

**Criminal  
Victimization,  
Safety and Policing  
in Nigeria: 2006**



**MONOGRAPH  
SERIES. NO. 4**

**Etannibi E. O. Alemika  
Innocent C. Chukwuma**

# **Criminal Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria: 2006**

Etannibi E.O. Alemika  
Innocent C. Chukwuma

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

First published in 2007

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.

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

Preface

### **Chapter**

- I Measurement of Crime and Victimization
- II Disputes and Dispute Resolution
- III Criminal Victimization of Household Members
- IV Personal Crime Victimization
- V Feeling of Safety and Fear of Crime
- VI Perceptions of Criminal Justice Agencies
- VII Summary of Findings

## LIST OF TABLES

1. *Socioeconomic characteristics of respondents*
2. *Geographical distribution of respondents*
3. *Incidence of Disputes*
4. *Satisfaction with dispute resolution mechanisms*
5. *Victimization of household members*
6. *Theft from home*
7. *Assault Victimization of Household Members*
8. *Rape of household members*
9. *Murder of household members at home and outside*
10. *Incidence of robbery of household member*
11. *Personal Victimization over the past 12 months*
12. *Rates of Personal Crime Victimization*
13. *Burglary Victimization*
14. *Robbery victimization*
15. *Rape victimization*
16. *Relationship of rape victims to offenders*
17. *Reasons for not reporting rape victimization to the police*
18. *Theft of GSM handsets*
19. *Incidences of Cheating*
20. *Report of criminal victimization to the police*
21. *Most important reason for not reporting victimization to the police*
22. *Most important reason for reporting victimization to the police*
23. *Satisfaction with the police handling of complaints*
24. *Trend of Corruption*
25. *Solicitation for bribes by public officials*
26. *Perception of corruption by public officials*
27. *Sexual harassment*
28. *Opinions on appropriate anti-corruption measures in Nigeria*
29. *Assault against female intimates*
30. *Places of criminal victimization*
31. *Time of criminal victimization*
32. *Weapons of crime*
33. *Gunsbots in the Neighbourhood*
34. *Socioeconomic characteristics, criminal victimization and fear of crime*
35. *Opinions on causes of or motivations for violent and property crimes*
36. *Opinions on measures for control of crimes by youths*
37. *Feeling of safety at home during the day and at dark*
38. *Fear of becoming a victim of crime*
39. *Socioeconomic characteristics and fear of crime*
40. *Perception of trend of crime in 2006*
41. *Measures adopted for security and safety at home*
42. *Crime that occurs most frequently in the neighbourhood*
43. *Measures for ensuring safety from property crime*
44. *Experience of stop and search by the police*
45. *Performance of the police in crime control*
46. *Police service and help to the public*
47. *Knowledge or awareness of law enforcement and regulatory agencies*
48. *Presence and activities of crime watch and vigilante groups in neighbourhoods*
49. *Presence of informal policing organisations in neighbourhoods*

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

The CLEEN Foundation wishes to acknowledge the following organisations and individuals for their contributions in the publication of this study. First and foremost, we thank the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation for supporting our national crime victimization survey project, which led to the publication of this report (the second in the second in the series) and continuing interest in the institutional growth of the CLEEN Foundation.

We are grateful to the lead consultant, Prof. Etannibi E.O. Alemika, for leading the research and writing the final draft of the report for publication. The Practical Sampling International (PSI) carried out the field administration of the questionnaires in the 36 states of Nigeria and Abuja the Federal Capital Territory and the data entry. F.O. Olarenwaju of the National Bureau of Statistics was responsible for data analysis using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

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.

Finally, we thank the 11, 161 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**

This report is the second to be produced under the CLEEN Foundation's National Crime Victimization Survey's Project, which began in 2005. The objectives of the project were to provide policy makers and practitioners in the Nigeria criminal justice systems, especially the police, with reliable and complimentary information to official statistics on extent, trend and patterns of criminal victimization in the country as well as geographical distribution of victimization. This we hope would aid the development of appropriate responses to crime and victimization by stakeholders as well as enable a time series analysis and better appreciation of the direction of crime and victimization in Nigeria.

The publication presents the findings and analysis of the data of the 2006 edition 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 disputes and disputes resolution in the society. It highlights the several dispute resolution mechanisms as well as the level of satisfaction society members derive from using them. It also compares the trend of their responses over the two-year study.

In Chapter III the extent of victimization of any member of household during the preceding twelve months was analysed. A comparative analysis of the 2005 and 2006 surveys was also undertaken.

Chapter IV dwelled on the extent as well as the types of personal crime victimization experienced by individuals in the 12 months preceding the interviews in 2006. It also went further to analyse the level of reporting of these crimes to the police and reasons respondents gave for reporting or not reporting them.

Chapter V is on feeling of 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 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 Bayelsa, Ekiti, Lagos and Rivers. Also the overall perceptions on the trend of crime reveal that crime has increased within the last 12 months. Chapter VII presents the summary and conclusion of the study.

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

- 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>2</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>3</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>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).

<sup>3</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. A total of 11161 respondents were covered in the survey comparable to 10036 respondents covered in the first survey conducted in 2005.

The questionnaire was translated to Pidgin English, Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba languages. These were the local languages spoken predominantly in the country. The translation aimed at ensuring uniform translation of questions and proper administration of questionnaire by the field interviewers.

#### *Sampling Procedure*

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

- 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 11161 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. More than seven-tenths (73.5%) of the respondents were 35 years old or younger, and more than a third (34.5%) were between 18 and 24 years of age, reflecting the preponderance of youth in the Nigerian population. Nearly one-half (48.0%) were married. Just about the same percentage (49%) were never married, reflecting the preponderance of young persons in the Nigerian population and the survey. Respondents were largely literate as 35.5% and 32.8% respectively had secondary and post-secondary education, much higher than the literacy levels in the country's general population. Nearly three-quarters (74.6%) of the respondents earned less than 50,000 naira per month, reflecting the general poor income levels and high poverty in the country. Nearly two-fifths (39%) were working while 28.3% and 9.5% respectively were students or apprentices and unemployed and looking for job). Respondents were predominantly adherents of Christianity (58.9%) and Islam (39.9%), the two major religions in the country.

**Table 1: Socioeconomic Characteristics of Respondents**

	Characteristics	No	%
1.	<b>Sex</b>		
	Male	5576	50.0
	Female	5585	50.0
2.	<b>Age (Years)</b>		
	18 – 24	3847	34.5

	25 – 30	3056	27.4
	31 – 35	1299	11.6
	36 – 40	924	8.3
	41 – 50	1190	10.7
	51 and older	845	7.6
3.	<b>Marital status</b>		
	Never Married	5470	49.0
	Married	5362	48.0
	Divorced/Separated	164	1.4
	Widow/Widower	165	1.5
4.	<b>Education</b>		
	No formal education	605	5.4
	Koranic school	744	6.7
	Literacy class	159	1.4
	Primary	935	8.4
	Secondary	5056	45.3
	Tertiary (Post secondary)	3662	32.8
5.	<b>Employment status</b>		
	Working	4349	39.0
	Unemployed (Looking for work)	1058	9.5
	House maker/housewife	1574	14.1
	Schooling or learning trade	3154	28.3
	Retired or disabled	276	2.5
	Others	750	6.7
6.	<b>Estimated personal monthly income</b>		
	Less than N5000	3656	32.8
	5000 < 10000	2333	20.9
	10,000 < 25,000	1622	14.5
	25,000 < 50,000	715	6.4
	50,000 < 75,000	195	1.7
	75,000 and higher	158	0.8
	Refused / don't know	2482	22.2
7.	<b>Religion</b>		
	Christian	6573	58.9
	Muslim	4448	39.9
	Traditional	62	0.6
	Others	22	0.2
	Atheists/none	56	0.5
Total sample size = 11161			

### Geographical Distribution of Respondents

The data on the geographical distribution of the respondents (table 2) indicate that 69.3% 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.

**Table 2: Geographical Distribution of Respondents**

1.	<b>Residence</b>		
	Urban	7739	69.3
	Rural	3422	30.7
2.	<b>ZONES</b>		
	Lagos	683	6.1
	South-West	1439	12.9

	South-South	1654	14.8
	South-East	1408	12.6
	North-West	2628	23.5
	North-East	1980	17.7
	North-Central	1369	12.3

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

## CHAPTER II

### DISPUTES AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

#### Dispute and dispute resolution in society

Disputing is a regular feature of social life. Recognizing this fact, societies have developed several mechanisms for resolving dispute so that they do not persist or escalate and disrupt essential socio-political and economic activities and relations. Nearly a quarter (24.5%) of the respondents in the 2006 Survey reported the involvement of a member of their household in family, marital, work-related, commercial or land dispute during the preceding twelve months. This figure is about the same (24.9%) as that reported in the 2005 Survey. Fourteen of the 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory recorded higher rates of involvement in disputes than the national average (24.5%). Such states were Jigawa, Imo, Kebbi, Nasarawa, Bauchi, Rivers, Bayelsa, Ekiti and Delta. Several states recorded decline in the incidence of disputes. Those states that recorded very significant decline were Taraba, Bayelsa, Cross River, Rivers, Plateau and Kwara. Some other states recorded significant increase in the incidence of dispute during 2006. These were Jigawa, Bauchi, Ekiti, Gombe, Kebbi, Nasarawa and Sokoto states (Table 3).

**Table 3: Incidence of Disputes**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, have you personally or has anyone in your household been involved in any dispute including family, marital, work related, commercial or land disputes.</i>	
	% Yes in 2005	% Yes in 2006
Abia	35.8	24.4
Adamawa	25.0	11.1
Akwa Ibom	34.6	33.5
Anambra	35.2	17.9
Bauchi	17.7	40.5
Bayelsa	85.0	38.5
Benue	20.0	22.2
Borno	17.4	23.8
Cross River	31.6	13.5
Delta	23.3	37.7
Ebonyi	33.5	22.2
Edo	17.1	23.0
Ekiti	17.8	37.8
Enugu	21.0	24.1
Gombe	12.4	27.8
Imo	31.4	48.8
Jigawa	20.9	66.3
Kaduna	23.3	16.0
Kano	28.9	19.8
Katsina	17.0	13.2
Kebbi	18.0	44.0
Kogi	47.1	33.6
Kwara	29.4	7.9
Lagos	7.0	6.9
Nasarawa	14.4	42.1
Niger	25.0	8.6
Ogun	13.9	21.4
Ondo	11.8	6.0



Osun	12.7	9.9
Oyo	22.6	16.0
Plateau	28.9	9.3
Rivers	61.6	40.5
Sokoto	5.6	31.3
Taraba	80.2	17.1
Yobe	10.0	5.6
Zamfara	17.9	11.1
FCT Abuja	23.7	33.7
<b>National</b>	<b>24.9</b>	<b>24.5</b>

### Resolution of Disputes

Disputes reported arose from different areas of social life. The distribution of the responses provided by the respondents showed that the disputes were related to the following matters: land (30.6%); money and finance (24.6%); physical fights (22.5%); marital relationship (20.2%); work and employment (14.5%); male and female love relationships (13.7%); inheritance - excluding land (7.9%); sexual harassment (2.7%) and others (5%)<sup>4</sup>. The disputes were handled through several mechanisms. Prominent among them were the involvement of family members and friends (47.8%); police (19.6%); traditional leaders (11.9%); courts of law (5%); religious leaders (4.8%); political leaders (2.9%); community associations and group leaders (2.0%); vigilante groups (0.5%); non-governmental and community based organisation (0.3%); professional associations (0.4%); armed forces (0.1%) and others (4.6%). Analysis of the responses of the respondents reveals substantial satisfaction with the handling of the dispute by the respective mechanisms that they employed (table 4).

**Table 4: Satisfaction with dispute resolution mechanisms**

Dispute resolution mechanism	Extent of satisfaction	
	Somewhat satisfied (%)	Very satisfied (%)
Family and friends	29.3	61.1
Police	30.7	38.4
Traditional leaders	38.5	50.5
Religious leaders	28.5	66.9
Community groups	38.2	45.5
Court	25.5	52.6
Politicians and public officials	13.3	32.5

*NOTE: These are the %s of the respondents that responded being satisfied, the rest said they were not satisfied*

It is not clear why very significant proportion of the respondents were satisfied with the mechanisms. But it is plausible that the high level of satisfaction may be due to the nature of the disputes and the freedom of the respondents to choose the mechanisms they think most appropriate for the resolution of the disputes. The only mechanism that failed to produce very high level of satisfaction for the disputants was politicians and public officials.

<sup>4</sup> Percentages do not add to 100 because of multiple responses.

## CHAPTER III

### CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS

Criminal victimization surveys attempt to estimate and analyse the experiences and perceptions of members of households and individuals through interviews. 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.

In this section, the extent of victimization of any member of household during the preceding twelve months was analysed. A comparative analysis of the 2005 and 2006 surveys was also undertaken. Theft, assault and robbery outside home were the three major forms of criminal victimization experienced by household members during the 2006 (table 5). On a comparative basis, there was a dramatic reduction in the level of theft at home suffered by household members during 2006 in comparison to 2005 when 6.5% and 15.9% respectively reported theft of property belonging to a household member at home (table 5). The level of reported victimization for assault at home, rape, murder and robbery at home of household members remain relatively similar for 2005 and 2006 (table 5).

**Table 5: Victimization of household members**

<i>Over the past twelve months did you or anyone in your household experienced any of the following crimes?</i>	% that responded yes, once or more times - 2005	% that responded yes, once or more times – 2006
Something stolen at home	15.9	6.5
Physically attacked at home	4.2	3.8
Physically attacked outside home	5.6	5.5
Raped at home (females only)	1.0	0.9
Raped outside home (females only)	1.1	0.9
Killed at home	0.8	0.8
Killed outside home	1.0	1.3
Robbed at home	3.7	3.6
Robbed outside home	4.8	4.7

#### ***Theft at home***

Significant reduction was recorded in the level of reported theft at home during 2006 in comparison with 2005. However, the level of reported theft at home during 2006 differed markedly across the states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). Very high proportion of respondents in Bayelsa, Rivers, Adamawa and Nasarawa states reported the incidence of theft within their households. Such incidence was lowest in Oyo, Osun, Ondo and Yobe states (table 6). Corresponding to the very significant reduction in the level of theft at home observed for the country, most of the states and the FCT recorded decline in rates of theft at home in 2006 compared to 2005. However, Jigawa, Nasarawa and Ogun states recorded marginal increases or similar levels of the theft as the previous year (table 6). The states with the highest incidence of

theft in the household in 2006 were Nasarawa, Jigawa, Bayelsa, Rivers, Kaduna, Imo and the Federal Capital Territory.

**Table 6: Theft from home**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, how often if ever, has anyone in your household had something stolen from your house?</i>	
	% that responded once or more in <b>2005</b>	% that responded once or more in <b>2006</b>
Abia	21.2	6.5
Adamawa	18.4	6.3
Akwa Ibom	15.8	8.1
Anambra	15.9	4.0
Bauchi	18.5	9.3
Bayelsa	32.7	15.1
Benue	24.7	5.0
Borno	13.6	5.6
Cross River	13.2	1.6
Delta	13.0	4.0
Ebonyi	20.4	5.1
Edo	20.1	9.9
Ekiti	5.5	4.4
Enugu	8.3	3.2
Gombe	19.0	9.7
Imo	12.9	12.0
Jigawa	12.5	16.9
Kaduna	26.3	10.0
Kano	24.5	8.8
Katsina	10.4	6.0
Kebbi	9.6	9.2
Kogi	34.1	6.3
Kwara	6.1	1.8
Lagos	6.4	0.7
Nasarawa	17.8	18.1
Niger	4.7	0.9
Ogun	2.7	3.2
Ondo	10.5	0.4
Osun	3.1	0.4
Oyo	12.7	2.4
Plateau	27.8	2.8
Rivers	34.3	13.5
Sokoto	16.3	3.2
Taraba	34.3	7.0
Yobe	5.6	1.4
Zamfara	6.0	3.2
FCT Abuja	26.8	10.3
<b>National</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>6.5</b>

**Assault:** More members of the households were assaulted outside home (5.5%) than at home (3.8%), although the difference was not very large. Respondents from Bayelsa state reported higher level of assault at home than any other state. Other states where relatively high levels of assault at home were reported included Enugu, Edo and Rivers. As regards assault outside home, a high proportion of respondents from Nasarawa state reported fairly high level of victimization (13.9%). Other states that reported fairly high levels of assault victimizations include Bauchi, Delta and Imo (table 7).

**Table 7: Assault Victimization of Household Members**

<i>Over the past 12 months, was anyone in your household physically attacked in the home or outside your home?</i>		
States	Attack at home	Attack outside home
	Once or More (%)	Once or More (%)
Abia	8.7	6.5
Adamawa	6.3	7.0
Akwa Ibom	5.2	6.5
Anambra	4.4	4.6
Bauchi	3.4	10.9
Bayelsa	20.3	9.5
Benue	4.6	6.7
Borno	4.0	6.1
Cross River	2.0	6.0
Delta	5.8	10.8
Ebonyi	2.3	6.0
Edo	7.2	7.6
Ekiti	4.4	4.0
Enugu	9.1	6.8
Gombe	6.3	4.9
Imo	4.3	10.5
Jigawa	1.9	2.5
Kaduna	0.6	3.4
Kano	2.0	3.8
Katsina	1.9	2.8
Kebbi	2.4	2.1
Kogi	2.8	4.0
Kwara	1.9	1.8
Lagos	1.3	2.6
Nasarawa	9.7	13.9
Niger	3.7	3.4
Ogun	4.0	5.6
Ondo	1.2	0.8
Osun	1.6	3.2
Oyo	0.7	2.6
Plateau	0.9	2.3
Rivers	7.2	25.4
Sokoto	3.6	3.2
Taraba	3.7	6.0
Yobe	0.5	1.9

Zamfara	2.0	2.4
FCT Abuja	0.8	4.0
<b>National</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>5.5</b>

### ***Rape of Members of Households***

Rape is a major source of anxiety for older girls and women. The prevalence of crime in any given community or space impairs effective female participation in the activities carried out in such places. The same rates of incidence of rape of household members were recorded outside the home (0.9%) as at home (0.9%). However, there were wide variations across the states. States with relatively high levels of incidence of rape at home were Bayelsa, Lagos, Nasarawa, Delta, Gombe and Osun. Similarly, states where relatively high levels of rape were recorded outside home were Bayelsa, Nasarawa, Osun, Gombe, Enugu and Imo (table 8).

**Table 8: Rape of household members**

<i>Over the past 12 months, how often if ever, has anyone in your household: Been raped in the home and outside home?</i>		
States	Rape at home	Rape outside home
	Once or More (%)	Once or More (%)
Abia	1.5	1.2
Adamawa	0.7	0.7
Akwa Ibom	0.3	0.6
Anambra	0.0	0.6
Bauchi	0.2	0.2
Bayelsa	4.8	5.6
Benue	0.6	0.3
Borno	1.2	1.2
Cross River	0.0	0.4
Delta	2.8	1.5
Ebonyi	1.4	1.0
Edo	0.0	0.8
Ekiti	0.4	0.4
Enugu	1.9	2.3
Gombe	2.8	2.8
Imo	0.3	2.1
Jigawa	0.6	0.3
Kaduna	0.0	0.0
Kano	0.6	0.8
Katsina	1.5	1.3
Kebbi	0.9	0.3
Kogi	1.2	0.8
Kwara	0.9	0.5
Lagos	4.0	0.1
Nasarawa	3.2	2.4
Niger	1.2	1.2
Ogun	0.0	0.0
Ondo	0.0	0.4
Osun	2.0	2.4
Oyo	0.2	0.2
Plateau	0.9	0.5

Rivers	0.8	1.2
Sokoto	0.8	0.4
Taraba	1.4	1.4
Yobe	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	0.4	0.4
FCT Abuja	0.8	0.4
<b>National</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.9</b>

### ***Murder of members of household***

Overall 0.8% and 1.3% of the respondents respectively reported the murder of a member of their households at home and outside home. Bayelsa state led in the rate of incidence of murder of members of household at home. Other states with relatively high levels of incidence include Gombe and Osun. Nasarawa state led in the incidence of murder outside home. Fairly high levels of incidence were also recorded in Bayelsa, Taraba, Akwa Ibom, Delta, Enugu, Gombe and Osun states (table 9).

**Table 9: Murder of household members at home and outside**

<i>Over the past 12 months, how often if ever, has anyone in your household, been murdered at home or outside home?</i>		
States	Murder at home	Murder outside home
	Once or more (%)	Once or more (%)
Abia	1.8	1.8
Adamawa	0.0	0.0
Akwa Ibom	0.0	2.2
Anambra	0.0	0.9
Bauchi	0.2	1.4
Bayelsa	4.8	4.4
Benue	0.3	0.9
Borno	1.2	1.2
Cross River	0.0	0.4
Delta	1.9	2.5
Ebonyi	1.4	1.9
Edo	0.8	2.0
Ekiti	0.4	1.2
Enugu	0.5	3.2
Gombe	2.8	2.8
Imo	0.6	0.3
Jigawa	0.9	0.6
Kaduna	0.0	0.0
Kano	0.8	0.4
Katsina	1.7	1.9
Kebbi	0.9	1.2
Kogi	0.4	0.8
Kwara	0.5	0.5
Lagos	0.1	0.7
Nasarawa	1.9	6.5
Niger	1.2	0.9
Ogun	0.0	0.8
Ondo	0.0	0.4
Osun	2.0	2.0

Oyo	0.2	0.2
Plateau	0.5	0.5
Rivers	1.2	2.4
Sokoto	0.8	0.8
Taraba	1.4	3.7
Yobe	0.0	0.5
Zamfara	0.4	0.8
FCT Abuja	0.0	0.0
<b>National</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.3</b>

### ***Robbery of members of household***

Robbery constitutes a major problem in the country. Successive governments since the 1970s introduced several measures to control the crime. The Nigeria Police Force established special squads in its commands in the thirty-six states and the Federal Capital Territory to ensure effective control of robbery, especially on the highways and in urban centres. However, these efforts seem to have fuelled more sophistication and violence on the parts of the robbers. Data obtained from the 2006 survey showed that robbery of household members of the respondents occurred more outside home (4.7%) than at home (3.6%). Significant differences were observed among states with regards to the incidence of robbery at home and outside home. The states with high incidence of robbery at home were Edo, Bayelsa, Rivers, Abia, Ebonyi and Enugu. High incidence of robbery outside the home were recorded in Rivers, Edo, Imo, Enugu, Nasarawa, Bayelsa, Abia, Gombe, Ebonyi and Borno states (table 10). Robbery is a violent crime that results in the death of thousands of citizens, police and suspected robbers every year.

**Table 10: Incidence of robbery of household member**

<i>Over the past 12 months, how often if ever, has anyone in your household been robbed at home and outside home?</i>		
States	Robbery at home	Robbery outside home
	Once or more (%)	Once or more (%)
Abia	6.8	8.0
Adamawa	2.1	5.5
Akwa Ibom	3.1	4.1
Anambra	4.9	5.2
Bauchi	1.8	3.8
Bayelsa	9.5	7.5
Benue	4.3	1.2
Borno	2.1	5.6
Cross River	2.0	2.0
Delta	4.6	4.3
Ebonyi	6.5	5.1
Edo	14.7	15.1
Ekiti	4.4	4.0
Enugu	5.9	8.6
Gombe	4.9	6.9
Imo	4.9	16.0
Jigawa	0.9	2.0
Kaduna	2.5	1.3
Kano	1.6	2.4
Katsina	2.1	2.8
Kebbi	2.9	0.3

Kogi	2.4	2.0
Kwara	1.4	0.9
Lagos	2.5	2.9
Nasarawa	9.2	7.4
Niger	2.8	2.8
Ogun	2.8	2.8
Ondo	1.2	0.8
Osun	2.4	2.4
Oyo	0.7	0.7
Plateau	2.3	7.4
Rivers	7.6	27.4
Sokoto	2.8	1.6
Taraba	4.2	2.4
Yobe	0.5	2.4
Zamfara	2.4	1.2
FCT Abuja	1.6	4.4
<b>National</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>



## CHAPTER IV

### PERSONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION

#### Personal victimization rates in 2005 and 2006

In this section, we present an analysis of the victimization experienced by individuals during the twelve months preceding the interview in 2006. Personal victimization rates are more reliable than reports on victimization of household members for several reasons. First, individuals are more likely to recall events affecting them more accurately than those affecting other members of their households. Secondly, they may not be informed of all victimizations against other household members. Thirdly, the problem of telescoping, reporting victimization outside the period of coverage will be higher in household victimization reports. The extent and pattern of crime and victimization are determined by several factors. Several criminological and sociological theories have attributed criminality<sup>5</sup> and victimization<sup>6</sup> to several economic, political, social and personal factors. The personal victimization rates for 2005 and 2006 were very high at 21.3% and 23.1% respectively. Burglary and theft of telephone handsets were the two most common incidences of criminal victimization in 2006 (table 11).

**Table 2: Personal Victimization over the past 12 months**

Over the past 12 months how often, if ever, did you experience:	Never %	Once	Twice or More	No response
Someone entered your home and stole something?	82.1	12.5	5.1	0.3
Someone unsuccessfully tried to enter your home, damage locks and windows, in order to steal your property?	93.1	5.4	1.1	0.4
Someone took your property by using force, or threat of force?	95.3	3.6	0.6	0.4
Someone stole your purse, money, etc at public places?	91.6	6.5	1.5	0.4
Someone stole your mobile phone or GSM handset?	83.8	13.0	2.7	0.5
Someone forced you to have sex with him (female only = 4941)	91.0	1.6	0.5	6.9
Someone attempted to force you to have sex with him?	88.5	3.3	1.1	7.1
Someone denied you promotion employment, admission or pass in an examination because you refuse his demand for sex	88.7	3.1	1.2	7.0
Verbal abuse by your husband (married female n = 3284)	81.8	4.1	4.1	10.0
Beaten by your husband (n = 3283)	85.7	2.8	1.6	9.8
Beaten by your boyfriend or date partner & spouse (n = 5585)	84.1	3.6	2.0	10.3

There are very significant variations in rates of victimization across the states. States with very high rates of victimizations in 2006 were Rivers, Abia, Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Imo, Oyo and the Federal Capital Territory. Some states recorded rates of victimization that were significantly lower than the national average of 23.1%. They were Osun, Plateau, Yobe, Niger, Katsina, Ekiti

<sup>5</sup> Merton, R. 1938. 'Social structure and anomie', *American Sociological Review*, 3, 672-682; Miller, W. 1958. 'Lower-class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency', *Journal of social Issues*, 14, 5-19; Cloward, R. and Ohlin, R. 1960. *Delinquency and Opportunity Structure*, London: MacMillan; Cohen, A. 1955. *Delinquent Boys*, New York: Free Press; Clinnard, M. 1978. *Cities with Little Crime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Shaw, C. and McKay H. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago. Levi, M. 2001. 'Business, cities and fears about crimes'. *Urban Studies*, 38: 5-6: 849-868.

<sup>6</sup> Wolfgang, M. 1958. *Patterns of Criminal Homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Von Hentig, H. 1948. *The Criminal and his Victim*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press;

and Kwara states. Few states, like Kogi, Osun, Plateau and Taraba, recorded decline in the rates of victimization in 2006. Many states recorded major increases in the rates of victimizations. The states were Lagos, Ogun, Oyo, Delta, Borno, Enugu and the FCT (table 12).

**Table 3: Rates of Personal Crime Victimization**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, have you personally suffered any crime victimization?</i>	
	% Yes in 2005	% Yes in 2006
Abia	26.2	35.5
Adamawa	25.0	32.4
Akwa Ibom	25.0	20.5
Anambra	22.9	26.9
Bauchi	23.1	32.3
Bayelsa	47.7	28.6
Benue	32.3	34.7
Borno	15.0	32.4
Cross River	33.5	23.4
Delta	21.2	31.5
Ebonyi	31.3	26.4
Edo	24.6	23.4
Ekiti	9.1	11.6
Enugu	13.8	28.2
Gombe	11.6	14.6
Imo	26.4	31.2
Jigawa	12.5	21.7
Kaduna	31.0	25.4
Kano	28.5	17.7
Katsina	16.8	14.1
Kebbi	13.7	19.4
Kogi	42.1	18.5
Kwara	15.6	14.6
Lagos	9.1	16.5
Nasarawa	11.1	15.3
Niger	11.8	13.0
Ogun	7.3	27.4
Ondo	11.8	12.3
Osun	16.5	6.7
Oyo	13.7	35.9
Plateau	33.3	13.0
Rivers	57.5	46.0
Sokoto	19.4	28.6
Taraba	40.0	18.8
Yobe	8.1	14.8
Zamfara	12.7	17.5
FCT Abuja	14.6	34.1
<b>National</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>23.1</b>

### **Burglary victims**

Burglary refers to unauthorised entry into premises to commit an act that amount to theft or stealing. In some jurisdictions, including Nigeria, the term housebreaking (including breaking into stores and commercial premises, and even vehicle that are parked in private and public

spaces) is used to describe burglary. Unauthorized entry with intent to commit a crime is the main element of the crime. Overall, 17.6% of the respondents reported being victims of burglary within the preceding twelve months. Similarly, 6.5% of the respondents said they were victims of attempted burglary during the same period. More than one-fifth of respondents from Adamawa, Bayelsa, Benue, Borno, Edo, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Kebbi, Kogi, Nasarawa, Ogun, Rivers and Sokoto states, and the Federal Capital Territory reported being victims of burglary during 2006 (table 13). States with low report of burglary were Osun, Cross River, Ekiti, Kwara, Lagos, Oyo and Yobe states.

**Table 4: Burglary Victimization**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, how often if ever did you experience someone entered your house and stole something or attempted to do so?</i>	
	Burglary	Attempted burglary
	Once or More	Once or More
Abia	18.2	8.4
Adamawa	25.0	12.5
Akwa Ibom	10.9	8.7
Anambra	17.0	3.4
Bauchi	16.7	10.3
Bayelsa	35.7	25.8
Benue	20.1	7.1
Borno	22.2	8.0
Cross River	9.5	2.8
Delta	11.7	12.0
Ebonyi	13.9	3.7
Edo	23.8	9.1
Ekiti	8.4	5.6
Enugu	13.2	5.0
Gombe	20.2	6.9
Imo	18.6	8.9
Jigawa	19.8	5.3
Kaduna	24.8	5.8
Kano	24.6	6.4
Katsina	16.9	2.8
Kebbi	24.3	6.4
Kogi	24.3	4.8
Kwara	9.3	2.8
Lagos	10.7	3.3
Nasarawa	32.9	12.5
Niger	11.1	6.8
Ogun	23.0	2.4
Ondo	10.7	0.8
Osun	5.2	0.8
Oyo	8.3	0.7
Plateau	15.7	8.8
Rivers	27.4	16.7
Sokoto	31.7	7.9
Taraba	19.0	9.3
Yobe	10.2	0.9
Zamfara	11.9	2.4

FCT Abuja	25.0	5.6
<b>National</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>

**Robbery victimization:** Frequent incidences of armed robbery and high robbery-related fatalities in various parts of the country have attracted the attention of successive governments since the early 1970s. In spite of the various anti-robbery measures introduced by the government, the problem has persisted, causing widespread fear of insecurity among urban residents and inter-city travellers. Overall, 4.2% and 8.0% of the respondents respectively reported being victims of armed robbery and attempted robbery. Robbery incidences were highest in Rivers, Edo, Bayelsa, Abia, Adamawa, Imo and Borno states. Similarly, cases of attempted robbery were reported by significant percentages of respondents in Rivers, Imo, Bayelsa, Borno, Edo, Enugu, Nasarawa, Niger, Lagos, Sokoto, Jigawa States and the FCT (table 14).

**Table 5: Robbery victimization**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, how often, if ever, did you experience someone took your property by using force or threat of force or attempted to do so?</i>	
	Robbery	Attempted robbery
	Once or More	Once or More
Abia	8.1	9.0
Adamawa	7.0	9.1
Akwa Ibom	5.6	4.7
Anambra	4.3	7.5
Bauchi	2.8	8.5
Bayelsa	9.1	12.3
Benue	5.2	6.1
Borno	6.5	13.3
Cross River	4.4	4.8
Delta	4.3	13.0
Ebonyi	5.1	5.6
Edo	9.3	13.5
Ekiti	1.2	6.0
Enugu	3.7	13.6
Gombe	3.5	5.6
Imo	7.7	16.1
Jigawa	4.2	7.6
Kaduna	2.1	6.8
Kano	2.6	5.2
Katsina	1.5	2.4
Kebbi	3.4	7.0
Kogi	1.6	4.8
Kwara	1.9	2.3
Lagos	2.9	7.8
Nasarawa	6.0	10.6
Niger	4.6	8.0
Ogun	3.2	6.0
Ondo	1.6	1.6
Osun	0.4	0.4
Oyo	0.9	4.2
Plateau	3.7	7.0

Rivers	25.0	44.0
Sokoto	3.6	9.1
Taraba	3.7	6.1
Yobe	1.9	2.4
Zamfara	0.0	2.4
FCT Abuja	4.0	8.3
<b>National</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>8.0</b>

### Rape Victimization

Rape is a violent crime more commonly committed against females. The crime produces physical and emotional harms. In most societies, it also attracts stigmatization, especially by members of the law enforcement agents who often believe that victims contribute to their victimization through inducements like dressing, gestures, and presence in environments considered suitable for men only. Overall, 2.1% and 4.4% of the female respondents said they were victims of rape and attempted rape during the preceding twelve months. States with high incidences of rape were Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Rivers, Cross River, Imo and Nasarawa and Abuja, and the FCT. Similarly, high incidences of attempted rape were reported in Bayelsa, Akwa Ibom, Delta, Imo, Nasarawa, Plateau, Edo and Rivers states (table 15).

**Table 6: Rape victimization**

	<i>Over the past 12 months, how often if ever, did you experience: Someone forced you to have sex with him or attempted to do so?</i>	
	Rape	Attempted rape
	Once or More	Once or More
Abia	1.2	2.5
Adamawa	1.4	5.6
Akwa Ibom	6.2	10.7
Anambra	1.9	5.0
Bauchi	0.4	4.8
Bayelsa	7.1	13.5
Benue	1.2	4.8
Borno	3.1	3.1
Cross River	5.6	5.6
Delta	1.8	10.5
Ebonyi	0.9	3.8
Edo	2.4	8.0
Ekiti	0.0	5.6
Enugu	1.8	3.6
Gombe	1.4	2.8
Imo	6.2	11.8
Jigawa	2.3	1.7
Kaduna	0.4	3.0
Kano	0.8	0.4
Katsina	1.3	0.8
Kebbi	0.6	4.4
Kogi	2.4	5.6
Kwara	0.9	0.9
Lagos	0.6	2.6
Nasarawa	6.5	11.1
Niger	1.2	3.7

Ogun	3.2	5.6
Ondo	1.6	0.8
Osun	0.8	3.2
Oyo	1.0	1.4
Plateau	2.8	9.3
Rivers	8.0	7.2
Sokoto	0.0	0.8
Taraba	1.8	4.7
Yobe	0.0	0.9
Zamfara	1.6	0.8
FCT Abuja	4.0	2.4
<b>National</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>4.4</b>

Most of the rape victims knew the offenders – 53.1% of them knew offenders by sight and name; 18.8% knew or recognized the offenders by sight only, and 3.1% knew them by name only. Only 21.1 % said they did not know the offender. Most of the victims were raped by people known to them and with whom they were acquainted (table 16).

**Table 76: Relationship of rape victims to offenders**

Victim-offender relationship	N	%
Spouse or partner at the time	20	7.0
Ex-spouse or ex-partner	8	2.8
Boyfriend at the time	37	13.1
Ex-boyfriend	38	13.5
Relative	13	4.6
Close friend	35	12.5
School mate or co-worker	25	9.0
Acquaintance	22	8.0
Someone in authority over victim (office boss, teacher, pastor, imam, etc.)	22	8.0
Robbers or criminals	7	2.5

More than seven-tenths (70.1) of the rape/attempted rape incidents involved a single perpetrator; 13.9% (41) involved two people, and 11.6% (34) involved three or more offenders. Only 12.7% (35) of rape victims reported to the police, and 39.5% of the victims who reported were dissatisfied with the police handling of their complaint, while 52.7% were satisfied, and 7.9% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The victims were dissatisfied as a result of the failure of the police to apprehend the offenders (42.9%) and demand for bribe by the police (35.7%). Many rape victims did not report to the police for several reasons, the most prominent ones being fear of stigmatization, disrespect and embarrassment by the police, and feeling that the police will not give the complaints deserved seriousness and attention (table 17).

**Table 87: Reasons for not reporting rape victimization to the police**

Reasons	No.	%
Fear of stigmatization	103	42.7
Police will not apprehend the offenders	46	19.1
Fear of disrespect and embarrassment by the police	75	31.1
Police will not take the complaint seriously	73	30.3
Others	55	22.9

*Note: Responses add up to more than 100% because of multiple responses*

### Theft of GSM handset

The mobile phone industry has grown considerably in the country over the past six years. There were four major mobile phone service providers in 2006. These were the MTN; Celltel, Globacom and the MTEL. These claimed to have more than ten million subscribers in the year. Theft of mobile phone handsets also became a common crime. In the 2005 survey, 9.5% of the respondents reported being victim of the crime. The figure rose significantly to 15.7% in 2006. High incidences of the crime were reported in 2006 by respondents in Abia, Anambra, Cross River, Edo, Enugu, Imo, Lagos, Nasarawa, Niger, Ogun, Ondo, Plateau and Rivers states, and the FCT (table 18)

**Table 98: Theft of GSM handsets**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, how often, if ever, did you experience someone stole your mobile phone/GSM handset?</i>	
	% that responded once or more in <b>2005</b>	% that responded once or more in <b>2006</b>
Abia	18.9	21.6
Adamawa	8.3	15.3
Akwa Ibom	27.0	14.6
Anambra	13.6	18.8
Bauchi	3.3	10.3
Bayelsa	22.3	21.2
Benue	12.0	13.6
Borno	5.1	12.6
Cross River	7.5	15.9
Delta	12.4	29.0
Ebonyi	9.3	9.7
Edo	18.4	30.9
Ekiti	6.0	6.8
Enugu	11.0	15.0
Gombe	0.8	9.7
Imo	15.3	16.9
Jigawa	3.1	11.3
Kaduna	8.1	16.2
Kano	5.0	13.3
Katsina	1.8	4.5
Kebbi	3.7	10.8
Kogi	16.2	13.1
Kwara	6.2	14.3
Lagos	9.5	24.3
Nasarawa	10.0	27.7
Niger	4.6	15.8
Ogun	8.1	21.1
Ondo	6.4	11.5
Osun	7.7	6.4
Oyo	8.6	13.6
Plateau	10.5	15.2
Rivers	26.5	35.6
Sokoto	3.6	13.9
Taraba	7.0	10.2

Yobe	4.4	5.1
Zamfara	3.6	4.8
FCT Abuja	23.2	17.1
<b>National</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>15.7</b>

### Victims of cheating

Cheating and fraud are interrelated crimes. Both essentially consist of the use of deception or misrepresentation to obtain money, services or other favours. The crime was the most common form of victimization reported in the 2005 survey. More than three-tenths (30.5%) of the respondents in 2005 survey reported being victim of cheating. The figure for the 2006 survey was lower at 27.1%. The states with high incidences of the crime were Rivers, Jigawa, and Abia states where more than one-half of the respondents reported being cheated during the preceding twelve months. Other states with relatively high incidences were Imo, Bayelsa, Bauchi, Ekiti, Enugu, and the FCT (table 19).

**Table 109: Incidences of Cheating**

States	<i>Were you a victim of cheating in the last 12 months?</i>	
	<b>% Yes in 2005</b>	<b>% Yes in 2006</b>
Abia	39.6	53.4
Adamawa	30.0	22.2
Akwa Ibom	40.8	25.2
Anambra	39.2	13.9
Bauchi	34.8	36.3
Bayelsa	54.1	40.5
Benue	38.7	28.7
Borno	24.6	25.9
Cross River	32.1	18.3
Delta	17.8	24.1
Ebonyi	39.6	20.8
Edo	25.4	25.8
Ekiti	23.7	37.8
Enugu	24.9	38.6
Gombe	26.4	31.9
Imo	42.1	49.1
Jigawa	15.3	64.9
Kaduna	49.1	22.2
Kano	40.0	31.7
Katsina	27.0	19.2
Kebbi	16.0	19.7
Kogi	35.0	13.8
Kwara	35.6	6.0
Lagos	15.2	15.4
Nasarawa	35.6	31.0
Niger	13.2	22.5
Ogun	19.7	31.7
Ondo	22.7	10.3
Osun	26.9	13.5
Oyo	41.0	19.9
Plateau	23.9	12.5



Rivers	63.9	60.3
Sokoto	21.4	29.0
Taraba	46.5	11.6
Yobe	10.0	5.6
Zamfara	15.1	26.6
FCT Abuja	24.2	34.5
<b>National</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>27.1</b>

**Victimization and victim complaints to the police:** The most important rationale for victim survey is that most victims do not report their victimization to the police. Therefore, police crime statistics are inadequate for academic, policy, planning, and operational purposes. Crime victim surveys are meant to complement police crime statistics to produce better estimates of the incidence of crime in society. As the data presented in table 16 show, most victims of rape and assault did not report to the police. Two-thirds of murder cases and less than one-half of robbery cases were reported to the police (table 20).

**Table 20: Report of criminal victimization to the police**

Type of crime	No of victims	% who reported to the police
Robbery	1251	41.9
Rape	276	12.7
Assault	1877	14.7
Murder of household member	250	66.0

There are several reasons why victims will not report their victimization to the police. In the cases of consensual crime, the so-called victimless crimes (such as prostitution, bribery, illicit drug retail business, gambling etc.), victims will not report their grievances to the police because of the illegality of the trades, their consent to the act and fear of reprisal which may often be violent and fatal. In other cases, however, victims often do not report for several reasons as reported in table 21. The seriousness of offences determines whether or not it will be reported to the police, solved or ignored by the victims.

**Table 111: Most important reason for not reporting victimization to the police**

Reasons	No.	%
Not serious victimization	1982	20.0
Solved it myself	2347	23.6
Inappropriate for the police	403	4.1
Police would not do anything about it	838	8.4
Did not want any involvement with police	621	6.3
Fear of reprisal	147	1.5
Did not have money to give the police	322	3.2
Police would inform the offender	36	0.4
Other	3431	32.6
Total N= 9927, 88.9% of sample		

Those who report their victimization to the police did so for several reasons. The most prominent reasons given by respondents for reporting their victimization were desire for

retribution, to recover property, to prevent future occurrences, and to carry out civic duties (table 22).

**Table 122: Most important reason for reporting victimization to the police**

Reasons	No.	%
Wanted offender caught and punished	469	36.7
Crime should be reported as a civic duty	178	13.9
To recover property	287	22.5
Insurance claim	21	1.6
To prevent future occurrence	186	14.6
To get help	98	7.7
To obtain compensation from offenders	15	1.2
Others	23	1.8
N = 1277, 11.4% of the sample		

Generally, the victims were not very satisfied with the handling of their complaints by the police. For example, 43.7% were satisfied and 40% were dissatisfied (table 23). The implication of this is that the victims who were dissatisfied with the handling of their complaints will not likely file complaints with the police when victimized in the future, further eroding confidence in the police.

**Table 133: Satisfaction with the police handling of complaints**

Satisfaction or dissatisfaction	No.	%
Not at all satisfied	158	12.4
Not satisfied	352	27.6
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	208	16.3
Satisfied	344	26.9
Very satisfied	215	16.8

### Extent and Trend of Corruption

Corruption is a multi-dimensional problem. It manifests in various forms such as bribery, fraud, nepotism, discrimination and favouritism. Corruption is widespread in Nigeria and generally considered as one of the major hindrances to its economic and socio-political development. Nigerian government and the public as well as foreign agencies often focus on the graft aspect of corruption, ignoring the equally widespread problem of nepotism which manifests as discrimination and favouritism in employment, promotion, posting, contracts, admission into educational institutions, etc. The latter forms of corruption also have serious adverse effects on development, nation building and stability. When people are asked about the extent of corruption in the country, it can only be assumed that respondents make their judgment based on their experience or information about these various dimensions of the problem. Respondents generally reported lower incidences of corruption in 2006 compared to their perception of the trend between 1999 and 2005. The figures in tables 24 and 25 are only indicative due to the difference in the range of periods.

**Table 144: Trend of Corruption**

<i>Trend of corruption</i>	<i>Do you think corruption has increased, remained same or decreased</i>	
	<i>May 1999 – 2005)</i>	<i>2006</i>

Increased a lot	64.1	47.2
Slightly increased	13.9	15.6
Stayed the same	7.0	11.5
Slightly decreased	9.0	17.2
Decreased a lot	3.0	3.7
Don't know and no response	3.0	4.8

The responses tabulated in table 24 indicate a decline in the perception of corruption in the form of solicitation for bribe by public officials. States where relatively high percentages of respondents said they were asked for bribe by public officials during the preceding twelve months were Nasarawa, Imo, Jigawa, Bauchi, Sokoto, Bayelsa, Kebbi, and Abia. In contrast, low percentages of respondents from Adamawa, Katsina, Kogi, Kwara, Ondo, Yobe and Zamfara states said public officials demanded bribe from them.

**Table 15: Solicitation for bribes by public officials**

	<i>During the past 12 months, did any government official ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for service?</i>	
	Yes in the past 3 years	Yes in 2006
Abia	37.3	25.0
Adamawa	24.2	5.6
Akwa Ibom	33.8	19.3
Anambra	30.6	11.1
Bauchi	20.6	34.9
Bayelsa	42.3	27.4
Benue	31.0	16.7
Borno	16.7	11.4
Cross River	23.1	10.7
Delta	19.9	38.6
Ebonyi	39.0	14.8
Edo	15.4	11.5
Ekiti	16.4	17.9
Enugu	15.5	18.6
Gombe	12.4	13.2
Imo	24.6	46.9
Jigawa	15.9	37.6
Kaduna	15.7	20.7
Kano	17.4	19.2
Katsina	22.7	8.5
Kebbi	7.3	25.8
Kogi	32.1	5.1
Kwara	25.0	6.5
Lagos	10.9	9.8
Nasarawa	15.0	35.6
Niger	15.4	24.7
Ogun	15.8	23.8
Ondo	27.3	5.2
Osun	28.1	19.8
Oyo	25.2	16.2
Plateau	15.0	10.6
Rivers	53.9	22.6
Sokoto	11.9	26.2

Taraba	34.9	18.5
Yobe	10.6	4.2
Zamfara	9.9	7.5
FCT Abuja	15.2	16.3
<b>National</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>19.2</b>

Relatively more concrete evidence of decline in public perception of corruption in public institutions was obtained from responses to the question on the likelihood of government officials demanding for bribe before or for rendering services. The percentage of respondents who said officials of certain agencies were likely to demand bribe declined, in some cases quite significantly (table 26).

**Table 166: Perception of corruption by public officials**

Officials	<i>How likely is it that a person would have to 'pay a bribe' to get service from the following agencies</i>	
	% that responded most likely and likely in 2005	% that responded most likely and likely in 2006
National Assembly	56.2	41.5
Ministries and Parastatals	58.4	43.6
Local Government	58.9	46.2
Power Holding Company of Nigeria	74.3	68.8
Police	84.3	74.9
Courts	57.6	45.6
Customs	57.7	56.0

### **Sexual harassment and unjust treatment**

The incidence of sexual harassment has featured prominently in the country's media over the past two decades. Government officials have also occasionally raised concern about the problem. Females are said to be denied admission, good passing grades in examinations, promotion, employment and other entitlements because they refused to yield to illicit sexual demands by persons in positions of authority. Similarly, others who yield to the demands were accorded undue advantages. However, there has been very little systematic evidence on the extent of the problem. Responses presented in table 27 provide broad indication of the extent of sexual harassment. The data indicate a national rate of 4.3%. However, high incidences of sexual harassment were reported by respondents in Bayelsa, Nasarawa, Kwara, Delta, Borno, Edo, Ekiti and Rivers states.

**Table 177: Sexual harassment**

States	How often if ever, did you experience: Someone denied you promotion, employment, admission or a pass in an examination because you refused his demand for sex?	
	YES during the past 3 years (2003-2005)	Yes in 2006
Abia	10.7	3.7
Adamawa	0.0	4.2
Akwa Ibom	12.3	9.4
Anambra	13.6	0.6

Bauchi	1.2	4.0
Bayelsa	11.2	23.0
Benue	1.4	0.6
Borno	4.1	8.0
Cross River	2.8	5.6
Delta	4.8	11.1
Ebonyi	6.7	2.8
Edo	0.0	6.4
Ekiti	0.0	7.1
Enugu	6.8	2.7
Gombe	0.0	1.4
Imo	2.2	4.2
Jigawa	0.6	3.4
Kaduna	1.3	4.3
Kano	2.2	0.4
Katsina	0.9	1.3
Kebbi	0.7	3.1
Kogi	12.0	4.8
Kwara	3.4	9.0
Lagos	1.3	2.9
Nasarawa	5.6	15.8
Niger	1.4	3.7
Ogun	0.8	4.0
Ondo	1.8	4.2
Osun	1.6	2.4
Oyo	5.2	0.5
Plateau	5.7	4.7
Rivers	34.3	5.6
Sokoto	0.8	4.0
Taraba	3.6	2.8
Yobe	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	0.0	0.8
FCT Abuja	3.1	4.0
<b>National</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>

Respondents proffered several suggestions toward the control of corruption in Nigeria. Their major recommendations were better education and proper upbringing of children; good examples of incorruptible leadership and better salaries for public service workers (table 28)

**Table 188: Opinions on appropriate anti-corruption measures in Nigeria**

Measures	No.	%
Tougher laws and sentence	3142	28.2
Better education and proper upbringing of children	4975	44.6
More regular and proper control of officials	2797	25.1
Greater publicity of problems of corruption	2764	24.8
Good examples of leadership	5405	48.4
Better salaries for public service workers	4620	41.4
Other measures	1812	16.2

*Note: Responses exceeded 100% because of multiple responses*

**Battering by husbands and boyfriends:** Several victimologists have argued that the incidence of violence against wives and girlfriends is far higher than society has acknowledged<sup>7</sup>. Data obtained from the female respondents and presented in table 29 indicate that boyfriends were more likely to batter or assault their mates than husbands did against their spouses. The incidences of spouse battering were highest in Rivers, Gombe, Bauchi and Bayelsa states. States with high incidences of battering of girlfriends were Edo, Imo, Akwa Ibom, Ekiti, Bayelsa, Cross River, Nasarawa, Taraba and Bauchi as well as the FCT.

**Table 199: Assault against female intimates**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, how often if ever, did you experience beating by your husband or by your boyfriend or date partner?</i>	
	Beating by husband	Beating by boyfriend or date partner <sup>2</sup>
	Once or More	Once or More
Abia	0.6	1.8
Adamawa	2.8	1.4
Akwa Ibom	3.1	15.0
Anambra	1.9	4.9
Bauchi	7.6	8.7
Bayelsa	7.2	11.1
Benue	3.0	5.4
Borno	0.0	0.6
Cross River	3.2	11.9
Delta	5.0	15.4
Ebonyi	1.8	4.7
Edo	7.2	19.8
Ekiti	2.4	11.9
Enugu	0.9	3.6
Gombe	8.4	1.4
Imo	0.6	15.4
Jigawa	1.1	2.8
Kaduna	0.4	3.0
Kano	0.4	0.4
Katsina	3.4	3.4
Kebbi	0.0	1.8
Kogi	0.8	4.8
Kwara	2.8	0.9
Lagos	1.5	2.0
Nasarawa	2.8	7.4
Niger	1.8	3.7
Ogun	5.6	1.6
Ondo	1.6	3.2
Osun	1.6	4.0
Oyo	1.9	1.4
Plateau	0.0	4.6

<sup>7</sup> Gelles, RJ and Straus MA. 1988. *Intimate Violence*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rivers	8.8	18.0
Sokoto	4.0	1.6
Taraba	4.7	9.3
Yobe	0.0	0.0
Zamfara	0.0	0.0
FCT Abuja	3.2	7.2
<b>National</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>5.6</b>

### Location and time of criminal victimization

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>8</sup>.

Since Marvin Wolfgang in his seminal work on pattern of criminal homicide was published in 1958, criminologists have been sensitized to the need to examine a range of situational and personal social characteristic that are associated with victimization<sup>9</sup>. The figures presented in table 30 showed that about two-thirds of crime occurred at or near the home of the victims. This is very informative because it reveals that individuals are more likely to be victimized in their own homes or near the homes.

**Table 30: Places of criminal victimization**

Type of crime	Place of crime					No. of respondents or victims
	At own home	Near own home	At work place or school	Elsewhere in the state	Elsewhere in the country	
Murder	30.1	32.7	4.4	28.3	4.4	113
Attempted murder	31.1	32.5	4.0	29.1	3.3	151
Robbery	18.1	42.3	6.7	26.7	6.2	1073
Attempted robbery	42.4	22.1	6.1	26.2	3.2	408
Rape	20.0	37.1	15.2	27.6	0.0	105
Attempted rape	14.9	43.1	16.1	25.9	0.0	174
Vehicle theft	33.9	22.8	10.5	32.2	0.6	171
Forced same-sex intercourse	31.6	21.1	15.8	26.3	5.3	57
Physical assault	29.8	38.4	16.7	14.6	0.6	1470

<sup>8</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>9</sup> Wolfgang, ME. 1958. *Pattern of criminal homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Theft of mobile phone hand set	24.3	29.3	19.4	25.3	1.6	2026
--------------------------------	------	------	------	------	-----	------

The knowledge of the time during which people are more vulnerable to different crimes is useful for policy intervention and individual measures aimed at minimizing victimization and improving safety and security. The data obtained from the respondents indicated that very high proportion of the crimes occurred in the evening and night. The only exception is physical assault that occurred more in the morning and afternoon. Theft of mobile phone, physical assault, attempted rape and attempted murder were clustered around afternoon and evening (table 31).

**Table 201: Time of criminal victimization**

Type of crime	Time of victimization				No. of respondents or victims
	Morning	Afternoon	Evening	Night/midnight	
Murder	12.7	18.6	23.5	45.1	102
Attempted murder	10.5	25.2	34.3	30.1	143
Robbery	5.6	14.0	27.8	52.6	1066
Attempted robbery	5.2	17.1	27.5	50.2	404
Rape	6.9	20.8	31.7	40.6	101
Attempted rape	9.4	22.2	37.4	31.0	171
Vehicle theft	5.3	15.9	32.9	45.9	170
Forced same-sex intercourse	13.0	16.7	35.2	35.2	54
Physical assault	23.8	40.1	28.0	8.1	1465
Theft of mobile phone hand set	12.2	31.5	37.0	19.3	2018

### Weapons of Crime

Of critical importance to policy intervention and personal safety measures is the knowledge of the types of weapons employed in the execution of serious crimes. The various types of weapon used in the serious violent crimes reported by the victims are presented in table 32.

**Table 21: Weapons of crime**

Nature of crime	No. of victims	Types of weapons								
		Knife and machete	Hand gun (pistol/revolver)	Long gun (rifle/machine gun)	Clubs, bars screw driver	Bow, arrow	Acid	Broken bottles	Fireworks (knock out)	Others
Robbery	1251	32.0	49.1	16.9	6.2	1.8	2.0	4.4	1.3	5.0
Rape; attempted rape	271	13.6	9.7	2.2	2.5	1.8	2.9	8.0	4.7	20.1
Assault	1877	11.3	4.5	1.4	2.1	1.2	1.1	6.9	4.6	15.5
Murder of household members	250	32.4	41.2	14.0	6.0	5.2	6.8	10.0	4.8	4.0



*Note: percentages did not add to 100 in some cases because of high refusals and non-response*

The data in table 32 revealed the preponderance of the use of knife, machete and handgun in robbery and murder. Therefore, the role of guns in these crimes deserves serious attention, especially against the concern about the proliferation of small arms in the society. Respondents were asked how often they hear guns shots in their neighbourhood. The responses tabulated in table 33 indicate that illicit possession and use of arms by various groups, especially criminals and vigilante groups are widespread.

**Table 223: Gunshots in the Neighbourhood**

How often heard gun shot in the neighbourhood	No.	%
Several times a day or night	669	6.0
Once a day or night	375	3.4
Several times a week	647	5.8
Once a week	488	4.4
Every few weeks	1752	15.7
Other periods	580	5.2
Never	5845	52.4
Don't know	711	6.4
Refused to answer	94	0.8

#### **Socioeconomic characteristics and victimization**

The literature on criminal victimization postulates strong relationships between socio-economic characteristics and victimization. As a result, victim surveys analyse the association between the two factors. Below we analyse the relationship between socioeconomic backgrounds and victimization. Although slight differences can be observed, significant differences in the rates of victimization were not observed among the different socioeconomic groups (table 34).

**Table 234: Socioeconomic characteristics, criminal victimization and fear of crime**

Socioeconomic characteristics	Criminal victimization	
	Yes	No
SEX		
• Male	24.4	74.6
• Female	21.8	77.4
AGE (years)		
• 18 – 24	22.4	76.5
• 25 – 30	24.5	74.6
• 31 – 35	24.6	74.8
• 36 – 40	22.0	77.1
• 41 – 50	22.3	77.2
• 51 and older	21.1	78.3
MARITAL STATUS		
• Never married	24.8	74.1
• Married	21.1	78.2
• Divorced	31.1	67.9
• Separated	37.9	62.1
• Widow and widower	19.4	78.8
RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD		

• Higher status	22.6	76.2
• Middle status	25.6	73.6
• Lower status	21.6	77.5

### Motivations for criminality

Public attitude towards the offenders is influenced by perceptions of the causes of crime. Majority of the respondents attributed criminality to need and poverty. Only about one fifth attributed criminality to greed (table 35). Incidentally, the public perception substantially corresponds to academic explanation of criminality<sup>10</sup>.

**Table 245: Opinions on causes of or motivations for violent and property crimes**

Causes or motivations	Violent crimes		Property crimes	
	No.	%	No.	%
Real need and poverty	5238	46.9	5067	50.2
Greed	2575	23.1	2389	21.4
Non-financial motives	1141	10.2	903	8.1
Don't know	2046	18.3	2128	19.1
Refused to answer	161	1.4	134	1.2

The measures for the control of crimes by youths proposed by the respondents correspond to traditional values of family responsibility for child upbringing, instilling discipline and fear of God. However, the respondents also advocated socioeconomic measures of poverty and unemployment reduction (table 36) for crime prevention and control.

**Table 256: Opinions on measures for control of crimes by youths**

Measures	No.	%
Better parenting and upbringing of children	8657	77.6
More discipline in school and better education	7394	66.2
Reducing poverty and increasing employment opportunities	8671	77.7
Better and more policing	5490	49.2
Increasing sentences for crime	5067	45.4
Increased public enlightenment on effects of crime	6333	56.7
Teaching and instilling the fear of God	8923	79.9

*Note: Responses exceeded 100% because of multiple responses*

<sup>10</sup> Alemika EEO. 1993 "Criminology, Criminal Justice and Philosophy of Policing" in T.N. Tamuno, I. L. Bashir, E.E.O. Alemika, and A. Akano (eds.) *Policing Nigeria: Past, Present and Future* (Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.). Pp. 30 - 78.

## CHAPTER V

### FEELING OF SAFETY AND FEAR OF CRIME

The nature, extent and pattern of fear of crime have been attributed to several factors like age, sex, community population structure, incivility, prior victimization and high crime incidence<sup>11</sup>. In this section, we analysed the data with respect to the extent of fear of crime and feeling of safety at home and in the neighbourhood, and the relationship between selected social characteristics and fear of crime.

#### **Feeling of safety at home during the day:**

Respondents generally felt safe at home alone during the day. Overall, 94.7% of the respondents said they felt safe while alone at home during the day; 4.1% felt a bit unsafe and only 1.3% felt very unsafe. Feeling of safety were highest among respondents in Kano, Ogun, Ondo, Yobe, Anambra, Imo, Kogi, Kwara, Osun, Sokoto, Taraba and Zamfara states and the FCT. In contrast, respondents felt less safe while alone at home alone at dark (night). Feeling of insecurity at dark was highest among respondents in Bayelsa, Benue, Edo, Nasarawa, Plateau, Rivers and Taraba states (table 37). In contrast, respondents in Kogi, Ogun, Ondo, Osun and Oyo states generally felt very safe while at home alone in the dark.

**Table 267: Feeling of safety at home during the day and at dark**

States	<i>How safe do you feel when you are at home alone during the day and at dark?</i>	
	% that felt safe during day	% that felt safe at dark
Abia	90.8	62.1
Adamawa	88.2	71.5
Akwa Ibom	94.7	73.6
Anambra	89.9	81.4
Bauchi	96.0	78.9
Bayelsa	85.7	29.4
Benue	93.5	58.3
Borno	95.7	85.8
Cross River	97.7	70.2
Delta	95.1	81.8
Ebonyi	91.2	79.1
Edo	83.7	51.6
Ekiti	96.4	82.1
Enugu	86.4	65.4
Gombe	91.0	68.1
Imo	97.9	88.2
Jigawa	91.9	80.3

<sup>11</sup> Silverman, EB. And Della-Giustina, J. 2001. 'Urban policing and fear of crime', *Urban Studies*, 38: 5-6; 941-957; Bennett, RR and Flavin, JM. 1994. 'Determinants of fear of crime: the effect of cultural setting', *Justice Quarterly*, 11: 357-381; Box, S., Hale, C. and Andrews G. 1988. 'Explaining fear of crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, 28, 340-356. Ferraro, KF. 1995. *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. New York: State University of New York Press. LaGrange, RL and Ferraro, KF. 1989. 'Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime', *Criminology*, 27: 697-719. Thomas, CW and Hyman JF. 1977. 'Perceptions of crime fear of victimization and public perception of police performance'. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 5: 305-317; Levi, M. 2001. 'Business, cities and fears about crimes'. *Urban Studies*, 38: 5-6: 849-868. Johnston, L. 2001. 'Crime, fear and civil policing'. *Urban Studies*, 38: 5-6: 959-976.

Kaduna	94.5	82.6
Kano	99.4	97.7
Katsina	96.4	92.9
Kebbi	92.6	81.8
Kogi	97.2	94.1
Kwara	96.7	85.7
Lagos	93.5	79.0
Nasarawa	92.1	75.4
Niger	95.7	88.9
Ogun	99.6	94.9
Ondo	98.8	92.8
Osun	97.7	96.0
Oyo	98.2	95.3
Plateau	94.9	69.5
Rivers	92.5	49.6
Sokoto	98.0	88.1
Taraba	96.3	71.8
Yobe	98.6	84.7
Zamfara	96.8	82.5
FCT Abuja	96.0	83.3
<b>National</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>79.6</b>

#### **Fear of Crime:**

Fear of crime, according to victimology literature, tends to be high, in excess of the actual risk of victimization. For example, 23.1% of the respondents said they were victims of any crime in 2006. However, 52.2% of the respondents said they were very fearful of becoming a victim of crime; another 20.4% were quite fearful (table 38). Altogether, 72.6% of the respondents were very or quite fearful of crime. Compared to the percentage that reported victimization during the year, the ratio of victimization to fear of victimization translated to 1:3.2. Very high percentages of respondents from Adamawa, Gombe, Jigawa, Ebonyi and Borno expressed fear of crime. In contrast relatively low proportion of respondents from Ekiti, Kwara, Lagos, Sokoto and Kogi state were afraid of becoming a victim of crime (table 38).

**Table 278: Fear of becoming a victim of crime**

States	<i>In general, how fearful are you in becoming a victim of any type of crime?</i>				
	Very fearful	Quite Fearful	A Little Fearful	Not At All Fearful	Don't Know
Abia	44.1	14.8	17.0	23.5	0.6
Adamawa	87.5	8.3	2.1	1.4	0.7
Akwa Ibom	35.7	26.1	20.8	11.8	5.6
Anambra	65.4	17.3	4.6	10.5	2.2
Bauchi	41.7	26.8	13.5	16.5	1.6
Bayelsa	42.9	31.7	11.1	12.7	1.6
Benue	57.4	21.3	6.8	14.5	0.0
Borno	59.3	26.5	7.4	4.9	1.9
Cross River	57.5	10.7	14.7	16.7	0.4
Delta	43.5	32.1	8.6	14.5	1.2
Ebonyi	31.5	40.7	21.3	6.0	0.5
Edo	57.1	21.0	6.0	15.5	0.4
Ekiti	15.5	8.0	37.8	38.2	0.4

Enugu	58.6	16.4	11.4	12.7	0.9
Gombe	64.6	25.0	6.9	2.8	0.7
Imo	34.3	24.4	16.7	20.7	4.0
Jigawa	91.4	2.8	1.4	4.2	0.3
Kaduna	48.3	23.9	12.0	15.4	0.4
Kano	55.2	17.1	7.9	19.6	0.2
Katsina	53.6	29.3	8.1	7.1	1.9
Kebbi	69.8	11.1	4.3	14.5	0.3
Kogi	49.4	16.6	7.5	24.5	2.0
Kwara	40.3	29.2	3.7	19.0	7.9
Lagos	61.8	6.1	5.4	25.8	0.9
Nasarawa	75.5	10.2	2.3	8.8	3.2
Niger	50.0	25.3	6.2	18.2	0.3
Ogun	59.5	23.8	8.3	7.9	0.4
Ondo	29.8	23.8	34.9	11.5	0.0
Osun	12.3	47.6	17.9	21.4	0.8
Oyo	52.3	15.7	9.0	21.5	1.4
Plateau	60.2	19.9	9.7	9.7	0.5
Rivers	65.5	10.3	8.7	14.7	0.8
Sokoto	47.6	11.5	14.3	23.4	3.2
Taraba	58.8	13.0	10.2	11.1	6.9
Yobe	30.1	40.3	14.4	15.3	0.0
Zamfara	55.2	26.6	4.4	13.9	0.0
FCT Abuja	65.9	19.4	4.0	9.5	1.2
<b>National</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>

**Socio-economic characteristics and fear of crime**

The relationship between social characteristics and fear of crime is one of the enduring interests in criminology, especially its sub-discipline of victimology. But the nature of the relationship has not been consistently determined. In some studies, victimization was reported to be strongly related to age and sex. Further, people who were less likely to experience victimization (aged and females) were reported to be more fearful of crime<sup>12</sup>. The data presented in table 39 show that females were more fearful of crime than males. Respondents in 18-24 years age category were most fearful of crime while those 51 years and older were least fearful. This pattern with respect to age differs from some findings in the literature which reported the opposite<sup>13</sup>. No significant differences in the level of fear of crime exhibited by people resident in different socio-economically determined residential areas, and among people of different marital statuses (table 39).

**Table 28: Socioeconomic characteristics and fear of crime**

Socioeconomic characteristics	Fear of crime	
	Yes	No
SEX		

<sup>12</sup> Box, S., Hale, C. and Andrews G. 1988. 'Explaining fear of crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, 28, 340-356. Ferraro, KF. 1995. *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. New York: State University of New York Press. LaGrange, RL and Ferraro, KF. 1989. 'Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime', *Criminology*, 27: 697-719.

<sup>13</sup> . LaGrange, RL and Ferraro, KF. 1989. 'Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime', *Criminology*, 27: 697-719.

• Male	70.2	28.5
• Female	75.0	23.5
AGE (years)		
• 18 – 24	75.1	23.5
• 25 – 30	71.3	27.1
• 31 – 35	71.6	26.9
• 36 – 40	72.8	25.9
• 41 – 50	73.7	25.3
• 51 and older	66.1	32.0
MARITAL STATUS		
• Never married	72.5	26.1
• Married	72.7	26.0
• Divorced	73.5	25.5
• Separated	74.1	25.8
• Widow and widower	75.7	20.6
RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD		
• Higher status	74.6	23.6
• Middle status	71.6	24.3
• Lower status	72.6	25.6

### Perception of the trend of crime

Crime is perceived as one of the major problems of the country, inhibiting its economic and socio-political development. Obasanjo administration (1999-2007) identified insecurity as a major hindrance to foreign investment. As a result, it established several committees to study and make recommendations for tackling the problems of violence and the reform of the various criminal justice agencies<sup>14</sup>. In spite of the measures, and also because the recommendations of the Committees were not vigorously implemented, the high incidences of crime, especially armed robbery and corruption, persist and remain major concern to the public. The security agencies, especially the police introduced special task forces to curb crimes like armed robbery, human trafficking and fraud. Overall, respondents said crime increased during the preceding twelve months. Thus, 48.7% of the respondents said that crime increased, 24.4% said it decreased, while 22.1% said crime rate remained the same during the period (table 40).

**Table 40: Perception of trend of crime in 2006**

States	<i>Opinion on crime increase in the country in the past 12 months</i>			
	Increased	Stayed the Same	Decreased	Don't Know
Lagos	66.0	13.2	19.0	1.8
Ogun	46.0	13.5	40.1	0.4
Oyo	61.8	17.1	17.6	3.5
Osun	34.5	22.2	26.6	16.7
Ondo	26.2	22.6	50.4	0.8
Ekiti	77.7	8.0	12.0	2.4

<sup>14</sup> The committees include Committee on Violence (chaired by Prof. Tekena Tamuno) and another on same issue (chaired by Justice Ayoola); Committee on the Reform of the Police (chaired by Alhaji Danmadami, retired Deputy Inspector-General of Police); Committee on Prison Reform (Chaired by Prof. Etannibi Alemika), and Commission on Criminal Justice Administration (chaired by Justice Ejiwumi).

Akwa Ibom	30.1	28.0	23.9	18.0
Bayelsa	77.0	12.7	7.1	3.2
Cross River	63.1	11.5	17.1	8.3
Delta	55.9	23.8	18.8	1.5
Edo	57.5	27.4	10.3	4.8
Rivers	64.7	11.9	22.2	1.2
Enugu	62.3	30.0	2.3	5.5
Anambra	47.8	26.9	17.3	8.0
Imo	59.0	26.5	10.8	3.7
Abia	79.6	13.9	6.5	0.0
Ebonyi	33.8	34.7	28.7	2.8
Kano	26.8	33.5	35.9	3.8
Sokoto	25.4	25.4	43.3	6.0
Kaduna	46.6	16.2	34.0	3.2
Katsina	46.6	33.5	12.2	7.7
Zamfara	29.0	33.3	26.9	0.8
Kebbi	45.2	32.9	20.3	1.5
Jigawa	51.3	24.2	20.9	3.6
Bauchi	32.7	21.8	42.9	2.6
Gombe	41.7	33.3	16.0	9.0
Borno	26.2	31.2	38.6	4.0
Adamawa	36.1	15.3	40.3	8.3
Taraba	43.1	9.7	36.6	10.6
Yobe	25.9	20.8	41.2	12.0
Plateau	62.5	16.2	15.3	6.0
Nasarawa	58.3	21.8	11.1	8.8
Benue	64.8	15.7	18.2	1.2
Kogi	49.4	30.0	15.8	4.7
Kwara	32.9	25.0	36.6	5.6
Niger	43.5	12.3	36.4	7.7
FCT Abuja	54.8	20.6	20.2	4.4
<b>National</b>	<b>48.7</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>4.9</b>

### Security and safety and measures

When the incidence of crime is perceived to be high and fear of crime is widespread, individuals adopt different measures to reduce their vulnerability. In table 41, the different measures adopted by the respondents are presented. Special door locks as well as door and window iron grilles were the most common safety measures adopted by the respondents. Overall, respondents adopted target hardening measures rather than electronic and other surveillance methods. In Nigeria, the rich usually build high fences around their premises, install special doors and locks, employ security guard and deploy dogs for their security. In contrast the poor tend to rely on locks, grilles, and arrangements between neighbours for mutual security.

**Table 29: Measures adopted for security and safety at home**

Measures	No.	%
Burglar alarm	648	5.8
Neighbourhood crime watch scheme	1490	13.4
Special door locks	3843	34.4
Special window and door grilles	2444	21.9
Dogs that would detect burglars	1622	14.5
High fence	2231	20.0

Care taker or security guard	1165	10.4
Special friendly arrangement for surveillance by neighbours	2357	21.1
Police	464	4.2

### Most prevalent crimes in community

Fear of crime derives from either high incidences or seriousness of the crimes in the community. Respondents across the country identified several crimes as the most prevalent in their communities. Violent and non-violent property crimes (robbery, theft, burglary) were the crimes that occur most frequently in the Nigerian communities and city neighbourhoods (table 42).

**Table 30: Crime that occurs most frequently in the neighbourhood**

Crime	No.	%
Theft of property	2487	22.3
Robbery	1833	16.4
Livestock theft	766	6.9
House breaking	771	6.9
Domestic violence	651	5.8
Assault	590	5.3
Pick pocket and bag snatching	518	4.6
Murder	460	4.1
Crop theft	389	3.5
Theft of motor vehicle	204	1.8
Sexual assault and rape	196	1.8
Land grabbing	176	1.6
Kidnapping	131	1.2
Others	424	3.8
Don't know	1565	14.0

### Opinions on measures for safety from property crime in community

The respondent suggested several measures to curb property crimes. Prominent among them were increased employment opportunities, poverty reduction and better education (table 43). Surprisingly, especially in the context of public complaints against police activities, very little emphasis was paid to law enforcement and punishment as strategies for crime control.

**Table 31: Measures for ensuring safety from property crime**

Measures	No.	%
More police	546	4.9
Equip police better	1074	9.6
Equip judiciary better	203	1.8
Provide harsher punishment	625	5.6
Better education and vocational training opportunities	1843	16.5
Reduce poverty level	2720	24.4
Create more employment opportunities	3252	29.1
Give police better orientation	429	3.8
Don't know	355	3.2
No response	114	1.0



## CHAPTER VI

### PERCEPTIONS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES

The coercive powers of the state are exercised through the armed forces and the criminal justice agencies. Indeed the routine exercise of such powers is reflected in the activities of the police and quasi-police agencies, prosecutors, courts and the prisons. The actions and inactions of the criminal justice agencies affect the rights of the citizens as well as the conditions of safety and security in society. Consequently, their conduct and performance affects the legitimacy of the government.

#### Contacts with the police

More than one-third (37.6%) of the respondents were stopped (on foot or in vehicle) by the police during the twelve months. The contacts resulted in arrest and detention (3.4%), bribery to get out of problem (50.8%); peddling of influence to avoid problem (3.9%); no action was required or taken by the police (37.0%), and other actions (4.9%). One of the elements of community policing which is currently the buzz-word in law enforcement is the visibility of police officers in communities, which proponents argue increase confidence in the police and reduce fear of crime. In essence, visibility of police and visible policing promote feeling of safety. Nearly one-half (49.1%) of the respondents said they see a police officer on duty at least once a day; 31.0% (3081) see them at least once a week; 11.3% see them at least once a month, and 8.7% (969) had never seen a police officer on duty in their neighbourhood or community. These responses indicate a fairly high level of visibility of the police in the community. Contrary to the assumption that the presence of the police in the community is an unquestionable good, literature showed that such presence are often resented in the communities with very large population of poor people. The resentment is attributed to the mutual suspicion of the poor and the police in many countries where police presence is considered as surveillance and harbinger of trouble<sup>15</sup>.

#### Police-citizen encounter

Citizens are more likely to come into contact with the police than other criminal justice agencies. A frequent context for such contact is in the course of stop and search by the police, a method they often used for crime prevention, control and investigation. More than a third (37.6%) of the respondents was stopped by the police during the preceding twelve months. Such contacts were highest in Nasarawa, Ogun, Abia, Oyo, Imo, Ekiti, Niger and Rivers states. Reports of such contacts were lowest Kogi, Katsina, Kwara, Akwa Ibom, Anambra, Cross River, Anambra, Zamfara and the FCT (table 44).

**Table 32: Experience of stop and search by the police**

States	<i>Over the past 12 months, have you been stopped by the police either on foot or in a vehicle?</i>		
	Yes	No	No Response
Abia	56.5	42.3	1.2
Adamawa	39.6	59.0	1.4
Akwa Ibom	21.4	74.5	4.0

<sup>15</sup> Alemika, EEO. 1999 - "Police-Community Relations in Nigeria: What Went Wrong?" Commissioned Paper Presented at the *Seminar on Role and Function of the Police in Post-Military Era*, organized by the Centre for Law Enforcement Education and National Human Rights Commission, held at the Savannah Suites, Abuja, March 8-10.

Anambra	24.4	72.5	3.1
Bauchi	37.9	61.9	0.2
Bayelsa	46.4	53.2	0.4
Benue	36.1	63.9	0.0
Borno	30.2	68.5	1.2
Cross River	24.6	74.2	1.2
Delta	29.3	69.4	1.2
Ebonyi	41.7	57.9	0.5
Edo	39.3	58.7	2.0
Ekiti	52.2	45.4	2.4
Enugu	40.9	58.6	0.5
Gombe	27.8	68.8	3.5
Imo	53.1	43.2	3.7
Jigawa	54.9	45.1	0.0
Kaduna	41.5	57.5	1.1
Kano	31.3	67.9	0.8
Katsina	19.4	78.0	2.6
Kebbi	23.7	75.1	1.2
Kogi	14.6	85.0	0.4
Kwara	24.1	74.1	1.9
Lagos	46.1	53.0	0.9
Nasarawa	62.0	36.6	1.4
Niger	50.6	49.1	0.3
Ogun	60.7	38.9	0.4
Ondo	30.2	68.7	1.2
Osun	28.2	70.2	1.6
Oyo	57.2	42.4	0.5
Plateau	38.4	59.7	1.9
Rivers	50.4	48.8	0.8
Sokoto	27.8	71.4	0.8
Taraba	29.6	69.4	0.9
Yobe	36.6	63.4	0.0
Zamfara	22.6	77.4	0.0
FCT Abuja	23.8	75.8	0.4
<b>National</b>	<b>37.6</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>

### Perception of police performance

The police perform various functions, many of which are not obvious to citizens and not taken into account when evaluating the police. For example, patrol is an important function of the police and through which they prevent crime, obtain information that are relevant to crime control, and demonstrate visible presence that inspire confidence in citizens. However, police tend to be evaluated more by arrests and recovery of property from criminals. There is continuing controversy among criminologists and policy makers concerning the appropriate measures of police performance. Notwithstanding the difficulty of assessing the performance of the police, citizens do applaud or condemn their police forces for performance or ineffectiveness respectively. More than one-half (55.4%) of the respondents adjudged the performance of the Nigerian police in respect of crime control as fairly (42.2%) or very (13.2%) good. Further 18.8% rated their performance as average – neither good nor bad. About a quarter (25.8%) rated the performance of the police as fairly (13.4%) or very (12.4%) poor. Wide variations were observed

in the perception of the performance of the police across the states. Police performance was rated highly by respondents in Jigawa, Zamfara, Benue, Bauchi, Kebbi, Sokoto, Delta, Adamawa, Niger and Plateau states. In contrast, the respondents in Bayelsa, Rivers, Ekiti, and Lagos states rated the performance of the police as poor (table 45).

**Table 335: Performance of the police in crime control**

States	<i>Opinion on how good or poor the police are in the control of crime.</i>				
	Very Poor Job	Fairly Poor Job	Neither Good Nor Poor	Fairly Good Job	Very Good Job
Abia	17.6	16.4	15.1	37.7	13.3
Adamawa	5.6	5.6	19.4	47.2	22.2
Akwa Ibom	12.7	12.1	47.5	21.4	6.2
Anambra	13.9	15.4	19.8	41.7	9.3
Bauchi	2.8	7.7	18.3	55.4	15.9
Bayelsa	39.7	17.5	19.0	19.4	4.4
Benue	11.1	10.5	2.2	69.8	6.5
Borno	1.9	7.7	17.3	65.1	8.0
Cross River	7.5	13.5	18.3	38.9	21.8
Delta	6.5	18.2	10.8	52.5	12.0
Ebonyi	5.1	6.9	28.2	54.6	5.1
Edo	16.7	20.2	32.9	25.4	4.8
Ekiti	42.2	25.5	8.8	17.1	6.4
Enugu	15.9	20.5	36.4	22.3	5.0
Gombe	6.9	8.3	24.3	52.1	8.3
Imo	9.3	13.6	18.5	48.8	9.9
Jigawa	3.6	5.0	9.5	25.9	56.0
Kaduna	17.5	17.5	13.9	42.3	8.8
Kano	6.7	13.9	18.3	47.2	13.9
Katsina	3.6	8.3	22.2	34.8	31.0
Kebbi	8.6	2.5	31.4	32.3	25.2
Kogi	9.1	11.1	19.8	50.2	9.9
Kwara	3.7	11.6	35.6	36.1	13.0
Lagos	30.0	13.3	12.4	32.2	12.0
Nasarawa	15.7	11.1	28.7	31.0	13.4
Niger	11.1	13.0	4.3	58.0	13.6
Ogun	6.7	19.8	17.9	52.0	3.6
Ondo	11.9	14.7	20.2	47.6	5.6
Osun	2.4	9.1	46.8	38.1	3.6
Oyo	16.7	26.6	14.6	37.3	4.9
Plateau	11.6	18.5	4.2	56.0	9.7
Rivers	35.7	24.2	8.7	29.4	2.0
Sokoto	6.3	8.3	18.7	42.1	24.6
Taraba	8.3	6.0	22.7	43.5	19.4
Yobe	11.1	11.6	24.1	48.6	4.6
Zamfara	0.8	7.1	6.7	62.3	23.0
FCT Abuja	8.3	19.8	9.9	52.8	9.1
<b>National</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>42.2</b>	<b>13.2</b>

### Police performance in helping and serving members of the public

Besides law enforcement, police are expected and do to varying degree in different jurisdictions to assist citizens in distress or difficult circumstances. Literature on the American police shows that law enforcement officials spend substantial time dealing with issues and problems not directly related to the breach of the law. In societies where the police serve and help people in circumstances other than booking them for the breach of law, the public respect for and confidence in the police tend to be high. But where encounter between the police and the public tend to occur predominantly in the course of law enforcement, there tend to be high level of public hostility towards the police<sup>16</sup>. Slightly less than one-half (48.1%) of the respondents across the country agreed that ‘the police are doing everything they can to help people and to be of good service’. Nearly three-tenths of the respondents disagreed and slightly more than one fifth (22.1%) maintained a neutral position. Overall, the public did not perceive the police as very helpful. Notwithstanding this general pattern, overwhelming majority of respondents in some states like Jigawa, Zamfara, Taraba, Benue, Bauchi and Adamawa states said the police strive to be very helpful and of service to the public. However, respondents from Bayelsa, Ekiti and Rivers differed (table 46).

**Table 34: Police service and help to the public**

States	<i>The police are doing everything they can to help people and to be of good service.</i>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Abia	11.7	28.7	20.4	29.0	10.2
Adamawa	2.1	8.3	28.5	48.6	12.5
Akwa Ibom	11.5	17.7	51.9	15.8	3.1
Anambra	13.3	16.4	23.1	40.7	6.5
Bauchi	2.2	10.5	20.2	53.8	13.3
Bayelsa	40.5	29.0	13.1	15.1	2.4
Benue	9.6	13.3	1.5	67.3	8.3
Borno	1.2	21.0	19.4	51.9	6.5
Cross River	4.0	18.7	14.7	52.8	9.9
Delta	11.7	18.8	17.6	45.7	6.2
Ebonyi	2.8	16.2	32.4	43.5	5.1
Edo	17.9	25.4	37.3	18.3	1.2
Ekiti	37.1	36.3	10.0	14.3	2.4
Enugu	11.4	33.2	39.1	15.9	0.5
Gombe	3.5	26.4	17.4	49.3	3.5
Imo	8.6	18.2	25.0	34.0	14.2
Jigawa	2.2	7.2	12.3	47.9	30.4
Kaduna	17.7	19.7	17.9	38.2	6.4
Kano	6.0	19.4	18.3	46.0	10.3
Katsina	3.6	10.5	28.0	37.6	20.3
Kebbi	4.0	8.3	43.4	28.0	16.3
Kogi	5.1	13.4	28.9	43.9	8.7
Kwara	4.6	10.2	41.7	28.2	15.3
Lagos	21.7	22.7	16.4	35.4	3.8

<sup>16</sup> Alemika, EEO. 1999 “Police - community relations in Nigeria: what went wrong?” Paper Presented at the Seminar on Role and Function of the Police in a Post-Military Era, organized by the Centre for Law Enforcement Education (CLEEN) and the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), at Abuja, FCT, from 8 - 10 March, 1999.

Nasarawa	15.3	16.7	35.6	26.4	6.0
Niger	5.9	17.9	12.0	58.3	5.9
Ogun	6.3	31.3	24.6	34.1	3.6
Ondo	6.0	25.0	21.4	43.7	4.0
Osun	2.4	11.5	50.8	32.1	3.2
Oyo	12.5	34.3	17.6	32.6	3.0
Plateau	12.0	25.5	2.8	56.9	2.8
Rivers	31.7	31.3	11.1	25.8	0.0
Sokoto	4.8	12.7	21.8	44.0	16.7
Taraba	4.2	12.0	19.4	51.9	12.5
Yobe	6.9	17.6	23.6	49.5	2.3
Zamfara	1.2	9.9	8.7	70.2	9.9
FCT Abuja	5.6	31.3	11.5	46.4	5.2
<b>National</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>8.3</b>

### Knowledge of law enforcement agencies

Despite the assertion that the ignorance of the law is not an excuse or defence in criminal proceedings, it is obvious that knowledge of legal provisions and functions of law enforcement and regulatory agencies will enhance compliance. The respondents were generally aware of the existence of the major law enforcement agencies (table 47) involved in the control of economic crimes (EFCC), corruption (EFCC and ICPC), adulterated drugs (NAFDAC), and misconduct by the police (PSC). Nearly nine-tenths of the citizens have heard of EFCC and NAFDAC and far less has heard of ICPC (53.7%) and PSC (29.6%). The poor knowledge of the PSC may be attributed to the fact that unlike the rest, its primary responsibilities do not involve routine contact with the public. Nonetheless given its oversight role over the police, it needs to increase public awareness of its functions so that it can receive public support necessary for ensuring effective performance and integrity among the country's police officials.

**Table 357: Knowledge or awareness of law enforcement and regulatory agencies**

Ever heard of the following agencies?	Respondents that said YES	
	No.	%
Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC)	5989	53.7
Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC)	8941	80.1
National Agency for Food and Drug Administration (NAFDAC)	9847	88.2
Police Service Commission (PSC)	3301	29.6

### Informal policing organisations in neighbourhoods

One of the changes taking place globally with respect to policing is the steady increase in the number of non-state policing agencies that have emerged to satisfy demands for security which the public police forces were unable to satisfy. The trend can be observed in the rapid growth of private security companies in developed economies and the proliferation of vigilante and crime watch groups in the less developed economies as well as in the poor communities within the cities of the advanced economies.

### Presence and use of private security and vigilantes

Vigilante groups have always existed in different communities within the country. The groups may be classified into three types: (1) groups consisting of young people resident in a neighbourhood who engaged in night patrol to curb criminality in their neighbourhood; (2)

groups recruited and paid by residents; (3) organisations that have multiple ethnic, religious and other objectives, including vigilantism, which often should be properly referred to as militias. The excesses of the latter groups so boldly represented by the activities of the *Baksssi Boys* in Anambra and Abia states between 1999 and 2004, and *Odu'a People's Congress* in Lagos and other south-western states between 1994 and 2004 generated concern about the role of informal policing groups in the country. As a result, the existence and contributions of the other two types of vigilante groups to crime prevention and control are grudgingly acknowledged. One-third (33.3%) of the respondents used the services of community based vigilantes, crime watch groups and militias for security and 8.0% employed the services of private security or guards (table 48). Nearly two-thirds of the respondents (64.6%) said private security officials and guards were doing a good job. Nearly one-half of the respondents reported the existence of vigilante groups in their neighbourhoods or communities. More than one-half of the respondents in the communities where vigilantes existed saw them administering punishment to suspects. Further, vigilante groups were remunerated through fees levied on residents (table 48).

**Table 36: Presence and activities of crime watch and vigilante groups in neighbourhoods**

Presence and activities of organisations providing security in neighbourhoods	Respondents that said YES	
	No.	%
Presence of an organisation other than police providing security in neighbourhood	5078	45.5
Existence of vigilante groups	5257	47.1
Payment of fees for services of vigilante groups (respondents being only those with such services in their neighbourhood = 5257)	3815	72.6
Vigilante groups administer physical punishment on suspects (N=5257)	2961	56.3
Vigilante groups arrest suspects (N=5257)	2333	44.4
Seen vigilante groups administering physical punishment on suspects (N=5257)	1948	37.1
Members of the public in neighbourhood administering physical punishment on suspects (N=11161)	2383	21.4

There are variations across the states with respect to the use of vigilante and crime watch groups for neighbourhood policing. The states with high presence of such organisations were Yobe, Zamfara, Oyo, Niger, Nasarawa, Borno and Bauchi. Their presence was reported by relative small percentages of respondents from Rivers, Katsina, Kebbi and Sokoto states (table 49).

**Table 379: Presence of informal policing organisations in neighbourhoods**

States	<i>Use of community based organizations (e.g. OPC, Volunteers, Vigilantes, neighbourhood watch)?</i>
	<b>Yes</b>
Abia	20.4
Adamawa	11.8
Akwa Ibom	10.6
Anambra	27.8
Bauchi	55.4
Bayelsa	6.0
Benue	58.6
Borno	26.5
Cross River	15.9

Delta	36.1
Ebonyi	24.5
Edo	37.7
Ekiti	31.5
Enugu	40.0
Gombe	15.3
Imo	50.0
Jigawa	14.8
Kaduna	40.8
Kano	17.1
Katsina	8.1
Kebbi	10.2
Kogi	31.2
Kwara	37.0
Lagos	34.3
Nasarawa	49.1
Niger	50.0
Ogun	32.5
Ondo	42.5
Osun	46.8
Oyo	65.3
Plateau	24.5
Rivers	2.4
Sokoto	10.7
Taraba	35.6
Yobe	96.8
Zamfara	68.3
FCT Abuja	34.9
<b>National</b>	<b>33.3</b>

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

1. Nearly a quarter (24.5%) of the respondents in the 2006 Survey reported the involvement of a member of their household in a family, marital, work-related, commercial or land dispute during the preceding twelve months. This figure is about the same (24.9%) as that reported in the 2005 Survey...
2. The disputes were related to the following matters: land (30.6%); money and finance (24.6%); physical fights (22.5%); marital relationship (20.2%); work and employment (14.5%); male and female love relationships (13.7%); inheritance – excluding land (7.9%); sexual harassment (2.7%) and others (5%).
3. The disputes were resolved through the following mechanisms and agents: family members and friends (47.8%); Police (19.6%); traditional leaders (11.9%); courts of law (5%); religious leaders (4.8%); Political leaders (2.9%); community associations and group leaders (2.0%); vigilante groups (0.5%); non-governmental and community based organisation (0.3%); professional associations (0.4%); armed forces (0.1%) and others (4.6%).
4. Respondents reported substantial satisfaction with the handling of the dispute by the respective mechanisms that they employed.
5. Theft, assault and robbery outside home were the three major forms of criminal victimization experienced by household members during the 2006. The level of reported victimization for assault at home, rape, murder and robbery at home of household members remain relatively similar for 2005 and 2006.
6. The same rates of incidence of rape of household members were recorded outside the home (0.9%) as at home (0.9%).
7. Overall 0.8% and 1.3% of the respondents respectively reported the murder of a member of their households at home and outside home.
8. There are very significant variations in rates of victimization across the states. States with very high rates of victimizations in 2006 were Rivers, Abia, Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Imo, Oyo and the Federal Capital Territory. Some states recorded rates of victimization that were significantly lower than the national average of 23.1%. They were Osun, Plateau, Yobe, Niger, Katsina, Ekiti and Kwara states. Few states, like Kogi, Osun, Plateau and Taraba, recorded decline in the rates of victimization in 2006. Many states recorded major increases in the rates of victimizations. The states were Lagos, Ogun, Oyo, Delta, Borno, Enugu and the FCT.
9. Overall, 4.2% and 8.0% of the respondents respectively reported being victims of armed robbery and attempted robbery. Robbery incidences were highest in Rivers, Edo, Bayelsa, Abia, Adamawa, Imo and Borno states. Similarly, cases of attempted robbery were reported by significant percentages of respondents in Rivers, Imo, Bayelsa, Borno, Edo, Enugu, Nasarawa, Niger, Lagos, Sokoto, Jigawa States and the FCT.
10. Overall, 2.1% and 4.4% of the female respondents said they were victims of rape and attempted rape during the preceding twelve months. States with high incidences of rape were occurred in Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Rivers, Cross River, Imo and Nasarawa and Abuja, and the FCT. Similarly, high incidences of attempted rape were reported in Bayelsa, Akwa Ibom, Delta, Imo, Nasarawa, Plateau, Edo and Rivers states. Most of the rape victims knew the offenders – 53.1% of knew offenders by sight and name; 18.8% knew the offenders by sight, and 3.1% knew them by name only. Only 21.1 % said they did not know the offender.



11. Theft of mobile phone handsets also became a common for criminality. In the 2005 survey, 9.5% of the respondents reported being victim of the crime. The figure rose significantly to 15.7% in 2006.
12. More than three-tenths (30.5%) of the respondents in 2005 survey reported being victim of cheating. The figure for the 2006 survey was lower at 27.1%.
13. Most victims of rape and assault did not report to the police. Two-thirds of murder cases and less than one-half of robbery cases were reported to the police.
14. Respondents generally reported lower incidences of corruption in 2006 compared to their perception of the trend between 1999 and 2005.
15. The percentage of respondents who said officials of certain agencies were likely to demand bribe declined, in some cases quite significantly.
16. Data obtained from the female respondents indicate that boyfriends were more likely batter or assault their mates than husbands did against their spouses.
17. About two-thirds of crime occurred at or near the home of the victims. Very high proportion of the crimes occurred in the evening and night. The only exception is physical assault that occurred more in the morning and afternoon. Theft of mobile phone, physical assault, attempted rape and attempted murder were clustered around afternoon and evening.
18. The data revealed the preponderance of the use of knife, machete and handgun in robbery and murder.
19. Although slight differences can be observed, significant differences in the rates of victimization were not observed among the different socioeconomic groups.
20. Majority of the respondents attributed criminality to need and poverty. Only about one fifth attributed criminality to greed.
21. Overall, 94.7% of the respondents said they felt safe while alone at home during the day; 4.1% felt a bit unsafe and only 1.3% felt very unsafe.
22. Altogether, 72.6% of the respondents were very or quite fearful of crime. Compared to the percentage that reported victimization during the year, the ratio of victimization to fear of victimization translated to 1:3.2.
23. Females were more fearful of crime than males. Respondents in 18-24 years age category were most fearful of crime while those 51 years and older were least fearful. This pattern with respect to age differs from some findings in the literature which reported the opposite<sup>17</sup>. No significant differences in the level of fear of crime exhibited by people resident in different socio-economically determined residential areas, and among people of different marital statuses.
24. Overall, respondents said crime increased during the preceding twelve months. Thus, 48.7% of the respondents said that crime increased, 24.4% said it decreased, while 22.1% said crime rate remained the same during the period.
25. Special door locks as well as door and window iron grilles were the most popular adopted. Overall, respondents adopted target hardening measures rather than electronic and other surveillance methods.
26. Violent and non-violent property crimes (robbery, theft, burglary) were the most widely reported crimes that occur most frequently in the Nigerian communities and city neighbourhoods.
27. More than one-third (37.6%) of the respondents were stopped (on foot or in vehicle) by the police during the twelve months. The contacts resulted in arrest and detention (3.4%), bribery to get out of problem (50.8%); peddling of influence to avoid problem; no action was required or taken by the police (37.0%), and other actions (4.9%).

---

<sup>17</sup>. LaGrange, RL and Ferraro, KF. 1989. 'Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime', *Criminology*, 27: 697-719.

28. Nearly one-half (49.1%) of the respondents said they see a police officer on duty at least once a day; 31.0% (3081) see them at least once a week; 11.3% see them at least once a month, and 8.7% (969) had never seen a police officer on duty in their neighbourhood or community.
29. More than one-half (55.4%) of the respondents adjudged the performance of the Nigerian police in respect of crime control as fairly (42.2%) or very (13.2%) good. Further 18.8% rated their performance as average – neither good nor bad. About a quarter (25.8%) rated the performance of the police as fairly (13.4%) or very (12.4%) poor.
30. Nearly nine-tenths of the citizens have heard of EFCC and NAFDAC and far less has heard of ICPC (53.7%) and PSC (29.6%).
31. One-third (33.3%) of the respondents used the services of community based vigilantes, crime watch groups and militias for security and 8.0% employed the services of private security or guards. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents (64.6%) said private security officials and guards were doing a good job. Nearly one-half of the respondents reported the existence of vigilante groups in their neighbourhoods or communities. More than one-half of the respondents in the communities where vigilantes existed saw them administering punishment to suspects. Further, vigilante groups were remunerated through fees levied on residents.
32. The respondent suggested several measures to curb property crimes. Prominent among them were increased employment opportunities, poverty reduction and better education.



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)