

Criminal Victimization and the Reporting of Crime in Kaduna State: Towards Integrating the Victim of Crime into Criminological Discourse

J.E. Gyong

Department of Sociology, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

Abstract: The aim of this study is to empirically demonstrate the importance of victims of crime towards a more comprehensive understanding of criminological discourse. This is done by using a victim-survey of crimes of murder, grievous harm and wounding, assault, rape and indecent assault, robbery, theft, housebreaking, false pretence/cheating, forgery, receiving of stolen property and unlawful possession. This is done against the backdrop that, one of the critical components of criminology is the victims of crime. These are individuals or corporate bodies that suffer directly or indirectly from acts of criminality. The areas of importance of victim surveys specifically covered in this study include the presentation of a broader picture of the volume of crime, the rate of reporting of instances of criminal victimization to the Police and the factors responsible for the observed rates for the year 2009 in Kaduna State. Using the multistage cluster sampling method, a sample survey of 900 household adults was studied. In addition, official statistics of Police crime records was collected and in-depth interview of key Police and victim respondents was made. The findings show that one, criminal victimization is under reported by as much as 60%; two, only about 36% of crimes are reported to the Police; and three, whether victims of crime report to the Police or not is a function of the interplay of factors such as their calculation of the probable costs and benefits, their perception of the seriousness of the offence, their moral and patriotic obligation, their attitude to law, the Police and the system of social control in general, the availability of other options open to them in terms of restitution and compensation etc. In conclusion, the study confirms that victim-survey of crimes does serve the function of increasing the scope of criminological discourse. Finally, the study recommends a periodic national survey of victims of crime as a way of improving our knowledge of crime as well as providing an evidence-based basis for crime control strategies by the law enforcement agencies.

Key words: Crime statistics, criminal justice system, neglect victims, triangulation, victim-survey, volume of crime

INTRODUCTION

Criminology is an old discipline with multifaceted dimensions. It was originally conceived as the study of the criminal (Randzinowicz and Wolfgang 1971; Schafer, 1977). The scope was later expanded to include the defining of persons and behaviors as criminal, the development of persons and behavior that are defined as criminal; and the social reaction to crime. In contemporary usage, the term criminology has been expanded to mean the use of scientific method in the study and analysis of the regularities, patterns and causal relationships with regard to three critical components: one, the making of laws which include the process, content and operation of laws; two, the breaking of laws, which include crime, criminals, victims and the circumstances under which the crime occurs; and three, the reaction to the violation of laws, both from formal and informal agencies (Iwarimie-Jaja, 2003; Gyong, 1996). In fact, the scope of the discipline of criminology is as wide as the phenomenon of crime in all its ramifications.

One of the major components of criminology is the victims of crime. After all, there can never be a crime without persons or organizations that suffer directly or indirectly. However, it has been observed that this aspect of criminology has suffered neglect (Gyong, 1996; Sparks *et al.*, 1997; Pointing and Maquire, 1988). But, before the extent of neglect of victims of crime within the subject matter of criminology is highlighted, it is safer to have a clear conceptual meaning of the term victims of crime.

Victimization generally is a widespread phenomenon/problem encompassing every facet of the life of individuals and organizations. Thus, the generic meaning of victimization is a situation in which persons or groups suffer physical, mental or psychological harm and/or injuries, material loss or damage or other social disadvantages resulting from either natural, socio-economic, political, or physical or mechanical disaster or misfortune. But specifically, victims of crime are in reality individuals or groups who have directly or indirectly suffered the brunt of criminal activities. Thus,

those who suffer from outright violations of Fundamental Human Rights perpetrated by individuals or the State, discriminatory socio-economic policies, white collar elite and conventional (common) crimes, among others, can be said to be victims of crime.

According to the United Nations Report, (1984) a person or a collectivity may be made victims of crime as a result of conduct which:

- Is a violation of the rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
- otherwise constitutes an abuse of power in violation of the international law and fundamental personal, economic, social, cultural, environmental, civil or political rights possessed by that person or collectivity
- otherwise constitutes an offence under national legislation.

Similarly, in the eyes of the New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties (NSWCCL, 2009), victims of crimes are citizens who have had their lives interrupted by crime. Wikipedia (2007) noted that a victim of crime is an identifiable person who has been harmed individually and directly by the perpetrators rather than merely the society as a whole. It further observed that this may however not always be the case as with victims of white collar crime who may not be clearly identifiable or directly linked to the crime. In the same vein, the UN High Commission for Human Rights (1995) has contributed to the understanding of victims of crime. It defines victims of crimes as persons who individually or collectively have suffered harm including physical or mental injury, emotional suffering, economic loss or substantial impairment of their fundamental rights through acts or omissions that are in violation of criminal law operating within a 'state' including those laws prescribing criminal abuse of power. Furthermore, it says a person may be considered a victim of crime regardless of whether the perpetrator is identified, apprehended, prosecuted or convicted and regardless of the familiar relationship between the perpetrators and the victim. In addition, it argues that the term victim of crime also includes where appropriately, the immediate family or dependents of the direct victims or persons who have suffered harm in intervening to assist victims in distress or to prevent victimization.

However, the more specific focus of this study is victims of common crimes. Such victims in reality are those who have suffered directly the crimes of murder, grievous harm and wounding, assaults, rape and indecent assault, armed robbery, theft, housebreaking, false pretence/cheating, forgery receiving of stolen property and unlawful possession.

Statement of the problem: The focus of this study is essentially on the neglect of the victims of crime in the total understanding of criminology and the need to give them a pride of place if the phenomenon of crime is to be fully understood. This is in view of the fact that victims of crime form an integral part of the subject matter of criminology. Never the less, they have never really been accorded that due recognition.

The study and analysis of criminal phenomenon, particularly in developing countries has been reduced to basically two approaches. One of these concentrates on the analysis of the individual offender. For this approach, crime is explained in terms of the physically identified features of the individual, brain injuries /diseases, endocrinal abnormalities or chromosomal aberration. In other words, the individual is the centre of focus in the understanding of crime (Gyong, 1989).

The second approach concentrates on the circumstances outside the individual offender that precipitate the commission of crime. This approach often points to environmental factors around the individual criminal, the distribution of political power and the development strategy adopted by a polity (Fitzgerald *et al.*, 1981; Sumner, 1982; Greenberg, 2003; Gyong, 1989). Consequently, and on the basis of these two popular approaches, wherever there is a crime problem, intellectuals and policy makers are quick to ask as to what can be done to the criminals/or the circumstantial event that precipitated such criminality. Very few ever ponder over what can be done about the victims/or their situations.

This scenario is reflected in most efforts in contemporary research in criminology whereby, very minimal attention is given to the study of the victims of crime. It is the feeling in some quarters that one of the most neglected subjects in the study of crime is its victims. Odekunle (1979) confirmed this and further noted that "governmental research interests and efforts in criminology usually precede or forerun those in victimology". Schafer, (1977) further added that "some of those involved in the problem of crime have included the victims in their observation efforts only to enhance the popular appeal of their subjects". In addition, Gyong (1996) observed that most researchers in the area of criminology have consistently seen the victim as playing a distinctly passive role. He further added that both the victim and the offender are two parties in any crime and therefore a realistic understanding of crime cannot be complete without due consideration being given to both.

The passive role accorded the victim in the study and understanding of the criminal phenomenon is further reinforced by the criminal justice system. A remarkable consensus of opinion demonstrates that contemporary justice systems in both developed and developing world

are doing badly with the victims of crime (Ochberg 1986; Gyong, 1996; Melissa and Anne, 2004; Roach, 2000; Arlene, 2005; Amnesty International Report, 2009). For instance, Gyong (1996) argues that right from the gateway of the criminal justice system, the police, through the courts and thereafter, the victim is subjected to near-total neglect. He/She is arrogated the task of playing a distinct role of merely reporting crime. The police are required by law to treat the accused as innocent until proved otherwise beyond reasonable doubt, (1999 Constitution FRN). These same legal rights are denied the victims of crime. The victim is completely at the merciful discretion of the law enforcement agents. In cases where the Law enforcement officer decides not to make an arrest, not to prosecute or even to allow the accused to plea-bargain, the victims rights of legal recourse are limited.

Ochberg (1986) observes that the victims of crime are neglected partly because crime is defined as an offence against the State and has been so since the eleventh century when the feudal concept of "the king piece" replaced the tribal practice of compensating the kin of injured parties. Courts served the king rather than the clan and the rise of nations signaled a decline in the rights of victims of crimes.

Similarly Melissa and Anne (2004) based on the findings of the presidential Task Force on victims of crime in the United States of America observe that the criminal justice system regularly re-victimized victims of crime; the system was out of balance in favor of offenders, and the poor treatment of victims was more widespread than they had imagined.

In the same vein, Amnesty International (2009) also commented on the neglect of the victims of crime through legislation. It argues that certain legislations can actually increase the victimization of people in the face of criminal activities. Drawing specific reference to the intending legislation to be passed on the crime of kidnapping by the government of Imo State of Nigeria, it maintained that kidnapping is a terrible crime that causes anguish for the victims and their families. However, he further argues that extending death penalty to include kidnapping is a retrogressive step that does not really protect the victims but in fact exposes them to greater risk. Such legislation may act as incentive to kill the victims, innocent bystanders and the police.

The Free Dictionary (2010) also observed that victims sometimes come to believe that they had fewer rights than the criminals who had injured them. In addition, some victims usually become so alienated from the criminal justice process that prosecutors had difficulty persuading them to testify at trials.

The plight of the victim extends beyond the criminal justice system to include social welfare services. In Nigeria in particular, National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) exists and offers emergency relief funds

and/or materials to victims of other disasters such as fire, draught, sectarian and ethno-religious disturbances, oil spillage, erosion, flood etc., Beyond NEMA, individuals and corporate bodies have demonstrated similar support to such victims. The argument has always been that victims of such disasters have suffered socio-psychological and emotional stress, personal injuries or even loss of live, monetary and material losses and therefore need some assistance to cushion their hardships. Even when victims of crime do suffer similar problems, these same humanitarian gestures are rarely extended to them.

It is in the light of this virtual or total neglect of the victims of crime as has been illustrated that this study presents empirical data to demonstrate the importance of victim- survey of crime in the more comprehensive understanding of criminological discourse. The areas of importance specifically covered by this study include a presentation of a broader picture of the volume of crime; two, the rate of reporting of instances of criminal victimization to the police and the factors responsible. In doing this, a more comprehensive picture of crime is presented and therefore a more holistic understanding of the subject mater of criminology will be attained.

Consequently, this empirical study was designed to answer the following research questions: what is the volume of criminal victimization in Kaduna State in 2009? How much of it was recorded officially by the police? What type of victimization did victims suffer or experience? How many of such cases were reported to the police? And finally, what were the factors responsible for the observed rate of reporting of cases of criminal victimization.

The aim of the study was to bring out the importance of victim studies of common crimes in the comprehensive understanding of criminological discourse.

The specific objectives were as follows:

- To measure the volume of criminal victimization of common crimes in Kaduna State;
- To compare the volume reported with that of the officially recorded by the police, and three, determine the nature of reporting of common crimes to the police and the factors responsible.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Kaduna State in the North-West Geo-political zone of Nigeria. The state has 23 local government areas, divided into three Police Area Commands. These are Zaria, Kaduna and Kafanchan with 16, 18 and 12 Divisional Police Stations, respectively. These stations are the ones responsible for the receipt, recording and collection of all reported cases of criminal victimization within their jurisdiction. Similarly, they are

equally responsible for the policing of all criminal activities within their jurisdiction.

The data for this survey consists of only cases of criminal victimization that occurred between January to December 2009 on the part of both the victims and those officially recorded by the police. Data was collected only on nine types of criminal victimization, which also form the areas of crime officially recorded by the police. Multi-stage cluster sampling technique accomplished through simple random method was used to select the respondents for this study at three different stages. In the first stage, 2 Divisional Police Stations were selected in each of the three Area Commands in the State using the simple random sampling technique, making a total of 6 Divisional Police Stations. In the second stage, each of the 6 Divisional Police Stations was further divided into clusters of residential areas in which 5 clusters were selected in each, using the simple random technique, giving a total of 30 clusters. In the third and final stage, 30 households were chosen through the simple random method in each of the 30 clusters of residential areas, giving a total sample of 900. A questionnaire was then finally administered on each of the 900 identified household heads. In addition, 2 key informants [one victim of common crime and one police officer] were selected in each of the selected Divisional Police Stations and administered an in depth interview guide. Similarly, officially recorded data on the nine common crimes selected for study in each of the selected Divisional Police Stations as well as those of the whole State for the year 2009 were collected and analyzed. Using the technique of triangulation, the three types of data were synergized and woven together to answer the specific research objectives.

RESULTS

Volume of criminal victimization: Out of a total of 857 validly completed questionnaires, 533 of the respondents had been victimized of murder, grievous harm or wounding, assault, rape and indecent assault, armed robbery, theft and other stealing, house breaking, false pretence and recovery of stolen property. This figure translates into a victimization rate of 62%. In other words, 62% of the studied samples were victimized of at least one of the crimes measured. This means that out of every 10 household heads in Kaduna State, more than six of them or members of their household were victims of crime in 2009.

The officially reported/discovered and recorded statistics of the same type of crimes in Kaduna State for the same year 2009 was 1,143 cases. When this is computed against the about 6 million population of the state (FRN Official Gazette 2007: B187), it will translate into a victimization rate of less than 1%.

The distribution of officially recorded crime figures and the ones generated through this victim-survey study is presented in Table 1.

The following observations can be made from the Table 1:

- In both the officially recorded and victim-survey figures of crime, criminal victimization of property is much higher than person crime (68% against 32%)
- Criminal victimization arising from victim-survey is proportionally much higher than those officially recorded by the police (62% against 1%)
- In the officially recorded and victim-survey statistics, thefts and other stealing predominated, followed by house breaking (32; 32% and 15.6; 19%) respectively. But the least types in both instances were rape (4, 0.5%) and recovery of stolen property (5, 4%), respectively. Thus, it is very evident that statistic of crime generated through victim-surveys present a much better picture of the occurrence of crime in society than that which is routinely reported by the police.

Reporting of crime to the police: Victim-survey has the potential of enhancing our knowledge of the pattern of reporting of criminal victimization to the police and the factors responsible for the observed rates. Certainly, a very important and credible means through which the police can get to know of the volume of crime that goes on in the society is through the reports it gets from the citizens who are either directly or indirectly affected. This is particularly so in developing countries where police patrol is mostly carried out with little no informed knowledge of the situation of crime coupled with clear instances of inadequate human and material resources.

In this particular study, out of the 533 persons that suffered one form of criminal victimization or the other, 342 or 64% did not report to the police while 36% did. Table 2 shows the pattern of distribution of those who reported and those who did not, across the crimes that were measured.

The findings in the table show the following pattern: one, the overall rate of non-reporting of criminal victimization to the police was as high as 64%. In other words, 64% of all those victimized of the offences measured in this study did not report to the police and only 36% did. Two, the difference between the rate of reporting of criminal victimization arising out of person crime (39%) and property crime (35%) is not significant. Three, while all the cases of criminal victimization arising from murder were reported, none of rape and indecent assault was. This may have been due to the seriousness of the former against the embarrassing nature of the latter.

With regards to the reasons for the low reporting of criminal victimization to the police, the primary reasons revolved around the victims' expressed attitude to the police, the seriousness of the offence, the relationship between the victim and the offender as well as the cost benefit analysis to the former. The various reasons given by the respondents are contained in Table 3.

Table 1: Officially recorded and victim-survey crime figures compared

Type of crime	Official figures *		Victim-survey figures **	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
A. Person crimes				
1 Murder	80	7	27	5.0
2 Grievous harm and wounding	144	12.5	56	10.5
3 Assault	99	8.6	52	9.8
4 Rape and indecent assaults	46	4.0	03	0.5
Sub total	369	32.0	138	25.8
B. Property crimes				
5 Armed robbery	51	4.5	54	10.0
6 Theft and other stealing	366	32	171	32.0
7 House breaking	179	15.6	101	19.0
8 False pretence and cheating	121	10.5	48	9.0
9 Receiving stolen property	57	5.0	21	4.0
Sub total	774	68	395	74.0
Grand total	1143	100	533	100.0

Sources: *: 2009 official crime statistics of Kaduna State Police Command, **: Statistics generated through the victim - survey study, 2010

Table 2: Reporting of crime to the police

Type of crime	Yes		No		Total
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Person crimes					
1 Murder	27	100	0	0	27
2 Grievous harm and wounding	16	29	40	71	56
3 Assault	11	21	41	79	52
4 Rape and indecent assault	0	0	3	100	3
Sub total	54	39	84	61	138
Property crimes					
5 Armed robbery	21	39	33	61	54
6 Theft and other stealing	48	28	123	72	171
7 House breaking	46	46	55	55	101
8 False pretence	11	23	37	77	48
9 Receiving of stolen property	11	52	10	48	21
Sub total	137	35	258	65	395
Grand total	191	36	342	64	533

Source: Victim Survey Study of 2010

Table 3: Reasons for not reporting criminal victimization to the police

S.No.	Reasons	Frequency	%
1	Did not have confidence in the police	134	39
2	Settled with the offender	75	22
3	Waste of time and resources	51	15
4	Have no evidence/or suspect	48	14
5	Fear of reprisal attack	14	04
6	Others	20	06
7	Total	342	100

Source: Victim - Survey Study, 2010

In addition to the picture of non-reporting of crime presented in the above table, further evidence was collected through in-depth interview with police officers and victims of crime. For instance, a police personnel in one of the Divisional Police Stations, stated thus “the distance between the station and the community is relatively far, for instance, people of Palladan find it difficult to report cases in Samaru Division because of the distance and the money involved in transporting themselves to the station”. Another one said “also due to the distance, before the complainant or victim reach the police station, the provocation or anger must have lapsed or he must have been begged and asked to forgive the offender”. Still another respondent (a victim of crime) said thus.

Another reason is the role played by the village head. District head within this community sometimes settle a lot of cases within the palace; this contributes a lot in reducing cases that are reported to the station. They only take cases that pass their power to the police for investigation.

Hear yet another respondent who is a Divisional Police Officer (DPO)

Sometimes the outcome of the case in court also determines whether the complainant or victim will bring his case to the station or not. Sometimes, court discharge and acquit cases based on some technical grounds, these make the complainants to desist from reporting cases, after all they believe the courts may likely discharge the suspect and it will amount to waste of time and resources.

Table 4: Reasons for reporting of crime to the police

S.No.	Reasons	Frequency	%
1	The seriousness of the offence	61	32
2	To get the offender punished	62	23
3	To recover stolen property	44	18
4	Confidence in the police	34	11
5	Civic responsibility	21	06
6	Others	12	10
7	Total	191	100

Source: Victim - Survey Study, 2010

Some additional accounts of non-reporting of criminal victimization to the police are thus “I had the intention to report to the police, but could not because that day I felt they may waste my time in the police station, I took a decision just to go to work”; “I did not report because I did not know the person that actually stole my chickens. This is not an issue you can come out and say you are suspecting anyone because it happened in the night and one did not see anybody, so it is not good to suspect anybody because it could create enmity between you, so the best is to leave it to God”; “My last experience with the police was when my room was burgled and some valuables were stolen. When I reported to the police, I had to go to the police station several times at my own expense and at the end of the day, nothing came out of it”. These narratives indicate the variety of reasons why victims of crime do not report to the police in instances of criminal victimization. The accounts are by no means exhaustive.

For those victims who reported to the police, the findings indicate that their experiences were sufficiently serious to warrant such actions. Others reported because they had personal relationship with the police and so were fairly certain that they would get a favorable outcome. Still others reported because they felt it was necessary so that their offenders can be caught and punished according to the law.

Table 4 is the distribution of reasons for reporting criminal victimization to the police by victims of crime.

The Table 4 indicates the distribution of the reasons for reporting crimes to the police by the victims. It is very clear that the seriousness of the offence is the overriding desire to report to the police followed by the need to get the offenders punished.

Accounts of key informants in the in-depth interview corroborate many of the reasons stated. Hear this respondent “Yes, like I have said, I reported to the police because I know that they are the only powerful body to handle my case and I believe they did their best”. A victim of grievous body wound said “Yes, I reported to the police because the injury I suffered was too serious and so I wanted the police to force the offender to pay me the money I used in my treatment”. Yet, another respondent said “I reported to the police because the offender has developed the habit of intimidating people in the neighborhood and so I wanted the woman to be taught

a lesson so that she will not dear do such a thing again”. On the whole, one can see that there are many genuine reasons why victims of crime do report their experiences to the police.

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to achieve the following objectives: one, to measure the volume of criminal activities officially recorded by the police and compare with that reported by victims of these crimes directly; two, determine the rate of reporting of crimes by victims to the police; and three, find out the factors responsible for the pattern of reporting or non-reporting of crimes by victims to the police. On the first objective, findings show that statistics of crime generated through victim-surveys present a much broader picture of the occurrence of criminal victimization in Kaduna State than what was officially recorded by the police in the year 2009. The implication is that victim-surveys provide a much more accurate picture of the volume of criminal activities in the society.

The superiority of statistics generated through victim-surveys over official statistics of the police in revealing a near accurate picture of crime has been demonstrated by a number of other empirical criminological studies (Clinard and Abbott, 1973; Olowu, 1978; Gyong, 1988, 1996; Alemika *et al.*, 2005). For instance, in a similar study conducted by Gyong (1996) more than 60% of the sample of study was victimized of common crimes as compared to the official figures of 7%. In another study by Alemika *et al.* (2005), about 81% of the households were victims of crimes that were not recorded officially by the police.

The above scenario clearly indicates that official figures of crime as compiled by the police are deficient to the tune of about 60% of the total volume of crime that actually takes place in the society at any one time. In view of the fact that these official figures of crime are meant to serve as major guides to government for planning, projecting and implementing crime control strategies, it will be quite misleading to rely on them absolutely.

Thus, the inadequacies of official sources of crime statistics as pointed out above and the consequences thereafter, make it imperative for any criminological study to give serious attention to statistics generated through

victim-surveys. If such statistics are accepted into the mainstream of statistics of crime in Nigeria, they will complement the country's crime-data bank and help reduce the dark-figures of crime.

The second major finding of this study, which is related to the first, is that the rate of reporting of common crimes to the police was found to be very low for the year 2009. This was found to be 36% as compared to 64% that did not report their experiences. This finding was again found to be consistent with other criminological studies in the past (Gyong, 1996; Alemika *et al.*, 2005). For instance, in a National Survey of 'Criminal Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria' by Alemika *et al.* (2005), it was established that only 27.7% of the sampled respondents who experienced criminal victimization reported to the police. The study also established that the differential victimization reporting showed that 61, 40.7, 18.1, 16% of those who reported suffered from murder, robbery, rape and assault, respectively. Similarly, in a study by Gyong (1989) on victims of crime and the criminal phenomenon in Kafanchan, findings indicate that only 37% of the victims of common crimes reported to the police. Of this number, 62% were victims of property and 38%, person crimes.

It is therefore very clear that studies on victims of crime have the potential of enhancing our knowledge of the crimes that are mostly reported to the police and vice-versa. Thus, a very important means through which the law enforcement agents can get to know the amount of crime that goes on in any polity is through the rate at which members of the public report these offences. This is particularly so in developing countries like Nigeria where police patrol is neither regular nor rationally planned, coupled with the problems of human and material inadequacies.

The third major finding of this study is that victims of crime had various reasons for reporting or not reporting their experiences to the police. For those who did not report, the distribution of their reasons were as follows: 'did not have confidence in the police', (39%); 'settled with the offender', (22%); 'waste of time and resources', (15%); 'have no evidence/no suspect', (14%); 'fear of reprisal attack', (4%); and others, (6%). For those who reported to the police, their reasons were as follows: 'the seriousness of the offence', (32%); 'to get the offender punished', (23%); 'to recover stolen property', (18%); 'confidence in the police', (11%); 'civic responsibility', (6%); and others, (10%).

This pattern is certainly similar to other patterns established by other criminological studies. For instance, in the study by Alemika *et al.* (2005), the following were given as reasons for reporting criminal victimization to the police: 'wanted the offender caught and punished', (41.3%); 'crimes should be reported as a duty', (23.9%); 'to recover property', (19.3%); 'to stop it from happening

again', (12.2%); 'to get help', (7.7%); 'for insurance claims', (15%); 'to obtain compensation from the offender', (1.7%); and others, (2.4%). Similarly, the Alemika *et al.* (2005) study also established the following reasons for non-reporting of criminal victimization to the police: 'police would not do anything', (22.1%); 'not enough and no loss', (21.8%); 'solved it myself', (19.4%), 'did not want any involvement with the police', (14.0%); 'inappropriate for the police', (7.3%); 'did not have any money to give to the police', (6.3%); 'fear of reprisal', (2.1%); 'police would inform offender', (0.6%); and others, (6.5%). The summary of the views expressed above illustrates that whether victims of crime report to the police or not is a function of the interplay of a number of factors. They include those that relate to the victim's calculation of the probable costs and benefits; the victim's perception of the seriousness of the offence; the victim's moral and patriotic obligation; the victims attitude to law, the police and the system of social control in general; the availability of other options open to the victim in terms of restitution and compensation etc.

With regards to reporting crimes to the police, particularly in developing countries, Barley as presented in Clinard and Abbott (1973) assert that, the reluctance on the part of the victim to report may be due to the fact that

The offence may be too trivial; the distance to police station may be too great; the expectation of productive outcome too meager; reporting may expose the individual to harassment from the criminal or his friends; the individual, family or group may not welcome the intrusion of outsiders and prefer to handle matters themselves; offence may be too embarrassing to the victim as in the case of sex offences.

The findings of this study and other criminological testimonies presented are indispensable to any serious criminological study on the pattern of reporting or not of criminal victimization by members of the public, particularly, victims of crime. Such findings serve as pointers to probable and possible remedial actions towards increasing the rate of reporting of crimes as well as enhancing the needed cooperation between members of the public and the police in the successful fight against crime. That these empirical facts are at best generated through victim-survey studies further demonstrate the need to integrate victims of crime into mainstream criminological discourse.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study has been able to establish the fact that criminal victimization arising from murder, grievous harm and wounding, assault, rape and indecent assault, robbery, theft, housebreaking, false pretence/cheating, forgery, receiving of stolen property and unlawful possession is under reported by as much as

60%. Similarly, only 36% of such crimes are reported to the to the official agencies i.e., the Police. Even then whether victims of such crimes report to the Police or not is a function of the interplay of factors such as their calculation of the probable costs and benefits, their perception of the seriousness of the offence, their moral and patriotic obligations. Other factors include victims' attitude to the law, the Police and the system of social control in general as well as availability of other options open to them in terms of restitution and compensation.

In view of the above, victim-surveys of crime have the potential of reducing the dark-figures of crime, and thus filling the gap of officially unrecorded crime figures. Such efforts are complementary to the work of the Police and also help in establishing the pattern of reporting of crimes and the reasons thereof by members of the public. The cumulative effect of all these is the extent to which victim studies widen the scope of criminological discourse. Finally, one would not hesitate to recommend a nationally planned and executed victim survey of crime periodically in Nigeria. This policy measure will not only substantially improve our knowledge of crime, but provide evidence-based, proactive and rationally developed strategies of crime control that will guide the law enforcement agencies.

REFERENCES

- Alemika, E.E.O., E.U. Igbo and C.P. Nnorom, 2006. Criminal Victimization. Safety and Policing In Nigeria. Series No 3 CLEEN Foundation, Lagos.
- Amnesty International, 2009. Nigeria: Imo State Death Penalty Decision Puts Victims at Risk. Amnesty International Report 2009. Retrieved from: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/for-media/press-release>.
- Arlene, G., 2005. National Victims of Crime Awareness Week. Retrieved from: www.victimweek.gc.ca
- Clinard, M.B. and D.J. Abbott, 1973. Crime in Developing Countries: A Comparative Perspective. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Fitzgerald, M., G. McLennan and J. Pawson, 1981. Crime and Society: Readiness in History and Theory. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London.
- FRN Official Gazette, 2007. National population Commission, Abuja, Nigeria. Federal Government Printer, Nigeria.
- Gyong, J.E., 1996. The Neglect of victims of common crimes In Nigeria: The case of Kaduna State. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, A.B.U., Zaria.
- Gyong, J.E., 1989. Criminological Theories and their Implications for Crime Prevention and Control. NSPMC LTD, Lagos.
- Gyong, J.E., 1988. Criminal Victimization as a Problem to the Operation of Small-Scale Food Processing and Distribution Industries: A study of four selected Towns in Kaduna State. Social Science Council of Nigeria.
- Greenberg, D.F., 2003. Crime and Capitalism. Mayfield Pub Coy, California.
- Iwarimie-Jaja, D., 2003. Criminology: The Study of Crime. Springfield Pub Coy Ltd., Nigeria.
- Melissa, H. and S. Anne, 2004. A retrospective of the 1982 Presidential Task Force on Victims of Crime. National Crime Victim's Right Week, US Department of Justice. Retrieved from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/ncvrw/---/NCVRW2005resourceguide.pdf>.
- NSWCCL, 2009. Victims of Crime. Sydney Soceth NSW1235.
- Ochberg, F., 1986. Victims and the Media Programme. In: Radelet, L. (Ed.), Police and the Community. Macmillan Pub. Coy, Nigeria.
- Odekunle, F., 1979. The Victims of Crime in Dveloping Countries: A Nigerian Study. International Symposium of Victimology Massachusettes.
- Olowu, E.U., 1978. The Victims of Crime and the Police: A case study of Ubokolo Edumoga in Okpokwu L.G.A of Benue State.
- Pointing, J. and M. Maquire, 1988. Victims of Crime: A New Deal? Milton Keynes OUP.
- Roach, K., 2000. Charging punishment as the turn of the century: Restorative justice on the rise. Can. J. Criminol., 43(3): 250-280.
- Schafer, S., 1977. Victimology: The Victim and His Criminal Offender. Reston Coy Inc. Virginia.
- Sparks, *et al.*, 1977. Surveying Victims of Crime: A Study of the Measurement of Criminal Victimization. John Wiley and sons.
- Sumner, C., 1982. Crime, Justice and Underdevelopment. Heinemann, London.
- The Free Dictionary, 2010. Victims of Crime. Farlex, Inc. USA.
- United Nations, 1984. Report on crime prevention and criminal justice in the context of development. Guidelines for the Measures on Behalf of Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power. Vienna.
- Wikipedia, 2007. Victimology. The Free Encyclopedia. Wikimedia Foundation, Wikipedia.
- Randzinowicz, L. and M.E. Wolfgang, 1971. The Criminal in Society. Basic Books Inc.