0.4
Adamawa	120	95.8	2.5	0.8	0.8
Anambra	301	97.9	1.8	0.0	0.0
Akwa Ibom	260	91.9	5.8	2.3	0.0
Bauchi	480	96.5	2.9	0.6	0.0
Bayelsa	220	98.2	1.4	0.5	0.0
Benue	300	95.3	2.3	2.3	0.3
Borno	293	99.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Cross River	212	94.3	4.7	0.9	1.0
Delta	292	94.9	3.1	1.0	0.0
Ebonyi	182	88.5	6.0	5.5	0.0
Edo	240	96.3	3.8	0.0	1.8
Ekiti	219	95.0	2.3	0.9	0.0
Enugu	181	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.8
Gombe	121	98.3	0.8	0.0	0.4
Imo	280	97.9	1.8	0.0	2.2
Jigawa	320	96.9	0.9	0.0	0.2
Kaduna	452	95.8	2.4	1.5	0.4
Kano	477	95.0	3.1	1.5	0.4
Katsina	440	98.4	0.7	0.9	0.0
Kebbi	300	96.3	1.7	1.7	0.3
Kogi	240	93.8	5.0	0.4	0.8
Kwara	180	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0
Lagos	640	94.2	1.9	2.0	1.9
Nasarawa	180	97.8	1.7	0.6	0.0
Niger	280	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ogun	259	97.7	1.2	0.4	0.8
Ondo	220	95.9	2.7	1.4	0.0
Osun	260	98.5	0.4	0.4	0.8
Oyo	393	98.0	1.8	0.3	0.0
Plateau	180	92.8	6.1	1.1	0.0
Rivers	219	87.2	7.8	4.6	0.5
Sokoto	252	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0
Taraba	172	95.9	2.3	1.7	0.0
Yobe	160	99.4	0.6	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	252	98.0	1.6	0.4	0.0
Federal Capital Territory	198	91.9	5.6	1.5	1.0

**Robbery Outside Victims' Residence**

Robbery on the highway and city streets as well as within business premises are frequently reported in Nigeria. The data in table 28 indicate that robbery outside victims' residences is prevalent in several States, especially so in Abia, Ebonyi, Kebbi, Lagos, Plateau and Sokoto States. Repeated victimization of members of households was highest in Abia, Anambra, Akwa Ibom, Ebonyi, and Nasarawa States.

**Table 28: Robbery Outside The Home**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>ROBBERY OUTSIDE THE HOME</i>			
		Never	Once	Twice or More	Don't know
Abia	260	81.9	14.2	3.5	0.4
Adamawa	120	90.8	8.3	0.0	0.8

Anambra	301	92.4	3.0	4.7	0.0
Akwa Ibom	260	91.5	6.2	2.3	0.0
Bauchi	480	98.3	1.5	0.2	0.0
Bayelsa	220	93.2	5.5	0.9	0.5
Benue	300	94.0	4.3	1.7	0.0
Borno	293	98.3	0.7	0.3	0.7
Cross River	212	91.5	6.6	1.9	0.0
Delta	292	90.8	5.8	1.4	2.1
Ebonyi	182	88.5	8.8	2.7	0.0
Edo	240	95.4	3.8	0.8	0.0
Ekiti	219	96.3	1.8	0.0	1.8
Enugu	181	94.5	5.0	0.6	0.0
Gombe	121	98.3	0.8	0.0	0.8
Imo	280	94.3	5.0	0.4	0.4
Jigawa	320	95.9	1.6	0.3	2.2
Kaduna	452	95.1	3.1	1.5	0.2
Kano	477	96.9	2.3	0.4	0.4
Katsina	440	99.3	0.7	0.0	0.0
Kebbi	300	97.3	2.3	0.0	0.3
Kogi	240	87.5	10.4	1.3	0.8
Kwara	180	98.3	1.1	0.6	0.0
Lagos	640	95.3	1.3	1.6	1.9
Nasarawa	180	91.1	6.7	2.2	0.0
Niger	280	98.6	1.4	0.0	0.0
Ogun	259	98.5	0.8	0.0	0.8
Ondo	220	95.9	3.6	0.5	0.0
Osun	260	96.9	1.9	0.0	1.2
Oyo	393	96.2	3.1	0.8	0.0
Plateau	180	98.3	1.1	0.6	0.0
Rivers	219	88.1	8.7	3.2	0.0
Sokoto	252	97.2	2.0	0.8	0.0
Taraba	172	89.0	9.9	1.2	0.0
Yobe	160	97.5	2.5	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	252	97.6	1.6	0.4	0.4
Federal Capital Territory	198	89.9	7.1	1.5	1.5

**Socioeconomic and Demographic Factors in Criminal Victimization**

Several criminological researches indicate that propensity to victimization varies by age, gender, and residence. Some of the variations are attributed to the nature of routine activity and lifestyle of different groups, neighbourhood characteristics and differences in the social structure of rural and urban communities. It is important however to realize that different socioeconomic and demographic groups are vulnerable to different forms of criminal victimization.

**Age and Criminal Victimization**

Some researchers have found that younger people are more prone to criminal victimization, especially of assault and other types of violence. Data presented in table 29 do not show any significant difference in propensity to victimization over the past 12 months. However, the data showed that those who were 51 years and older showed lower rate of victimization during the period.

**Table 29: Age and Criminal Victimization**

Age in Group	Experience of criminal Victimization over the past 12 months
--------------	--

	Yes	No	No Response	Total
18-24 years	21.0	78.0	0.7	3366
25-30	22.2	77.2	0.6	2689
31-35	23.2	75.9	0.9	1150
36-40	21.2	78.4	0.4	968
41-50	22.8	76.8	0.5	1093
51 years +	17.8	81.4	0.8	769

### Gender and Criminal Victimization

The literature of criminology and its sub-discipline of victimology have generally revealed that females are less prone to criminal victimization than their male counterparts. However, women and men are differentially victimized and so also the level of fear of crime and insecurity vary between males and females<sup>10</sup>. In a study of the experience of victimization by female respondents, it was found that 22.1 percent of them had experienced crime victimization in the past one year<sup>11</sup>. This figure is similar to the national personal victimization rate of 21.5% found in this study. There has been continuing debate in the literature about the paradox of higher male victimization and higher fear of crime among females. Some argue that the high level of fear exhibited by females is irrational judging by their lower rates of victimization. But some researchers have argued that female victimizations either within the household or in terms of sexual assault are under-reported. Women victimizations are therefore said to be largely hidden and unreported even to researchers: According to Zedner: “Since crimes against women, particularly sexual offences and assaults occurring within the home, are least susceptible to discovery or revelation, women may suffer far higher levels of victimization than are revealed even by crime surveys” (1997: 588)<sup>12</sup>. Similarly, Jennet argued that crimes against women tend to be unreported and suggested that if “the full extent of unreported crimes against women were known and coupled with acknowledgement of the continuum of sexual violence which they experience, we might have a clearer understanding of women’s fear’ (1998: 33)<sup>13</sup>. The percentage differences between male and female rates of victimization did not reveal highly substantial difference. Nonetheless the data in table 29 indicate that males were more prone to victimization than females.

**Table 30: Gender and criminal victimization**

	Any personal victimization over the past 12 months?		
	Yes	No	NR
Male	23.2	76.1	0.6
Female	19.8	79.5	0.6

### Religion and Criminal Victimization

<sup>10</sup> Innocent Chukwuma, 2000. ‘An Investigation of Women’s Perception of Safety and Victimization Experience in Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria’. An M.Sc. Dissertation in Criminal Justice Submitted to the Scarman Centre, University of Leicester

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Zedner L. (1997) ‘Victims’ in: M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 577 – 612.

<sup>13</sup> Jennet, C. (1998) ‘Qualitative Review’ in Tulloch J. et al, *Fear of Crime: Audit of Literature and Community Programs*, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

There are no intrinsic reasons for expecting that adherents of different religious faiths will experience differential rates of victimization. However, religion may correlate with other factors such as employment, mobility and exposure to criminogenic lifestyles. As argued by proponents of routine activity and lifestyle models of criminal victimization, religion may be an intervening factor that predisposes or makes it more likely for an individual to be at some place at some time and in the company of some time of people that render them vulnerable to specific forms of criminal victimization. Christians in Nigeria were more prone to criminal victimization than their Muslim counterparts (table 31). This may be partly attributed to their higher educational attainment with attendant mobility and exposures to activities and areas of high crime rates.

**Table 31: Religious Affiliation and Victimization**

	Victimized over the past 12 months			
	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Christian	24.2	75.1	0.7	5854
Muslim	17.8	81.6	0.6	4099

Regional Variations in Criminal Victimization

Criminology literature showed that regions and cities with high concentration of industrial, financial and commercial activities tend to have higher victimization rates. Lagos is the nation’s primary centre for such activities. The nation’s oil fields and production are located in the South-South, while the South-East, South-West and North-West have high level of commercial activities. Incidentally, respondents from Lagos reported substantially fewer rates of victimization than their counterparts in other zones (table 32). However, national and international media portray Lagos as unsafe. This is perhaps partly due to journalistic sensationalism as well as the concentration of media agencies in the city, and the sophistication with which armed robbery incidents are executed. Even the official crime statistics produced by the police often indicate high crime figures for Lagos which are higher than its share of the national population<sup>14</sup>. The high levels of victimization in South-South and South-East regions may be attributed to the levels of conflicts commercial activities in the respective communities.

**Table 32: Regional Variations in Criminal Victimization**

	Victimized over the past 12 months			
	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Lagos	9.1	90.0	0.9	640
South-West	12.0	87.1	0.9	1351
South-South	33.8	64.9	1.2	1443
South-East	24.3	75.3	0.3	1204
North-West	20.5	78.9	0.6	2493
North-East	21.2	78.5	0.3	1706
North-Central	24.0	75.5	0.4	1198

Residence and Criminal Victimization

Crime varies across neighbourhoods. However, the issue examined here is not victimization within neighbourhoods but the experiences of criminal victimization of people residing in different neighbourhoods. Residence is employed only as an indicator of socioeconomic status. Their victimization may occur in their neighbourhood or elsewhere. The data presented in table

<sup>14</sup> Etannibi Alemika, 1997. ‘Criminal Violence in Lagos State, Nigeria’. *Africa Peace Review*. 1(2): 72-95

33 show that people resident in different neighbourhoods reported similar victimization rates. This is perhaps not surprising because the data in table 17 show that most victimization occurred outside home.

**Table 33: Residential Neighbourhood and Criminal Victimization**

	Suffered any victimization during the past 12 months			
	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Higher socio economic residential area	20.9	78.3	0.8	1583
Middle socio economic residential area	21.8	77.5	0.8	2592
Lower socio economic residential area	21.6	77.8	0.5	5860

Differential Victimization in Rural and Urban Locations

Generally, both experience and criminological knowledge suggest that criminal victimization is lowest in rural areas. Some of the reasons may simply be that rural areas rarely report victimization to official agencies and victimization there though widespread are not as serious as those in urban areas. The official statistics produce an incomplete picture of rural-urban differential in criminal victimization. The figures in table 34 indicates lower victimization rate in rural areas. But the difference is not as substantial as official statistics, media reports and even criminological literature suggest.

**Table 34: Rural – Urban Variations and Criminal Victimization**

	Suffered any criminal victimization the past 12 months			
	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Urban area	22.4	76.9	0.6	7080
Rural area	19.5	79.9	0.6	2955



## CHAPTER IV

### Safety and Fear of Crime

#### Introduction

Feeling of safety from criminal victimization is affected by several factors. Such factors include personal experience, information from acquaintances and the press, reports and advice by law enforcement agencies, and observed deterioration of infrastructure and quality of life and civil association in the neighbourhood<sup>15</sup>. Fear of crime and actual level of criminality do not often highly correlate because fear includes assessment of risks or vulnerability<sup>16</sup>.

The data presented in table 35 show that most respondents feel safe while at home in the community during the day than at night.

**Table 35: Feeling of Safety**

	<i>How safe do you feel:</i>	<i>Very safe</i>	<i>Fairly safe</i>	<i>A bit unsafe</i>	<i>Very unsafe</i>
1.	When at home alone during the day	76.2	19.5	2.8	1.5
2.	When at home alone in the dark	54.7	28.9	10.7	5.7
3.	Walking alone in your area/community during the day	75.3	21.0	2.5	1.2
4	Walking alone in your area/community during the dark	49.6	31.7	12.8	5.9

Feeling of safety can also be assessed through respondents' perception of their likelihood of being victims of crime. When asked about chances of someone breaking into their homes over the next twelve months, 8.0% (801) and 24.1% (2419) said very likely and likely respectively. In contrast, 57.8% (5805) said not likely while the remaining 10.1% (1011) of the respondents said they do not know.

Similarly, feeling of safety is also affected by perception of whether crime is increasing or decreasing. The respondents (10036) were asked whether crime has increased or decreased in the country over the past three years. Nearly three-fifths (59.8) said it has increased, in contrast to 18.2% which said that it has remained the same, while another 18.7% reported that crime rates had decreased.

Perceived increase or decrease in the crime levels in the community in which the respondents lived is important for their feeling of safety or otherwise, and also their assessment of police performance. More than one-third (36.5%) of the respondents reported violent crimes (robbery, rape, murder, etc) increased in their community during the past three years (2003-2005). However, 44.2% and 14.0% of the 10036 respondents respectively said the levels of violent crime have decreased or stayed the same. Similarly, 36.1%; 44.4% and 14.5% respectively felt that the level of property crimes have increased; decreased and stayed the same as recorded in table 36.

**Table 36: Perceptions of Crime Trend in Respondents' Communities**

<sup>15</sup> See a very good review of the issues in Eli B. Silverman and Jo-Ann Della-Giustina, 2001. 'Urban Policing and the Fear of Crime', *Urban Studies*, 38(5-6): 941-957

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. See also CW Thomas and JF Hyman, 1977. 'Perceptions of crime, fear of victimization and the public perceptions of police performance'. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*. 5: 305-317; M. Warr, 1984. 'Fear of victimization: why are women and the elderly more afraid?' *Social Science Quarterly*, 65: 681-702; M. Warr, 1990. 'Dangerous situations: social context and fear of victimization'. *Social Science Quarterly*, 891-907

<i>How has the level of violent crime changed in your area or neighbourhood in the last 3 years (2003-2005)</i>	No	%
Increased	3667	36.5
Decreased	4439	44.2
Stayed the same	1408	14.0
Don't know	522	5.2
<i>How has the level of property crime changed in your area or neighbourhood in the last 3 years (2003-2005)</i>		
Increased	3628	36.1
Decreased	4459	44.1
Stayed the same	1459	14.5
Don't know	490	4.9

### **Common and Feared Crimes**

There are differences in the level of incidence of crimes across communities. As the data in table 37 show theft, house breaking or burglary, livestock theft and assault, are the most common crimes in the respondents communities. The most feared crimes did not necessarily correspond to the level of incidence of certain crimes in communities for example; the two most feared crimes (robbery and murder) were not identified as crimes that occur fairly frequently in the community.

**Table 37: Most Common and Feared Crimes in Respondents' Community**

<i>Crime that occurs most often in respondents' communities</i>	No	%
Robbery	2173	21.7
House breaking	1968	19.6
Livestock theft	862	8.6
Crop theft	405	4.0
Murder	331	3.3
Assault	503	5.0
Pick-pocketing and bag snatching	250	2.5
Theft of motor vehicle	142	1.4
Sexual assault and rape	162	1.6
Land grabbing and land disputes	177	1.8
Kidnapping	121	1.2
Others	389	3.9
Don't know	1291	12.8
<i>Crime most feared in respondents' communities</i>		
Robbery	2923	29.1
Murder	2061	20.5
Theft of property	1338	13.3
House breaking	482	4.8
Livestock theft	335	3.3
Sexual assault and rape	300	3.0
Kidnapping	219	2.2
Domestic violence	372	3.7
Crop theft	185	1.8
Pick-pocketing and bag snatching	111	1.1
Others	183	1.8

None	1021	10.2
------	------	------

Respondents identified robbery, murder and theft as the most feared crimes in their communities. Understandably, robbery and murder are extreme violent crimes, although they are rare events in most communities across the country.

**Crimes of Concern to Communities**

Residents in various communities discuss the crimes that are of serious concern to them and which occurrences they also fear. Five types of crime were most after discussed in the communities inhabited by the respondents. The crimes are robbery, theft, murder, corruption and political violence (table 38). It is significant that respondents identified corruption and political violence as two of the crimes frequently discussed in the community; generally, law enforcement priorities at community level do not often include the two problems.

**Table 38: Types of crime most talked about in community**

<i>Types of crime most talked about in community</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Robbery (excluding vehicle snatching)	991	29.0
Theft of personal goods (excluding pick-pocketing)	436	12.8
Murder or killing	412	12.1
Pick-pocketing (bag/purse snatching, etc)	154	4.5
Corruption	369	10.8
Political violence	217	6.4
Sexual abuse/rape	119	3.5
Livestock/poultry theft	146	4.3
Domestic violence	119	3.5
Assault	130	3.8
Burglary	119	3.5
Vehicle snatching	41	1.2
Vehicle theft	52	1.5
Bicycle/motorcycle theft	32	0.9
White-collar crimes (embezzlement, forgery etc)	79	2.3
Total respondents = 3416		

### **Feeling of Safety in States**

Criminal victimization varies across the states so also is feeling of safety across residents. The states may be classified in terms of the extent of feeling of safety by their residents. Table 39 presents data on feeling of safety in the states.

**Table 39: Feeling of Safety at Home (Day)**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>FEELING OF SAFETY AT HOME (DAY)</i>			
		Very Safe	Fairly Safe	A Bit Unsafe	Very Unsafe
Abia	260	62.3	19.2	8.8	9.6
Adamawa	120	75.0	22.5	2.5	0.0
Anambra	301	64.8	27.9	3.0	4.3
Akwa Ibom	260	71.2	22.7	3.8	2.3
Bauchi	480	86.5	12.3	1.0	0.2
Bayelsa	220	63.2	35.9	0.0	0.9
Benue	300	72.0	22.7	3.0	2.3
Borno	293	76.5	17.4	5.1	1.0
Cross River	212	54.7	39.6	5.2	0.5
Delta	292	74.7	17.8	5.5	2.1
Ebonyi	182	55.5	38.5	3.3	2.7
Edo	240	68.3	24.2	4.2	3.3
Ekiti	219	71.7	24.7	1.8	1.8
Enugu	181	77.3	18.8	3.3	0.6
Gombe	121	71.9	26.4	1.7	0.0
Imo	280	71.4	27.1	0.7	0.7
Jigawa	320	82.8	14.4	0.9	1.9
Kaduna	452	84.3	11.3	3.3	1.1
Kano	477	83.6	12.8	2.7	0.8
Katsina	440	87.5	10.9	1.1	0.5
Kebbi	300	67.5	24.3	5.3	2.7
Kogi	240	71.3	24.6	4.2	0.0
Kwara	180	85.0	14.4	0.6	0.0
Lagos	640	86.6	10.6	2.5	0.3
Nasarawa	180	83.3	13.3	1.7	1.7
Niger	280	88.2	11.1	0.7	0.0
Ogun	259	81.1	17.8	1.2	0.0
Ondo	220	80.9	16.8	0.5	1.8
Osun	260	82.7	15.4	1.2	0.8
Oyo	393	78.4	19.3	1.5	0.8
Plateau	180	87.2	11.1	0.6	1.1
Rivers	219	54.3	29.2	4.2	3.3
Sokoto	252	81.3	14.7	3.2	0.8
Taraba	172	63.4	34.3	2.3	0.0
Yobe	160	58.8	36.9	3.1	1.3
Zamfara	252	65.5	29.4	2.8	2.4
Federal Capital Territory	198	85.4	11.1	1.5	2.0

However, more residents of Abia, Anambra, Borno, Cross River, Kebbi, FCT, Rivers, Edo, Ebonyi states, felt relatively unsafe at home.

Fear of crime is heightened in the night. Therefore, people generally feel less safe after daylight. Nevertheless, the feeling of safety will vary across communities, reflecting residents' perception of threat to life and property. Respondents felt considerably less safe at night than they were

during the day (compare table 39 and 40). Residents of Abia, Rivers, Anambra, Bayelsa, Kebbi, Sokoto and Yobe States felt relatively unsafe at home during the night (table 40).

**Table 40: Feeling of Safety at Home (Night)**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>FEELING OF SAFETY AT HOME (NIGHT)</i>			
		<i>Very Safe</i>	<i>Fairly Safe</i>	<i>A Bit Unsafe</i>	<i>Very Unsafe</i>
Abia	260	21.9	17.3	39.2	21.5
Adamawa	120	46.7	33.3	15.0	5.0
Anambra	301	35.5	31.2	17.6	15.6
Akwa Ibom	260	52.3	28.5	9.6	9.6
Bauchi	480	61.0	31.9	5.8	1.3
Bayelsa	220	37.7	42.7	6.8	12.7
Benue	300	46.0	28.7	14.7	10.7
Borno	293	54.3	24.6	14.3	6.8
Cross River	212	39.2	42.9	12.7	5.2
Delta	292	37.3	32.5	21.6	8.6
Ebonyi	182	37.9	37.4	19.2	5.5
Edo	240	30.8	45.0	20.0	4.2
Ekiti	219	56.2	30.1	11.0	2.7
Enugu	181	57.5	33.1	6.6	2.8
Gombe	121	38.0	38.0	19.8	4.1
Imo	280	38.9	48.9	10.4	1.8
Jigawa	320	70.9	19.1	6.6	3.4
Kaduna	452	71.5	18.6	7.3	2.7
Kano	477	70.4	20.5	6.9	2.1
Katsina	440	64.5	27.0	5.5	3.0
Kebbi	300	32.0	41.3	12.7	14.0
Kogi	240	41.3	42.9	15.4	0.4
Kwara	180	67.8	22.8	9.4	0.0
Lagos	640	70.8	21.4	6.4	1.4
Nasarawa	180	56.1	25.0	12.2	6.7
Niger	280	75.0	20.0	4.3	0.7
Ogun	259	76.1	20.5	2.7	0.8
Ondo	220	64.1	24.1	9.5	2.3
Osun	260	73.1	21.9	2.3	2.7
Oyo	393	67.2	25.4	4.1	3.3
Plateau	180	54.4	28.9	14.4	2.2
Rivers	219	26.9	24.2	26.0	22.8
Sokoto	252	58.7	18.3	7.1	15.9
Taraba	172	40.1	44.2	14.5	1.2
Yobe	160	37.5	40.0	6.3	16.3
Zamfara	252	55.2	37.7	4.4	2.8
Federal Capital Territory	198	63.1	27.8	6.6	2.5

### **Respondents' Fear of Crimes in the Home and Neighbourhood**

Respondents generally had not encountered situations warranting their being afraid of crime at home. Nonetheless, significant proportion of respondents had feared crimes in home. Such fears are higher in Abia, Anambra, Benue, Cross River, Delta, Ebonyi, Edo, Ondo, Rivers, Taraba, States and the Federal Capital Territory. Residents of Ekiti, Imo, Katsina, Sokoto and Zamfara expressed least fear of crime at home (Table 41).

**Table 41: Fear of Crime at Home**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>FEAR OF CRIME IN HOME</i>			
		<i>Never</i>	<i>Once</i>	<i>Twice or More</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Abia	260	68.5	15.4	13.8	2.3
Adamawa	120	82.5	8.3	7.5	1.7
Anambra	301	74.1	8.3	16.3	1.3
Akwa Ibom	260	83.5	8.8	7.7	0
Bauchi	480	85.2	7.5	7.3	0
Bayelsa	220	66.4	29.1	4.5	0
Benue	300	70.7	12.7	16.7	0
Borno	293	76.8	14.3	8.5	0.3
Cross River	212	66.0	18.9	15.1	0
Delta	292	76.4	7.2	12.7	3.8
Ebonyi	182	68.1	13.7	17.0	1.1
Edo	240	58.8	18.8	22.1	0.4
Ekiti	219	96.3	2.3	0	1.4
Enugu	181	78.5	9.9	11.6	0
Gombe	121	82.6	10.7	5.0	1.7
Imo	280	87.5	9.6	2.1	0.7
Jigawa	320	80.6	11.6	3.8	4.1
Kaduna	452	64.6.	22.1	12.4	0.9
Kano	477	82.6	13.0	3.4	1.0
Katsina	440	97.3	1.6	1.1	0
Kebbi	300	90.0	7.3	1.7	1.0
Kogi	240	85.8	7.5	5.4	1.3
Kwara	180	95.0	2.2	1.7	1.1
Lagos	640	84.1	4.1	10.0	1.9
Nasarawa	180	81.7	11.7	5.6	1.1
Niger	280	85.7	3.9	10.0	0.4
Ogun	259	95.8	1.9	1.5	0.8
Ondo	220	80.5	2.7	16.8	0
Osun	260	95.8	2.3	0.8	1.2
Oyo	393	91.6	5.9	2.3	0.3
Plateau	180	52.8	22.8	24.4	0
Rivers	219	64.8	11.0	23.7	0.5
Sokoto	252	96.8	2.8	0.4	0.9
Taraba	172	64.5	20.9	14.5	0
Yobe	160	97.5	1.3	0.6	0.6
Zamfara	252	89.7	9.9	0.4	0
Federal Capital Territory	198	76.3	8.1	14.6	1.0

More respondents expressed fear of crime in the neighbourhood than at home. Residents of the Federal Capital Territory as well as Abia, Rivers and Taraba States were more fearful of crime in their neighbourhood than residents of other states (Table 42).

**Table 42: Fear of Crime in Neighbourhood**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>FEAR OF CRIME IN NEIGHBOURHOOD</i>			
		<i>Never</i>	<i>Once</i>	<i>Twice or More</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Abia	260	70.4	14.6	13.5	1.5
Adamawa	120	71.7	11.7	7.5	9.2
Anambra	301	64.5	5.6	28.2	1.7
Akwa Ibom	260	81.9	9.6	8.5	0
Bauchi	480	82.9	9.4	7.7	0
Bayelsa	220	59.1	32.7	7.7	0.5
Benue	300	58.7	10.0	30.7	0.7
Borno	293	73.7	9.9	15.4	1.0
Cross River	212	66.5	15.6	17.9	0
Delta	292	71.2	7.9	16.8	4.1
Ebonyi	182	64.8	12.6	19.2	3.3
Edo	240	60.4	18.3	20.4	0.8
Ekiti	219	97.7	0.9	0	1.4
Enugu	181	76.8	11.0	12.2	0
Gombe	121	81.0	9.1	8.3	1.7
Imo	280	82.5	12.9	4.3	0.4
Jigawa	320	78.8	10.0	5.6	5.6
Kaduna	452	64.8	18.8	15.9	0.4
Kano	477	80.3	12.2	2.5	5.0
Katsina	440	89.1	6.8	3.9	0.2
Kebbi	300	88.0	7.0	3.7	1.3
Kogi	240	80.4	8.3	10.4	0.8
Kwara	180	94.4	3.9	1.7	0
Lagos	640	81.7	5.2	10.5	2.7
Nasarawa	180	81.7	15.0	3.3	0
Niger	280	83.9	3.9	10.4	1.8
Ogun	259	89.2	6.6	3.1	1.2
Ondo	220	80.0	4.1	15.9	0
Osun	260	94.2	2.7	1.9	1.2
Oyo	393	86.0	9.7	4.3	0
Plateau	180	55.0	17.8	27.2	0
Rivers	219	60.7	11.0	27.9	0.5
Sokoto	252	89.7	5.2	4.8	0.4
Taraba	172	55.2	19.2	25.0	0.6
Yobe	160	96.3	1.9	1.3	0.6
Zamfara	252	88.9	9.5	1.6	0
Federal Capital Territory	198	67.2	12.1	19.7	1.0

### **Fear of Crime and Socio-Economic Life**

Fear of crime can have significant impact on socio-economic life. Those who are most fearful of crime tend to restrict their involvement in economic, social and civic life of their communities. The data in Table 42 show that fear of crime prevented a significant percentage of respondents and their children from walking around in their neighbourhood at night (18.3%). Walking, playing and resting in parks or public spaces (10.8%) and allowing their children to play around freely in their neighbourhood (10.4%). In contrast, fear of crime did not significantly affect their use of public transport and walking to shops and market (Table 43).

**Table 43: Fear of crime and Socio-economic Activities**

<i>Do the levels of crime in your area or community prevent you from:</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes %</i>	<i>No %</i>
Using public transport?	10036	3.5	96.5
Walking to shops and market?	10036	2.7	97.2
Walking or strolling in the night	10036	18.3	81.6
Walking/playing/resting in open spaces or parks	10036	10.8	88.9
Allowing children to play around freely in your area	7147	10.4	89.6
Allowing children to walk to school	6642	7.8	92.2

### **Protective Measures against Criminal Victimization**

Citizens take various measures to protect themselves against crime. Nearly one-half (49.6%) of the citizens did not take extra measures against criminal victimization. Among those who did, the use of vigilantes and community watch initiatives as well as target hardening mechanisms (locks, alarm, fences, etc.) were preferred. One-hundredth (1.3%) of the respondents also acquired firearms (table 44).

**Table 44: Measures taken to protect households against crime**

<i>Measures</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Physical target hardening of home (locks, alarms etc)	1278	12.7
Physical target hardening of vehicles (locks, alarms etc)	82	0.8
Acquisition of firearms and weapon's	134	1.3
Private security guards	464	4.6
Self help group (including vigilantes and community watch)	2574	25.7
Others	524	5.2
No measures	4978	49.6



## CHAPTER V

### VICTIMS AND THE POLICE

#### *Crime Reporting Behaviours of Victims*

The perception of the police by the public influences the decision taken by crime victims with respect to whether or not to report their victimizations for handling within the criminal justice system. Where public-police relation is poor, the victims may be unwilling to invoke the criminal process, except in very serious cases of victimization. Table 45 shows that only 29.7% of the respondents who experienced victimization reported the incidence to the police. Altogether, 21.5% of (2162) of the respondent (10036) in the sample said they suffered personal victimization over the past 12 months

**Table 45: Report of crime victimization to the Police by victims**

<i>Did you report your last victimization to the police</i>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	531	29.7
No	1255	70.1
Don't know	4	0.2

**Table 46: Differential Crime victimization Reporting**

<i>Type of Crime</i>	<i>No Of Incidents</i>	<i>Victimization Reported?</i>	
		Yes	No
Murder	171	61.0	38.4
Robbery	942	40.7	58.9
Rape	232	18.1	81.9
Assault	2008	16.0	83.8

The likelihood of victims reporting their victimization to the police is dependents on several factors, including the seriousness of the crime, likelihood of apprehension of offenders, prospect of recovering stolen items, requirements for compensation by insurance companies, perceived efficiency of the police. As data in table 46 indicate, murder and robbery that are regarded as serious crimes have higher rate of report to the police.

Respondents gave several reasons for reporting their victimization to the police. The most permanent reason given by 41.3% of the respondents was that they wanted the offender caught and punished. Other major reasons were the desire to recover lost property (19.3%), to discharge a civic duty of reporting crimes (13.9%) and prevention of future incidence (table 47).

**Table 47: Reasons for Reporting Victimization to the Police**

<i>Reasons</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Wanted the offender caught and punished	220	41.3
Crimes should be reported as a duty	74	13.9
To recover property	103	19.3
To stop it from happening again	65	12.2
To get help	41	7.7
For insurance claims	8	1.5
To obtain compensation from the offender	9	1.7
Others	13	2.4

### **Victims' Satisfaction with Police Handling of Complaints**

Criminological literature indicates that citizens are often not very satisfied with police handling of their complaints. Contacts with the police through criminal complaints have been found to lead to less positive attitudes toward the police<sup>17</sup>. More respondents 47.8% were not satisfied with police handling of their complaints compared to 41.6% that were satisfied (table 48).

**Table 48: Satisfaction with Police Handling of Report**

<i>Level of Satisfaction or dissatisfaction</i>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Not at all satisfied	70	13.2
Not satisfied	184	34.6
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	57	10.7
Satisfied	144	27.1
Very satisfied	77	14.5

There are several reasons why victims may not report their victimization to the police. Some of the factors that have been identified in the literature and mentioned by some respondents are:

- 1). Seriousness of injury or losses – less serious cases are less likely to be reported.
- 2). Perception of the police as effective or ineffective-victims are less likely to report when they think the police will neither arrest the offender nor recover lost property. The respondents in the survey gave four major reasons for not reporting their victimization to the police. These were that:
  - The incident was not serious (21.8%);
  - Police would not do anything about the complaint (22.1%).
  - They solved the problem themselves (19.4%).
  - They did not want any involvements with the police (14.0%).

More than one-third did not report their victimization because of their lack of trust in the police (table 49).

**Table 49: Reasons for Not Reporting Victimization to Police**

<i>Reasons</i>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Police would not do anything about it	278	22.1
Not enough and no loss	275	21.8
Solved it myself	244	19.4
Did not want any involvement with the police	176	14.0
Inappropriate for the police	92	7.3
Did not have money to give to the police	80	6.3
Fear of reprisal	26	2.1
Police would inform the offender	7	0.6
Others	82	6.5

There are differences in the degree to which victims are satisfied or dissatisfied with the handling of their complaints. Some of the differences are due to the nature, sensitivity and seriousness of the crime. Researches have shown that rape victims often consider the police to be insensitive to their plights. The police are accused of asking the victims embarrassing questions. In this study, 23.9% of the rape victims did not report to the police because of fear of being asked embarrassing questions, while 28.3% also did not report because of fear of being stigmatized or

<sup>17</sup> White, M. F.; Cox, T. C. and Basehart, J., 1991. "Theoretical Considerations of Officer Profanity and Obscenity in Formal Contacts with Citizens" in T. Barker and D. L. Carter (eds.) *Police Deviance* Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Co.

ostracized. Different victims have expectations of the police and which if met or unmet may determine their level of satisfaction with the handling of complaints taken to the police.

The presentation in table 50 indicates that victims of assault were most satisfied while those who lodged complaints about murder of household members were least satisfied. A third of the rape victims were satisfied with the police handling of their complaint.

**Table 50: Comparison of Victims' Satisfaction with Police**

<i>Level of Satisfaction</i>	<i>Types of Crime</i>			
	<i>Murder</i>	<i>Robbery</i>	<i>Rape</i>	<i>Assault</i>
Not at all satisfied	22.1	14.0	16.7	9.9
Not satisfied	42.3	39.7	42.9	30.1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	9.6	14.3	7.1	6.9
Satisfied	17.3	18.7	19.0	34.3
Very satisfied	8.7	13.2	14.3	18.8
No.	104	385	42	335

Crime victims in the sample were generally dissatisfied with the police because not much or enough was done by them to apprehend the offender. This was the major reason for dissatisfaction that was cited by those who took complaints to the police about murder (50.0%), robbery (38.2%), rape (48.0%) and assault (39.5%).

Request for bribery was also cited as an important reason for dissatisfaction with the police by those who reported cases of murder (12.8%), robbery (15.0%) and assault (19.1%). Rape and assault victims complained of not being properly informed about the handling of their reported victimization. In addition, victims of rape also were dissatisfied because the police did not treat them with respect (table 51).

**Table 51: Comparison of Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Police**

<i>Reasons</i>	<i>Types of Crime</i>			
	<i>Murder</i>	<i>Robbery</i>	<i>Rape</i>	<i>Assault</i>
1. Police did not do enough to apprehend offender	50.0	38.2	48.0	39.5
2. Police did not keep me properly informed	9.0	1.9	12.0	19.5
3. Police did not treat me with respect	5.1	1.0	16.0	5.9
4. Police kept asking me for money (bribe)	12.8	15.0	4.0	19.1
5. Police colluded with offenders	5.1	1.4	8.0	7.9
6. Police did not do enough to recover property	-	25.1	-	-
7. Police were slow to arrive	7.7	14.0	8.0	5.3
No. of Respondents	78	207	25	152

**Police Performance in Crime Control**

Slightly more than one-half (50.7%) of the respondents felt that the police did a good job in controlling crimes compared to about a third (34.9%) who felt that they were doing a poor job (table 51). Respondents were nearly equally divided as to whether police performance has improved (29.1%) stayed the same (28.6%) or worsened (32.9%) during the past three years. Nevertheless, altogether, 52.7% of the respondents felt the performance of the police has either improved or stayed the same level over the past three years (table 52).

**Table 52: Perception and Assessment of the Police**

<i>Respondents' Perception and Assessment</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
1. How good or poor are the police in controlling crimes		

Very poor job	1635	16.3
Fairly poor job	1867	18.6
Neither good nor poor	1447	14.4
Fairly good job	3786	37.7
Very good job	1301	13.0
<i>2. Has the Police performance improved become worse or stayed the same in the last three years</i>		
Improved	2870	29.1
Stayed the same	3618	28.6
Become worse	3305	32.9
Refused/No response	243	2.4

## CHAPTER VI

### PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME AND POLICE

Public perceptions of crime influence the evaluation of police performance. In addition, contact with the police also impact on the perceptions of police conduct and performance. In the sections below, data on public perceptions on motivations for criminal behaviours, crime trend and police performance are presented

#### Motivations for Criminal Behaviour

Citizens have diverse explanations of the causes of criminal behaviour. The data presented in table 53 reveal that 58% of the respondents attributed the behaviour of those involved in property crimes to need and poverty while 20.3% attributed it to greed. Majority (50%) also attributed the cause of violent crimes to need and poverty, and also to greed (23.8%).

**Table 53: Criminal Motivations**

<i>Persons who commit property crimes in this community are motivated by:</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Real need and poverty	5825	58.0
Greed	2034	20.3
Non-financial motives	800	8.0
Don't know	1302	13.0
Refused to answer	75	0.7
<i>Persons who commit violent crimes in this community are motivated</i>		
Real need and poverty	5021	50.0
Greed	2386	23.8
Non-Financial motives	1107	11.0
Don't know	1445	14.4
Refused to answer	77	0.8

One-tenth (10.4%) of the 10036 respondents reported that they know someone who makes a living from crime in their area or community .

#### Assessment of Performance of Policing Institutions

Most respondents (97.9%) said NAFDAC is doing a good job, likewise, EFCC (90.8%) and Police Service Commission (72.3%). In contrast, 48.2% said the police were doing a good job while 39.3% rated police performance as bad. Overall, majority felt that the police were doing a good job. The high ratings of the EFCC, NAFDAC and PSC may be attributed to several factors. For example, literature has shown that contacts with law enforcement agencies tend to engender less favourable attitudes<sup>18</sup>. Most citizens have contact with the police on regular basis. But only few have contacts with the EFCC and PSC because they were only recently established under the present administration and have limited jurisdiction compared to the police. The widespread report and encounter of police corruption and brutality also contribute to the relatively poorer assessment of the police by the citizens

**Table 54: Respondents' assessment of the law enforcement agencies**

<sup>18</sup> Etannibi Alemika 1988 "Policing and Perceptions of Police in Nigeria" *Police Studies: International Review of Police Development* 11(4): 161 - 176.

<i>Law Enforcement Agencies</i>	<i>How good or bad is the agency doing?</i>					
	<i>Very bad job</i>	<i>Fairly bad job</i>	<i>Fairly good job</i>	<i>Very good job</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Refused or no response</i>
Police	22.3	17.0	35.1	13.1	10.7	1.9
Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC)	2.2	1.8	32.8	58.0	4.7	0.4
Police Service Commission	9.1	6.7	42.9	29.4	11.3	0.5
Independent Corrupt Practice Commission (ICPC)	4.3	4.2	40.0	43.8	7.2	0.5
National Agency for Drug Administration and Control (NAFDAC)	0.6	0.5	13.2	84.4	1.3	0.1

### Contact with the Police

Citizens' contact with the police over the past twelve months varied across the states. Respondents in Abia, Rivers, Oyo, Osun, Enugu and Benue states reported high degree of contacts with the police. Incidentally, respondents in these states did not have very high positive assessment of the police (table 55). The lowest citizen/ police contacts were reported in Zamfara, Ogun, Kebbi, Niger, Gombe, Ekiti, Edo, Borno, Bauchi, Jigawa, Kogi and Sokoto states. Contacts between police and citizens in Nigeria are determined by various factors including policing strategies to curb crimes.

**Table 55: Contact with the Police**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>CONTACT WITH POLICE</i>		
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Refused or No Response</i>
Abia	260	64.2	35.0	0.5
Adamawa	120	47.5	51.7	0.8
Anambra	301	40.5	58.8	0.7
Akwa Ibom	260	35.0	64.6	0.4
Bauchi	480	29.6	70.2	0.2
Bayelsa	220	54.1	44.1	1.8
Benue	300	66.7	33.3	0.0
Borno	293	25.9	74.1	0.0
Cross River	212	35.4	64.2	0.5
Delta	292	33.9	65.8	0.3
Ebonyi	182	35.7	63.7	0.5
Edo	240	24.2	74.2	1.7
Ekiti	219	21.5	78.5	0.0
Enugu	181	55.2	44.8	0.0
Gombe	121	19.0	81.0	0.0
Imo	280	78.	20.4	0.7
Jigawa	320	18.8	81.3	0.0
Kaduna	452	47.3	52.0	0.7
Kano	477	32.1	66.9	1.0
Katsina	440	29.8	69.5	0.7
Kebbi	300	16.7	83.0	0.3
Kogi	240	27.5	72.5	0.0

Kwara	180	51.7	47.8	0.6
Lagos	640	42.7	57.2	0.2
Nasarawa	180	36.1	63.3	0.6
Niger	280	27.9	71.1	1.1
Ogun	259	28.2	71.8	0.0
Ondo	220	36.8	63.2	0.0
Osun	260	68.8	30.4	0.8
Oyo	393	69.2	29.3	1.5
Plateau	180	53.9	45.0	1.1
Rivers	219	70.3	29.2	0.5
Sokoto	252	22.6	76.6	0.8
Taraba	172	37.8	60.5	1.7
Yobe	160	36.1	63.3	0.6
Zamfara	252	9.5	90.1	0.4
Federal Capital Territory	198	39.4	60.1	0.5

### Perception of Crime Trend

Perceptions of the trend of crime varied across the states in the country. Very high percentages of respondents in Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Edo, Enugu, Rivers and Plateau states reported that crimes have increased. Notably, only in Niger State did a majority (52.1%) of respondents report that crime rates have decreased in their state (table 56). In essence, most respondents in every state of the federation felt that the country's crime rates have increased or stayed the same over the past years.

**Table 56: Perception of Crime Trend**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>PERCEPTION OF CRIME TREND</i>			
		Increased	Stayed the same	Decreased	Don't know
Abia	260	88.5	6.9	2.3	2.3
Adamawa	120	63.3	17.5	15.8	3.3
Anambra	301	86.0	9.0	5.0	0.0
Akwa Ibom	260	48.1	37.7	8.1	6.2
Bauchi	480	45.2	21.9	30.4	2.5
Bayelsa	220	35.9	40.5	23.2	0.5
Benue	300	60.7	15.7	22.0	1.7
Borno	293	68.3	13.0	13.0	5.8
Cross River	212	62.7	12.3	23.6	1.4
Delta	292	75.3	13.0	6.8	4.8
Ebonyi	182	79.7	18.7	1.1	0.5
Edo	240	80.8	15.0	0.8	3.3
Ekiti	219	59.8	22.8	15.1	2.3
Enugu	181	82.9	14.4	2.8	0.0
Gombe	121	52.1	16.5	24.8	6.6
Imo	280	63.6	26.4	8.6	1.4
Jigawa	320	64.1	16.6	10.0	9.4
Kaduna	452	50.9	20.1	26.5	2.4
Kano	477	60.6	11.3	25.8	2.3
Katsina	440	62.7	9.3	24.8	3.2
Kebbi	300	59.7	23.0	14.3	3.0
Kogi	240	66.7	23.8	9.6	0.0
Kwara	180	52.8	17.2	23.9	6.1
Lagos	640	65.5	14.2	18.0	2.3
Nasarawa	180	73.9	11.7	10.6	3.9
Niger	280	26.1	16.1	52.1	5.7
Ogun	259	67.2	7.7	22.0	3.1
Ondo	220	70.9	14.5	13.2	1.4
Osun	260	53.5	19.6	20.0	6.9
Oyo	393	47.1	27.5	22.4	3.1
Plateau	180	76.7	18.3	5.0	0.0
Rivers	219	86.8	6.4	6.4	0.5
Sokoto	252	25.8	40.1	28.2	6.0
Taraba	172	49.4	15.1	34.9	0.6
Yobe	160	32.5	33.1	20.0	14.4
Zamfara	252	19.8	42.1	30.2	7.9
Federal Capital Territory	198	64.6	15.2	16.7	3.5

### State Variations in the Perception of Police Performance

Assessment of police performance varied across the state. More than 60% of the respondents in Cross Rivers, Zamfara, Yobe, Taraba, Niger, Nasarawa, Kwara, Kebbi, Katsina, Gombe and



Benue State perceived the police as doing a good job. The police were most negatively evaluated by respondents from Anambra, Plateau, Rivers and Lagos states. (Table 57)

**Table 57: Perception of Police Performance**

<i>States</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>PERCEPTION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE</i>				
		<i>Very P. Job</i>	<i>Fairly P. Job</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Fairly G. Job</i>	<i>Very G. Job</i>
Abia	260	25.0	29.2	6.5	31.2	8.1
Adamawa	120	12.5	18.3	15.8	25.8	27.5
Anambra	301	32.9	23.6	22.6	19.9	4.0
Akwa Ibom	260	27.3	10.4	21.5	31.2	9.6
Bauchi	480	10.3	30.2	13.5	31.3	15.0
Bayelsa	220	22.3	6.8	18.6	46.4	5.9
Benue	300	13.3	20.3	5.3	49.3	11.7
Borno	293	18.8	25.9	7.5	40.3	7.5
Cross River	212	5.2	14.6	17.0	51.4	11.8
Delta	292	17.5	32.2	5.5	38.7	6.2
Ebonyi	182	20.3	19.2	15.4	40.1	4.9
Edo	240	16.3	24.6	10.0	39.2	10.0
Ekiti	219	9.6	18.7	25.6	30.6	15.5
Enugu	181	32.0	14.9	5.5	37.0	10.0
Gombe	121	2.5	5.8	20.7	41.3	29.8
Imo	280	23.9	20.0	20.7	33.2	2.1
Jigawa	320	7.2	13.8	24.1	37.2	17.8
Kaduna	452	13.3	12.8	14.6	46.2	13.1
Kano	477	13.8	16.4	13.6	34.6	21.6
Katsina	440	13.6	13.9	6.8	41.6	24.1
Kebbi	300	9.0	7.3	14.0	48.3	21.3
Kogi	240	20.4	22.9	0.0	51.3	5.4
Kwara	180	5.6	10.6	12.8	56.1	15.0
Lagos	640	30.3	24.1	17.8	21.4	6.4
Nasarawa	180	10.0	10.6	12.2	56.7	10.6
Niger	280	5.4	8.2	16.4	46.4	23.6
Ogun	259	16.2	23.2	12.0	41.7	6.9
Ondo	220	15.0	34.1	3.6	33.6	13.6
Osun	260	17.7	13.5	25.8	23.7	20.0
Oyo	393	15.8	18.1	16.8	37.7	11.7
Plateau	180	25.0	36.7	6.7	28.3	10.6
Rivers	219	30.1	27.4	14.2	24.2	31.7
Sokoto	252	7.9	10.3	31.3	31.3	19.0
Taraba	172	12.2	10.5	16.3	45.9	15.1
Yobe	160	5.6	17.5	12.5	47.5	16.9
Zamfara	252	2.4	7.9	8.7	61.5	19.4
Federal Capital Territory	198	16.7	16.2	20.7	30.3	16.2

### Age and Perception of Police Performance

Young people have been found in several studies, to exhibit less favourable attitudes toward the police<sup>19</sup>. This in part has to do with high contacts between the police and young persons and the latter's tendency to defy or challenge the authority of law enforcement agencies resulting in antagonistic relationships. Table 58 shows that there is no substantial significant difference in the evaluation of the performance of the police by respondents across the age category.

**Table 58: Age and Perception of Police Performance**

Age	How are Police doing their job in your area/community						Total No.
	Very bad job	Fairly bad job	Fairly good job	Very good job	Don't know	No response	
18-24	22.5	17.9	34.9	12.9	9.7	2.0	3366
25-30	24.1	16.5	34.7	12.0	10.4	2.2	2689
31-35	23.1	15.0	36.5	12.5	11.3	1.5	1150
36-40	18.5	17.1	36.9	15.9	10.2	1.3	968
41-50	20.2	16.7	36.0	13.6	12.3	1.1	1093
51year +	20.9	17.0	31.9	14.7	13.3	2.2	769

### Gender and Perception of Police Performance

Women have less contact with the police<sup>20</sup>. But when they do, it is likely to be in fairly serious situations of distress such as victimization in respect of assault, rape and domestic violence. Female respondents were slightly less negative in their evaluation than their male counterparts (37.0% vs. 41.4%). However nearly equal males and females assessed police performance positively (table 59).

**Table 59: Gender and perception of police performance**

	How are the police doing their job in your area or community?						Total No.
	Very bad job	Fairly bad job	Fairly good job	Very good job	Don't Know	Refusal & no response	
Male	24.0	17.4	34.8	13.4	8.8	1.6	5075
Female	20.5	16.5	35.4	12.8	12.5	2.2	4960

### Religious Affiliation and Perception of Police Performance

Police should enforce laws without regards to the religious backgrounds of citizens. However, in countries divided along religious lines or in multi-religious societies, police may be accused of bias by some religious groups. Data in table 60 show that Muslims evaluated the police more positively than their Christian counterparts.

**Table 60: Religion and Perception of Police Performance**

Religion	How are the police doing their job in your area or community?						Total No.
	Very bad job	Fairly bad job	Fairly good job	Very good job	Don't know	No Response	
Christian	25.7	18.5	33.9	9.5	10.3	2.2	5854
Muslim	17.3	14.7	37.1	18.5	11.2	1.4	4099

<sup>19</sup> Etannibi Alemika, 1988, op. cit

<sup>20</sup> In this survey, 31.4% of the females had contact with the police compared to 47.4% by males.

### Regional Patterns of Public Perception of Police Performance

Evaluations of police performance are influenced by level of crime in a community or region and by the effectiveness of the police in solving crimes and responding to distress calls. In Nigeria, media reports of criminal incidents tend to portray Lagos, South-East and South-South regions as more prone to higher incidences of crimes. These are the areas of high economic and commercial activities with attendant opportunities for criminal activities. Data presented in table 61 shows that respondents in the three zones provided lower evaluation of police performance than their counterparts in South-West, North-Central, North-East and North-West zones. The relatively higher and protracted conflicts in South-South zone associated with agitation for resource control as well as the activities of Movement for the Actualisation of Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB) agitating for independent Biafra also engender ‘repressive policing’ that creates hostility towards police by agitators and their sympathisers.

**Table 61: Regional Variation in Public Perception of Police Performance**

Regions	How are the police doing their job in your area or community						Total No.
	Very bad job	Fairly bad job	Fairly good job	Very good job	Don't know	No response	
Lagos	35.2	17.3	26.9	5.9	9.5	4.2	640
South-West	18.9	16.9	31.9	12.1	18.8	1.4	1351
South-South	30.5	18.2	29.9	5.7	12.4	3.3	1443
South-East	32.4	22.4	28.1	5.7	8.7	2.7	1204
North-West	15.4	13.2	37.3	21.7	11.0	1.4	2493
North-East	18.3	18.3	41.4	13.8	7.2	0.9	1706
North-Central	18.9	15.8	43.0	15.1	6.3	1.0	1198

### Residential Neighbourhoods and Perceptions of Police Performance

Critical criminologists argue that the police serve those neighbourhoods where people in higher and medium socioeconomic statuses live<sup>21</sup>. If this is the case, then residents of such areas should have more favourable evaluation of the police. However, data in table 62 failed to show significant differences in the perception of police performance across the three socio-economic areas.

**Table 62: Residential Neighbourhood and Perceptions of Police Performance**

Residence	How are the police doing their job in your area or community?						Total N.
	Very bad job	Fairly bad job	Fairly good job	Very good job	Don't Know	No Response	
Socio economic higher residential area	24.6	18.3	33.1	12.8	9.2	2.1	1583
Middle socio economic residential area	21.0	17.1	36.7	12.0	11.3	1.9	2592
Lower socio economic residential area	22.2	16.6	35.0	13.7	10.8	1.8	5860

<sup>21</sup> Etannibi EO Alemika. “Colonialism, State and Policing in Nigeria” *Crime, Law and Social Change: An International Journal* 20: 187 - 219.

### Rural – Urban Variations in Perceptions of Police Performance

Generally, rural communities tend to be under-policed. Residents of rural areas also tend to have fewer contacts with the police. Researches indicate that those with higher contacts tend to be less positive towards the police. However, as data in table 63 show, there was no significant difference in the perception of police performance by urban and rural respondents.

**Table 63: Rural – Urban Residence and Perceptions of Police Performance**

Residence	How are Police doing their job in your area/community						
	Very bad job	Fairly bad job	Fairly good job	Very good job	Don't Know	No Response	Total N.
Urban area	22.3	17.9	36.6	12.0	9.5	1.8	7080
Rural area	22.3	14.8	31.7	15.7	13.4	2.1	2955

### **Police Effectiveness**

The police authority in the country continues to introduce measures to curb crime and disorder. But whether or not the citizens perceive police effectiveness to be improving or declining is a different issue. Data presented in table 64 below show that respondents in most of the states perceived police effectiveness to have improved or stayed the same. However, a high proportion of the respondents from Adamawa, Katsina, Kebbi, Nasarawa, Niger, Taraba and Zamfara states reported improvement in contrast to the FCT, Rivers, Plateau, Ogun, Imo, Enugu, Ebonyi and Anambra states where declining effectiveness is reported.

**Table 64: Public Evaluation of Police Effectiveness**

States	N	PUBLIC EVALUATION OF POLICE EFFECTIVENESS			
		Improved	Stayed the same	Become worse	Refused/No Response
Abia	260	16.2	30.0	31.2	2.7
Adamawa	120	42.5	27.5	26.7	3.3
Anambra	301	8.3	26.6	64.5	0.7
Akwa Ibom	260	19.2	43.1	35.0	2.7
Bauchi	480	32.9	30.0	36.0	1.0
Bayelsa	220	11.4	50.0	35.0	2.7
Benue	300	38.3	42.0	18.3	1.3
Borno	293	24.6	34.1	37.9	3.4
Cross River	212	34.9	39.6	24.5	0.9
Delta	292	29.8	37.0	29.5	3.8
Ebonyi	182	18.1	35.7	45.1	1.1
Edo	240	21.7	45.4	28.3	4.6
Ekiti	219	27.9	43.4	27.4	1.4
Enugu	181	8.3	38.1	53.6	0.0
Gombe	121	46.3	45.5	7.4	0.8
Imo	280	14.3	44.6	41.1	0.0
Jigawa	320	30.9	38.8	25.9	4.4
Kaduna	452	36.9	40.3	21.5	1.3
Kano	477	34.4	40.0	23.3	2.3
Katsina	440	43.6	29.5	24.1	2.7
Kebbi	300	41.0	40.3	16.3	2.3
Kogi	240	26.7	33.8	39.6	0.0
Kwara	180	42.2	30.6	22.2	5.0

Lagos	640	14.2	26.1	55.6	4.1
Nasarawa	180	45.6	30.0	22.2	2.2
Niger	280	46.8	39.6	11.4	2.1
Ogun	259	26.6	27.4	43.2	2.7
Ondo	220	37.7	24.1	35.9	2.3
Osun	260	30.0	30.0	32.7	7.3
Oyo	393	23.2	46.6	26.2	4.1
Plateau	180	18.9	27.8	52.2	1.1
Rivers	219	12.8	23.3	62.6	1.4
Sokoto	252	29.8	53.2	13.1	4.0
Taraba	172	45.3	28.5	26.1	0.0
Yobe	160	21.9	53.8	21.9	2.5
Zamfara	252	40.5	40.	17.1	2.4
Federal Capital Territory	198	25.8	26.8	47.0	0.5

#### Measures for Ensuring Security and Safety

Governments often have difficulties in identifying effective measures for guaranteeing security and safety. They also encounter problems of determining priorities for various crime control measures. Frequently however, governments often prefer the options of introducing harsher punishment, recruiting and deploying more police personnel establishing new agencies, and purchasing more sophisticated crime control gadgets. These measures do not produce lasting effects and emphasized more fundamental measures like employment opportunities and poverty reduction as solutions to the country's crime problems (table 65)

**Table 65: Respondents' Recommendations for Ensuring Safety in their Communities**

<i>Recommended Measures</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Create more employment opportunities	3609	36.0
Reduce poverty level	2293	22.8
Create better educational and vocational opportunities	159	13.5
Equip police	937	9.3
Impose harsher punishment on offenders	651	6.5
Recruit more police	425	4.2
Give police better orientation	460	4.6
Equip judiciary	164	1.6
Don't know	106	1.1
Refused/No response	32	0.3

## **CHAPTER VII**

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The study has revealed important patterns and trends of victimization in the country. Some of the key findings are:

1. Nearly a quarter of the respondents said that a member of their households were involved in some disputes over the past 12 months, the most common being disputes around land, marital issues, money and physical assault (table 3).
2. In resolving the disputes, most of those involved were friends and family members, traditional ruling institutions and the police for resolution.
3. Those who resolved their conflicts through the mediations of friends and family as well as religious leaders were most satisfied (table 3).
4. The most common forms of victimization of household members were theft and assault.
5. Theft of livestock and agricultural products was widespread. In particular, the theft of chicken and duck as well as goat was very common, with more than two-fifths of households with such birds and animals reporting thefts.
6. Destruction of farmlands involved both nomadic herdsmen and members of the community. However, such destruction was done more by herdsmen (tables 8 and 9).
7. Slightly more than one fifth (21.5%) of Nigerians reported personal victimization during the preceding 12 months.
8. Burglary and theft of various types of goods were the most common form of victimization experienced by respondents over a twelve months period. Different forms of sexual assault were also reported (table 10).
9. One-fifth (20.1%) of the respondents reported being solicited for bribe by a public official (table 11).
10. Significant proportion (in all cases higher than 40%) of the respondents said it was likely that they will be required to pay bribe by public officials before rendering their services.
11. While the government has waged a campaign against corruption over the past seven years, more than three-fifths of the respondents said the incidence of corruption has increased in the country since 1999 when the military handed over power to an elected government led by Olusegun Obasanjo (table 13)
12. A significant proportion of the respondents were victims of fraud and cheating, especially concerning fake products, obtaining under false pretences, purchases and substandard works.
13. Many crimes like robbery, rape and other sexual crimes, automobile theft and assault occurred more at home or near the home of the victims.
14. Machete and handgun were the most common weapons used in robbery and murder (table 9).
15. The incidence of theft within the household was most prevalent in Kogi, Rivers, Taraba, and Bayelsa States and lowest in Ogun, Osun, Yobe, Zamfara, and Ekiti States.
16. Cases of assault within household were highest in Rivers and Abia States, while assault outside the home was highest in Rivers, Ebonyi, Abia, Bayelsa and Kogi States.
17. Nearly one-twentieth (4.7%) of the female respondents were victims of rape and sexual assault during the year; 51.3% of which knew the rapists by name and 12.7% knew the rapist by sight alone, with only 29.2% being total strangers.
18. Incidence of rape and sexual assault within the victims' home was highest in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT); Bayelsa, Rivers and Abia States. Cases of rape outside the victims' residence occurred more frequently in the same states, with the exception of the FCT.

19. Murder within the victims' households was more prevalent in Abia, Rivers and Enugu States.
20. Incidents of robbery within the victims' residence were highest in Abia, Akwa Ibom, Ebonyi and Rivers State and the Federal Capital Territory. Cases of robbery outside the victims' residence were highest in Abia, Adamawa, Ebonyi, Kebbi, Kogi, Nasarawa, Plateau, Rivers and Taraba States.
21. There were no substantial differences in the experience of victimization across age groups, sexes and residents of different neighbourhoods. However, there were variations in the experience of victimization across religions, regions and rural-urban communities. Christians and residents of South-South, South-East and North-Central regions as well as urban areas recorded higher levels of victimization.
22. Fear of crime at home and community was highest in the night.
23. More respondents said that the incidents of violent and property crimes have decreased than increased during the past three years (2003-2005).
24. Theft, house breaking, livestock theft and assault were the common crimes in the communities. However, the most feared crimes were robbery, murder and theft. Crimes that constituted major concern and were most talked about were robbery, theft, murder, corruption and political violence (tables 36 and 37)
25. Respondents reported a high level of feeling of safety. However, respondents generally felt safer both at home and in the neighbourhood during the day than at night (tables 39-41). Fear of crime prevented respondents from walking or strolling at night (18.3%), walking, playing or resting in open spaces or parks (10.8%) and allowing children to play around in the neighbourhood (10.4%).
26. Most respondents did not report their victimization to the police, as altogether only 29.7% did so. However, level of report varied across crime as 61.0% of murder cases, 40.7% of robbery, 18.1% of rape and 16.0% were reported to the police.
27. The major reason for reporting victimisation to the police was to ensure that the offender was caught and punished (table 46). About 41.6% of the victims who reported to the police were satisfied with the handling of their complaints, but 47.8% were not satisfied. The level of satisfaction with police handling of complaints varies across crimes (tables 47-49). The most stated reason for lack of satisfaction with the police handling of complaints was not doing enough to apprehend offenders.
28. Slightly more than one half (50.7%) of the respondents reported that the police were doing a good job in controlling crimes while 35% said the police were doing a poor job in this respect. Likewise, 29.1% said police performance improved, in contrast to 28.6% and 32.9% respectively that said police performance has stayed the same or become worse.
29. Nearly three-fifths (58%) felt that property offenders were motivated by needs and poverty. Likewise 50.0% said that violent offenders were motivated by needs and poverty.
30. A large majority of the respondents recommended the following measures for the prevention and control of crime in the country – creating employment opportunities (36.0%), poverty reduction (22.8%) and improved educational and vocational training opportunities (13.5%).