

# CLEEN FOUNDATION

Lagos, Nigeria

## NATIONAL CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION AND SAFETY SURVEY, 2010<sup>1</sup> *SUMMARY OF FINDINGS*

Prof. Etannibi ALEMIKA

### **1.0: Introduction and objectives**

Crime victimization surveys are very critical instruments of law-making, polices, programmes and decisions aimed at promoting security and safety in society. They are also required instruments for effective and efficient planning, operations and administration by the police, prosecutors, judges and prison officials. The significance of crime surveys derive from the inadequacies of official criminal statistics produced by the police, prosecutors, courts, prisons and numerous other law enforcement and regulatory agencies in the various countries. Reliable crime statistics are required by various groups for different purposes. Without reliable crime statistics:

1. Criminologists cannot produce reliable and valid theoretical explanations of criminals, crimes and victims;
2. Law-makers and criminal justice policy-makers cannot develop relevant and effective laws and policies for effective control of crime and insecurity.
3. Law enforcement officials cannot offer effective service because they do not know the extent and pattern of crime and victimization in their commands.
4. Judges cannot pass judgments that reconcile the interests of the society, offenders and victims;
5. Prison and correction officials will lack the required information for the training, reformation and rehabilitation of offenders
6. Members of the society will lack the necessary information that may assist them in taking the appropriate actions that may enhance their personal safety and public security.

Due to the significance of crime and victimization statistics, nations strive to develop adequate capacity and deploy enough human, financial and infrastructural resources for 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 availability of reliable crime and victimization statistics has remained a major problem, to varying degrees, in most countries.

Several problems impinge on the collection of reliable statistics on criminal activity and victimization<sup>2</sup>. The following are the major difficulties.

---

<sup>1</sup> Conducted In July 2010

<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).

- a. Some crimes occur without anyone realizing it;
- b. Many victims of crimes do not report them to formal law enforcement officials such as the police to enable them record such events;
- c. 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.

### ***Measurement and sources of crime statistics***

There are three measurement and sources of crime statistics. They are the official statistics, self-report crime survey, and crime victim survey.

*Official crime statistics:* Official crime statistics are mainly produced by the police, prisons and the courts. Official statistics are the traditional indicators of the level and pattern of criminality. But they are inaccurate due to dark figures (unreported crimes), grey figures (reported but unrecorded crimes; manipulation of records to satisfy political and, or institutional interests like 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. They are useful for the purpose of understanding the volume, variety, and distribution of crimes processed by the criminal justice institutions.

*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 victimization 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 present study adopted the crime victimization survey method.

## **2.0: Criminal Victimization: Theoretical Overview**

The major theories of crime victimizations, that attempts to explain propensity or vulnerability to criminal victimization, are the:

- ❖ Victim precipitated perspective;

- ❖ Lifestyle and exposure approach;
- ❖ Deviant (victimogenic) place;
- ❖ Routine activities perspectives, and
- ❖ Integrated approach (lifestyle, routine activities and opportunity model).

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

The risk of criminal victimization is seen as largely dependent on the lifestyle and routine activities of persons that bring them and/or their property into direct contact with potential offenders in the absence of capable guardians who could potentially prevent the occurrence of a crime.

### **3.0: Population, Sampling and Method**

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.

The population for the study consists of all adult Nigerian males and females aged 18 years and older. It was conducted in all the thirty six states of Nigeria (36) and the Federal Capital Territory. The basic methodology employed for data collection was the in-home, face-to-face personal interview using a stratified multi-stage random selection procedure in order to achieve a nationally representative sample (proportional representative sample).

Respondents for this study were adult Nigerian males and females aged, eighteen years and above and have stayed in the selected household for a period of not less than six months. Non-citizens of Nigeria, people aged less than eighteen years and people living in institutionalized settings were not part of the respondents. A total of 11518 respondents were interviewed in July 2011.

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.

The fieldwork for the survey was conducted by Practical Sampling International (PSI), a very competent private commercial company with wide experience in survey research.

### **4.0: Findings**

The major findings on criminal victimization, fear of crime and corruption are highlighted in this presentation.

#### *Victimization of household members and respondents*

Respondents were asked two separate questions. The first asked the respondents to report if any member of their household (other than themselves) were victims of specific crimes in

2010. The second question asked the respondents if they were victims of specific crimes during 2010. Their responses are presented in table 1.

Table 1: Household and Personal Victimization: 2010

Crime	% of respondents who reported victimization	
	Household members	Personal victimization
Murder	1.3	-
Attempted murder	1.4	2.5
Robbery	6.7	13.5
Attempted robbery	3.5	6.2
Rape	1.0	1.2 <sup>3</sup>
Attempted rape	1.4	1.6
Kidnapping	0.8	0.9
Attempted kidnapping	0.8	1.4
Theft of car	2.0	2.0
Motorcycle theft	4.0	5.3
Domestic violence	13.8	21.0
Same-sex intercourse	2.0	2.4
Physical assault	10.6	20.2
Theft of mobile GSM phone	21.1	49.9
Burglary	9.3	13.7
Theft of money	16.2	34.8
Theft from car	3.1	3.8
Theft of agricultural product	6.9	10.3

The most common forms of victimization were theft of various kinds of property (GSM handset, money, agricultural products), domestic violence, robbery and physical assault (table 1). Overall 23.7% of the respondents reported being victim of crimes in 2010.

The respondents were further asked about their personal last victimization in 2010. Their responses indicated the following as the most common forms of victimization: theft of GSM handset, theft of money, physical assault, domestic violence, robbery, theft of agricultural products and burglary (table 2).

---

<sup>3</sup> Only female respondents were asked the question

Table 2: Last experience of criminal victimization in 2010

Crime	% of respondents who reported following crime as their most recent victimization
Attempted murder	0.8
Robbery	6.6
Attempted robbery	2.7
Rape	1.2
Motorcycle theft	2.1
Domestic violence	8.1
Physical assault	7.2
Theft of mobile phone	35.7
Burglary	4.5
Theft of money	23.2
Theft of agricultural products	4.4

Comparative Personal victimization across the States indicate that the highest level of personal victimization was reported in Jigawa, Rivers, FCT and Ebonyi. In contrast the lowest levels were reported in Osun, Imo, Enugu, Abia, Ogun and Lagos states (table 3)

Table 3: Personal victimization in 2010

State	<i>% that reported personal victimization in 2010</i>
Jigawa	73.7
Rivers	52.0
FCT	51.0
Ebonyi	44.8
Akwa-Ibom	38.2
Kwara	37.7
Delta	37.6
Nasarawa	37.0
Oyo	33.9
Taraba	33.9
Bauchi	33.7
Niger	28.8
Anambra	28.7
Plateau	25.9
Kebbi	25.6
Sokoto	25.0
Ekiti	22.9
Kano	22.0
Borno	20.7
Ondo	20.5

Gombe	20.1
Kogi	19.7
Adamawa	19.1
Katsina	19.1
Bayelsa	18.8
Yobe	18.8
Kaduna	18.7
Cross River	17.3
Benue	15.5
Edo	15.5
Zamfara	15.0
Lagos	12.3
Ogun	11.2
Abia	10.6
Enugu	10.5
Imo	10.5
Osun	7.9
National	23.7

More than a half (56.1%) of the respondents reported their experience of victimization to family members and friends while less than a fifth (16.0%) reported to the police. Among those that reported to the police, 8.1% and 29.1% respectively were very satisfied and satisfied the way they were treated by the police while 12.3% and 35.8% of the respondents were not satisfied and not satisfied at all respectively.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with the police handling of their victimization complaints include:

- a. 31.1% - police did not do enough to apprehend offenders;
- b. 28.2% - police did not recover property;
- c. 5.5% - police did not keep complainant properly informed of actions and progress
- d. 4.6% - police did not treat complainant with respect;
- e. 12.2% - police were slow to arrive when invited during victimization or distress;
- f. 14.7% - police demanded for bribe, and
- g. 2.9% - police colluded with the suspects

#### *Rape victimization*

Rape is a form of sexual violence with devastating psychological, social and economic impact on the victims who are predominantly women. Experience of rape victimization was explored but limited only to female respondents (5767).

Female respondents reported being victims of following forms of sexual violence in 2010.

- ❖ 1.0% reported being raped during the year
- ❖ 1.8% reported attempted rape
- ❖ 2.0% reported indecent assault
- ❖ 3.7% reported offensive behaviours

Rape victims are generally known to be reluctant in reporting their experience to law enforcement agencies due to fear of stigmatisation and insensitivity.

- ❖ 27.8% of the respondents said they reported the incidence of rape or attempted rape of which they were victims to the police
- ❖ Among those who reported to the police, 47.8% were satisfied with the handling of the case
- ❖ However, 40.9% were not satisfied and cited the following reasons for their dissatisfaction:
  - 47.8% - police did not do enough to apprehend the offenders
  - 13.0% - police did not keep victim adequately informed of actions taken
  - 4.3% - police did not treat victim with respect
  - 8.7% - police were slow to arrive when invited or called for assistance
  - 17.4% - police asked for bribe
  - 8.7% - police colluded with suspects
- ❖ All the respondents in the sample were asked about the incidence and prevalence of rape in their neighbourhood, the following responses were obtained:
  - 68.3% said rape was non-existent
  - 27.9% reported that there were occasional and isolated cases
  - 6.5% said rape was widespread in their neighbourhood but not all the time
  - 1.8% reported that rape was widespread and happens all the time in the neighbourhood.
- ❖ The respondents were further asked reasons for women being raped and they gave the following reasons:
  - Provocative dressing by young women – 78.6%
  - Influence of the media – 19.7%
  - Lack of self-control by men – 47.8%
  - Mental illness of men – 27.5%
  - Influence of alcohol – 38.9%
  - Keeping late hours – 1.2%
  - Greed by women – 0.2%

### *Corruption in Nigeria*

Corruption is the most devastating threat to Nigeria's security, unity and development. Most of the critical problems in the country – violent inter-group conflicts, bureaucratic ineffectiveness, deterioration and absence of critical developmental and welfare infrastructure, widespread poverty; unemployment and crime are largely due to corruption. Inter-group conflicts are largely due to competition and rivalry over the control of the state agencies where corrupt practices thrive, while corruption engenders theft and misallocation of national resources required to prevent or mitigate economic, social and political problems. Consequently, corruption engenders socio-political and economic crises in the country.

There are difficulties in measuring the extent of corruption in institutions. Perception questions on corruption generally exaggerate the level of corruption because the responses tend to be based on diverse and generally unreliable sources. Our approach is to determine the extent of corruption among officials by asking those who had contacts with officials of

different agencies who asked them for bribe. Table 4 presents responses on contacts with agencies, demand for bribes by officials before delivering service and perceptions of likelihood of corruption in different agencies.

Table 4: Contacts with officials, demand for bribe and perceived likelihood of bribe

Agencies	% with Contacts with agency	% asked to pay bribes	Likelihood of official of agency soliciting bribe prior to service
Econ. & Fin. Crimes Commission	1.8	34.6	51.0
Federal Road Safety Commission	8.6	21.7	55.1
State Security Service	2.1	15.2	50.1
Independent Corrupt Practices Com.	1.6	39.8	-
Nigeria Customs Service	4.2	25.5	67.7
Nigeria Immigration Service	5.7	17.3	66.8
Nigeria Police Force	27.7	39.4	78.8
Nigerian Prisons Service	9.0	9.8	53.7
NEPA/PHCN – (public electricity co.)	47.0	20.8	65.3
Nigerian Security & Civil Def. Corps	9.8	18.2	-
National Assembly Members	3.6	17.8	59.5
State Assembly Members	3.1	11.1	58.2
Tax officials	9.0	19.4	61.6
Lower court judges/officials	4.7	15.1	56.8
Higher court judges/officials	3.9	14.9	54.7
Traditional leaders	21.0	4.9	40.3
Religious leaders	52.0	3.5	26.0
Private sector officials	15.4	6.7	50.1

As can be observed, there is a high level of official corruption (column 3). However, public perceptions of likelihood of being asked to pay bribe by officials of public agencies before serving them overestimated the extent of corruption by the officials (column 4).

Most victims of demand for bribe did not report to any law enforcement agency:

- ❖ 9.4% reported to the police
- ❖ 5.5% reported to ICPC
- ❖ 5.3% reported to EFCC

Respondents were generally not satisfied with the treatment of their complaint by the respective agencies to which they reported (table 5).



Table 5: Satisfaction with Anti-corruption agencies

Satisfaction or dissatisfaction	Police	EFCC	ICPC
Not at all satisfied	51.1	77.4	77.6
Not satisfied	21.9	10.3	13.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11.7	2.6	5.6
Satisfied	11.3	8.4	3.1
Very satisfied	4.0	1.3	0.6
<i>No. of respondents</i>	<i>274</i>	<i>155</i>	<i>161</i>

There was a general perception among the respondents that corruption increased in their states in 2010 than in the previous year.

- ❖ 10.5% - decreased a lot
- ❖ 24.8% - slightly decreased
- ❖ 14.4% - stayed the same as in previous year
- ❖ 19.6% - slightly increased
- ❖ 26.8% - increased a lot

Overall, 46.4% of the respondents said corruption increased in their states while 35.3% said that the practice decreased.

Respondents were asked about what measures they think would effectively control corruption in the country. Their responses were as follow:

- ❖ 66.8% - tougher laws and sentences
- ❖ 72.7% - better education and upbringing of children
- ❖ 58.8% - more control of officials
- ❖ 60.4% - greater publicity of problems corruption
- ❖ 77.1% - providing good example of leadership
- ❖ 65.2% - better salaries for public and civil service officials
- ❖ 55.5% - social security for the aged, unemployed and handicapped
- ❖ 5.4% - nothing could be done.

Respondents were asked about what they considered to be the most important constraints against the prevention and control of corruption by EFCC and ICPC. The following pattern of responses was obtained.

- ❖ 16.8% - inadequate fund
- ❖ 17.6% - poor facilities
- ❖ 25.1% - interference by the government
- ❖ 6.8% - inefficiency by the courts
- ❖ 15.9% - corruption by ICPC/EFCC officials
- ❖ 14.4% - lack of personal examples by political leaders
- ❖ 3.1% - corruption by judges

The respondents were asked to suggest what measures they think will enhance the effectiveness of the anti-corruption agencies in the country. The following measures were suggested:

- ❖ 21.4% - better training of officials
- ❖ 16.4% - adequate funding
- ❖ 16.6% - adequate facilities and equipment
- ❖ 19.8% - more discipline and supervision by the government
- ❖ 8.1% - stricter laws
- ❖ 7.1% - establishment of anti-corruption court
- ❖ 9.7% - greater autonomy from interference by the government

### ***Fear of Crime in Nigeria***

Fear of crime is a major obstacle to personal well-being, social interactions and economic transactions and activities. In an economy with large informal sector like Nigeria, fear of crime inhibits the volume of economic transaction by restricting location and period of activities. Night-time economy such as retail trading and leisure or recreational in particular suffer from widespread fear of crime. In many areas, hours of operation of critical commercial and service organisations like supermarkets and petrol stations are restricted due to fear of crime (e.g. robbery). Respondents were asked how fearful of becoming a victim of crime they were in 2010. Their responses are presented in table 6.

Table 6: Fear of Crimes

Types of crime	Not at all fearful	A little fearful	Fearful	Very fearful	Overall Fearful Cols 4 & 5
Murder	20.0	8.9	20.9	49.3	70.2
Armed robbery	16.8	11.1	28.3	43.1	71.4
Burglary	17.9	16.2	32.3	32.7	65.0
Theft	17.5	17.5	35.6	28.7	64.3
Assault	22.4	19.7	31.6	25.1	56.7
Rape	29.1	12.3	24.1	32.6	56.7
Domestic violence	21.6	19.6	30.8	27.0	57.8
Kidnapping	23.7	13.2	25.8	36.2	62.0
Fraud	23.9	17.5	30.8	26.3	57.1
Unlawful detention by security agents	22.8	17.5	32.2	26.2	58.4
Political, ethnic and religious violence	20.2	15.3	31.0	31.5	62.5

Respondents were general fearful and mostly fearful of being a victim of murder, armed robbery, burglary and theft (table 6).

The respondents were further asked about their feeling of safety in specific contexts of location and activities. Their responses are presented in table 7.

Table 7: Feeling of safety

Feeling of safety in contexts	Very unsafe	Unsafe	Neither unsafe or safe	Safe	Very Safe
Walking in the community during the day	0.9	3.1	2.5	45.4	47.8
Walking in the community in the night	2.4	11.5	7.3	48.2	30.2
At home during the day	0.9	2.8	2.8	47.0	46.2
At home at night	1.8	7.3	6.6	47.9	36.0
At work	1.0	3.8	5.2	51.6	36.5
At public places	2.5	5.6	7.0	51.5	32.0

The respondents generally felt safe in their community or neighbourhood; at home and public places. When compared with the fairly high level of fear of crime by the same respondents, one can observe the paradox of discrepancy between subjective feeling of safety and objective risk of victimization.

*Levels of crime in the community and state*

Respondents were asked about their perception of the level of crime in the community or area and the state where they live. Their responses are as follow.

Incidence of crime in the community or area where the respondents live:

- ❖ Extremely high – 9.0%
- ❖ Somewhat high – 15.2%
- ❖ Average – 21.5%
- ❖ Somewhat low – 22.6%
- ❖ Extremely low – 21.4%
- ❖ Non-existent – 10.3%

Overall, more than a half (54.3%) consider the level of crime in their community to be low.

Incidence of crime in the state where the respondents live:

- ❖ Extremely high – 22.5%
- ❖ Somewhat high - 25.3%
- ❖ Average – 23.2%
- ❖ Somewhat low – 17.2%
- ❖ Extremely low - 10.6%

Generally, the respondents consider their communities much safer than the state in general. This might be the effect of amplification of the incidence of crime and hysteria that often follows. Fear of crime may be reduced by minimizing amplification of crime, especially by the media and moral entrepreneurs.

What is it that respondents fear most about crime? More than four-fifths (83.8%) feared loss of life while 6.6% and 5.8% feared loss of property and physical injury respectively. In essence, violent crimes were most feared.

Apart from the police, there were several agencies responsible for policing in the country. Respondents were asked of agencies other than the police that were responsible for protection against crime in their community, the following were identified:

- ❖ 46.9% - God
- ❖ 29.1% - vigilante group
- ❖ 12.6% - night guards
- ❖ 6.5% - neighbourhood crime watch group
- ❖ 4.0% - civil defence corps

*Most frequently occurring and feared crimes in the community*

The following crimes were identified as the most occurring crimes in the communities in which respondents across the country live:

- ❖ 23.0% - theft of property
- ❖ 12.3% - domestic violence
- ❖ 11.8% - robbery
- ❖ 7.5% - burglary
- ❖ 5.2% - assault
- ❖ 4.1% - livestock theft
- ❖ 3.8% - pick-pocketing or bag snatching
- ❖ 3.0% - theft of motor-vehicle
- ❖ 2.2% - area boys (gangs)
- ❖ 1.7% - kidnapping

However, there is no high correspondence between most frequently occurring crime and most feared crimes in the community. Respondents identified the following as the most feared crimes in their neighbourhoods or areas of residence:

- ❖ Robbery – 20.2%
- ❖ Murder – 15.7%
- ❖ Theft of property – 13.3%
- ❖ Domestic violence - 8.0%
- ❖ Kidnapping - 6.6%
- ❖ Burglary – 5.5%
- ❖ Theft of motor vehicle - 2.8%

What factors motivate individuals to commit crime? Respondents were asked of their opinions about motivations for crime. They identified the following factors:

- ❖ Real need and poverty – 51.7%
- ❖ Greed – 22.4%
- ❖ Non-financial motives – 8.4%
- ❖ Don't know - 15.9%

***Policy recommendations for priority spending to enhance security, safety and justice in the country***

Respondents identified several measures on which government should spend money as priority in order to enhance security, safety and justice in the country. Those identified were:

- ❖ Create more employment opportunities – 24.7%
- ❖ Create better educational and vocational education opportunities - 17.7%
- ❖ Reduce poverty level – 17.2%
- ❖ Provide stable electricity – 12.0%
- ❖ Fix the roads - 11.6%
- ❖ Harsher punishment for offenders – 5.1%
- ❖ Increase the capacity of the police – 4.9%

Overall, majority of the respondents felt that provision of socio-economic opportunities and improved socio-economic developmental infrastructure should be given priority in spending in order to enhance safety and security in the country. These recommendations obviously reflect the best thinking and practice in security and safety policy.

## Comparative analysis of robbery victimization, police effectiveness and corruption in states

### *Fear of crime*

Fear of crime was generally high in the country, especially in Jigawa, Kebbi, Borno, Sokoto, Adamawa, Anambra and Plateau States (table 8)

Table 8: Fear of becoming robbery victim in 2010

<b>State</b>	<i>% that were fearful and very fearful</i>
Jigawa	97.1
Kebbi	96.5
Borno	95.0
Sokoto	94.7
Adamawa	93.0
Anambra	91.1
Plateau	90.9
Imo	89.8
Taraba	86.3
Niger	85.6
Yobe	84.2
FCT	83.6
Gombe	81.6
Cross River	80.4
Zamfara	80.4
Nasarawa	79.3
Ondo	78.0
Abia	77.4
Enugu	76.0
Bayelsa	75.0
Oyo	74.7
Benue	73.7
Bauchi	70.1
Lagos	68.7
Delta	67.5
Kaduna	67.1
Kano	65.2
Ekiti	63.4
Ebonyi	55.2
Kwara	54.9
Akwa-Ibom	54.4
Katsina	52.2
Rivers	51.0
Ogun	50.5
Osun	46.4
Kogi	35.7
Edo	28.6

National	71.4
----------	------

### *Trend of Corruption*

A very high proportion of respondents in Borno, Bauchi, Kogi, Yobe, Delta, Sokoto, Ekiti, Niger and Bayelsa states reported that corruption was on the increase in their states (table 9)

Table 9: Trend of corruption in 2010

<b>State</b>	<i>% that reported slightly increased and increased a lot in the state in 2010</i>
Borno	90.7
Bauchi	73.4
Kogi	72.6
Yobe	70.6
Delta	69.8
Sokoto	68.6
Ekiti	66.3
Niger	62.0
Bayelsa	60.9
Kano	59.6
FCT	56.8
Imo	55.5
Anambra	55.1
Kaduna	50.2
Ogun	49.0
Benue	48.7
Enugu	47.1
Oyo	46.1
Akwa-Ibom	45.6
Kwara	44.0
Ondo	43.3
Cross River	42.1
Nasarawa	41.5
Zamfara	41.4
Osun	37.8
Lagos	37.7
Abia	34.7
Katsina	33.3
Edo	33.1
Gombe	32.8
Plateau	31.9
Jigawa	30.5
Ebonyi	27.3
Kebbi	25.2
Rivers	22.4
Taraba	20.8
Adamawa	20.0
National	46.4



### *Police effectiveness*

A substantially high proportion of respondents in Katsina, Benue, Gombe, Jigawa, Kogi and Nasarawa states said the police were doing a good job and very good job (table 10).

Table 10: Perception of police effectiveness in 2010

<b>State</b>	<i>% that reported that police were doing good job and very good job</i>
Katsina	80.0
Benue	78.0
Gombe	77.0
Jigawa	75.0
Kogi	74.3
Nasarawa	71.1
Yobe	69.4
Kaduna	68.9
Plateau	67.6
Kano	67.5
Ondo	64.6
Adamawa	64.4
Ogun	64.4
Osun	63.0
Sokoto	59.4
Taraba	56.7
Bauchi	55.9
Zamfara	54.7
Cross River	51.8
Enugu	51.7
FCT	48.1
Edo	47.5
Ekiti	46.3
Ebonyi	44.9
Oyo	44.8
Akwa-Ibom	41.8
Imo	41.1
Anambra	40.9
Lagos	40.9
Abia	38.5
Niger	35.6
Kebbi	35.1
Kwara	34.9
Bayelsa	34.4
Delta	32.2
Borno	27.7
Rivers	22.4
National	52.2