

**KIDNAPPING FOR RANSOM AND ITS SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS IN NIGERIA'S
NORTH-WEST (2010-2022): EVIDENCE FROM KATSINA STATE****YUSUFU AHMED AUDU, PHD**

Department of Political Science
Federal University Dutsin-Ma, Katsina State
Corresponding Author's E-Mail: auduyusuf@gmail.com

IDREES Mahmud Gana

Department of Political Science
Federal University Dutsin-Ma, Katsina State

&**MAMMAN Aliyu**

Department of Political Science
Federal University Dutsin-Ma, Katsina State

ABSTRACT

The paper investigated kidnapping as an emergent security challenge and its socio-economic effects in Nigeria's north-west region using Katsina state as a reference point between 2010 and 2022. Theoretically the paper deployed Routine Activity Theory (RAT) as its framework of analysis while methodologically the paper employed mixed methods approach with quantitative dominance in data collection and analysis. Research hypotheses were tested at 5% level of significance using non-parametric statistics (chi-square). Findings revealed that unemployment and poverty are the major factors responsible for the rising incidences of kidnapping in the state. Findings also showed that, loss of the lives of some victims, financial loss through payment of ransom, forceful closure of businesses; forceful closure of schools; and restrictions in farming activities were the major socio-economic effects of kidnapping in the state. Further finding revealed that Katsina state's response to kidnapping in particular and armed banditry in general through amnesty programme and dialogues among others have not effectively curtailed its occurrence in the state. The paper thus concluded that kidnapping would continue to remain a major security challenge in the state in particular and the north-west in general as long as the sponsors/handlers of kidnapers are not identified and made to face the full wrath of the law. The paper recommended among others that government should come up with new policies on employment creation and poverty alleviation so as to reduce the number of idle hands on the streets; identify and prosecute the sponsors/handlers of kidnapers so as to serve as deterrent to others.

Keywords: *Effects, kidnapping, security challenge, socio-economic & ransom*

Introduction

The phenomenon of kidnapping is not a novel social problem in the World. The phenomenon manifests in different forms, dimensions, degrees and intensity in terms of its practice in different parts of the World. Kidnapping has been experienced in different countries irrespective of whether they are developed or not. For instance, the menace of kidnapping has been experienced in Mexico, the United States of America (USA), Iraq, Cameroon, and Nigeria among others. According to the U.S Department of State (2014), Mexico was reported to have suffered an estimated 105,682 kidnapping cases in 2012 alone. According to the National Centre for Missing and Exploited Children, roughly 800,000 children are reported missing each year in the USA alone (Ene, 2018)

Kidnapping for ransom is an emerging security challenge in Nigeria's North-West region. Kidnapping actually started on 25th February 2006 in Nigeria by the abduction of expatriate oil company employees in the Niger Delta region, which was displayed as an open message to the World for many years of marginalization, injustice, exploitation, and underdevelopment of the oil-rich region (Akpan, 2010). Since then, the phenomenon of kidnapping became openly commercialized in several parts of the country, including the North-Western region. The phenomenon has since then become a big money spinning

'venture'. In the year 2008 Nigeria was placed sixth on the Global Kidnap Index (GKI) by an online tourism site (Inyang & Abraham, 2013). This rating puts the country among countries with serious kidnapping problems, such as Philippines, Venezuela, Columbia, Brazil, and Mexico (Ujumadu, 2008; Ekpe, 2009). In contemporary Nigeria, the implications of kidnapping are not only on the foreigners; sadly, it now includes locals, such as; the poor and the rich, the aged, and children (Ibrahim & Ahmad, 2020). According to Ekpe, (2009), Nigeria recorded 512 cases of kidnapping and 30 persons were reported to have died in their kidnappers' den that year as against 353 cases recorded throughout 2008. Similarly, Kyrian (2009) reported that the former Inspector General of Police in Nigeria had noted that, kidnappers and hostage takers got about USD100 million between 2006 and 2009.

The spate of kidnapping for ransom has been so alarming in recent years. The country's rate of kidnapping at National level was 0.001 per 100,000 populations in 2013; reports also indicated that the phenomenon escalated from 29 in 2016 to 40 in 2018, evolving at an average annual rate of 42.84%, even though the incidences fluctuated substantially, from 2017 to 3rd quarter of 2019 it tended to decline to 25 and changed at 78.57% (Knoema, 2019). The most unfortunate victims of the menace of kidnapping in Nigeria often die in the process while the luckier ones are released after severe torture and payment of huge ransom (Ibrahim & Ahmad, 2020). Most of the incidences of kidnapping in Nigeria in recent years take place on the road, where the security network is very poor; and reasons ranging from unemployment, idleness, vengeance, rituals, monetary gains and politics have been blamed for the prevalence of this security challenge (Onwuatuegwu, 2020).

In Nigeria, kidnapping gradually started in the Niger Delta region of the country with the kidnap of foreign oil company workers, but has now metamorphosed into a very "lucrative business" especially with the introduction of ransom payment by these kidnappers. Today, virtually every state in every geo-political zone of Nigeria is riddled with the incidences of kidnapping! In Nigeria's North-West for instance, states like Zamfara, Kaduna and Katsina have become the epicenters of kidnapping. Anyone plying Abuja-Kaduna expressway is seen as being on a suicide mission given the rising cases of kidnapping on that road. Adebajo (2021) citing Nigeria Security Tracker (NST) revealed that about 8, 661 people were kidnapped in the Nigeria between 2015 and the first half of 2021! Kidnapping has led to a high level of fear which threatens the economic prosperity, political climate, business and general climate of the country (Onwuatuegwu, 2020).

It is against this backdrop that this paper analyses the phenomenon of kidnapping and its socio-economic effects in Nigeria's north-west region using Katsina state as a reference point from 2010 to 2022. The paper is divided into six sections. Section one is the introduction. Relevant and related literature is conceptually and empirically reviewed in section two. Section three focuses on theoretical framework while section four centers on the research methodology of this study. In section five, data generated from the field survey are analyzed and the results/findings discussed; and in section six, conclusion is drawn and recommendations made.

Review of Related Literature

The term "kidnapping" is difficult to define with precision, because it varies from one State to another and from one jurisdiction to the other (Asuquo, 2009). Walsh and Adrian (1983) also noted that, kidnapping varies from country to country; therefore, the term is uncertain and devoid of any straight jacket definition. They therefore simply defined kidnapping as an unlawful seizure and detention of people by force, against their will. Ene (2018) defined kidnapping as the forcible seizure, taking away and unlawful detention of a person against his/her will. It is a common offence against the law and the key part is that, it is considered an unwanted act on the part of the victim. Fage and Alabi (2017) defined kidnapping as forceful or fraudulent seizure of an individual or a group of individuals for economic, political and religious reasons. According to Dodo (2010), kidnapping is a crime of seizing, confining, abducting or carrying away a person by force or fraud often to subject him or her to involuntary servitude in an attempt to demand a ransom. In other words, it involves unlawfully seizing and carrying away a person by force or fraud or seizing and detaining a person against his or her will with the intent of carrying that person away at a later time (Garner, 2009).

Inyang and Abraham (2013) defined kidnapping as the forcible seizure, taking away and unlawful detention of a person against his/her will. According to Nwaorah (2009), kidnapping is an act of an angry

man who wants to take any person of value hostage, and who could be rescued by loved ones. In most cases, victims are often released after payment of ransom. The phenomenon of kidnapping can also be described as abducting or capturing away of a person intentionally to deprive them of personal freedom (Ugwuoke, 2011; Walsh & Poole, 2019). Ogabido (2009) defines kidnapping to mean abduction, capturing, carrying off, removing or stealing away a person or persons. Kidnapping occurs when a person is abducted and taken from one place to another against their will, or a situation in which a person is confined to a controlled space without the confinement being from a legal authority. Consequently, when the transportation or confinement of the person is done for an unlawful purpose, such as for ransom or for the purpose of committing another crime, the act becomes criminal. Kidnapping is an act of seizing, taking away and keeping a person in custody either by force or fraud (Mungadi *et al*, 2020).

For Uzorma and Nwanegbo-Ben (2014), kidnapping is the act of seizing and taking away a person with the use of unlawful force or through fraudulent means requiring the payment of a ransom. Thomas and Nta (2009) defined kidnapping as robbery of the highest rank. To these scholars, kidnapping is an organized and systematic robbery which is not as deadly as armed-robbery, but more profitable than armed-robbery. Kidnapping comprises capturing and detaining an individual against his or her will, usually it is an extension of other criminal intentions (Ibrahim & Ahmad, 2020). The strategies employed by kidnapers in Nigeria include the use of telephones to lure their unsuspecting victims or trailing them to any location considered safe for them to strike (Chukwigwe & Albert, 2015).

According to Nseabasi, (2010), kidnapping in Nigeria manifests in different forms and patterns. The first pattern of manifestation is the ethnic militia that employs kidnapping as the major weapon of agitation against oppression, exploitation and environmental pollution. This set of kidnapers, kidnap expatriates who work in the oil companies in the region. This form of kidnapping is common in the oil-rich region of the Niger Delta. Another form of kidnapping is dislodged militia and other criminal elements that engage in kidnapping as a means of survival. The last but not the least form of kidnapers is not militants but elements in the society that engage in any venture they consider lucrative. This category of people sees kidnapping as source of livelihood. Other recent and digital forms of kidnapping have since emerged; terrorists or political revolutionaries like the Islamic fundamentalists (*Boko Haram*) terrorist group which employs kidnapping as a tactic to extort or seek concessions from the government and the digital or online kidnapping. This form of kidnapping directly and indirectly impacts on man and operates in two forms. One involves the kidnapping of the organization's website by hacking for a ransom while the other involves the stealing of images of children posted online by some parents (Chukwigwe & Albert, 2015).

For Zannoni (2003), there are three broadly categories of kidnapping, namely (i) Criminal kidnapping: This according to Zannoni (2003) is a kidnapping motivated by the quest to obtain ransom from the victim's family, business or associates; (ii) Political kidnapping; this type of kidnapping is informed by the desire to advance a political course often through the use of sophisticated weapons. Militant and terrorist activities fall under this category; and (iii) Pathological kidnapping, which is also known as emotional kidnapping (Zannoni, 2003). This is a type of kidnapping where the motive is to inflict psychological pains on the victim (s). Examples of this type of kidnapping include rape and child abduction by separated parents among others. Other forms of kidnapping identified by Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC, 2019) in Ayuba (2020, p.150) include: tiger kidnapping or proxy bombings. It is a form of kidnapping in which ransom is not sought; rather the victim is forced into doing a specific action for the criminals like coercing a banker to disclose the password of the vault of the bank in order to steal from it. Sometimes, the victim could be kidnapped and coerced to plant an explosive in a target (proxy bombing) which is very common among militant groups through guerrilla warfare. Tiger kidnapping is common in western and Asian countries. Another form kidnapping identified is Express kidnapping. This type of kidnapping is mostly common in Africa and Latin America. It involves only the perpetrator and the victim where the victim is threatened by the criminal through the use of weapon or other dreadful means usually to coerce them to make ATM withdrawals of maximum daily amount of cash. In some instances, the victim is held hostage to pass the night with the criminals, particularly when the victim exceeds the daily maximum limit of withdrawals. Express kidnapers use different strategies or forms to execute their evil intentions. Apart from using weapon to physically conscript the victim and get him/her do what they want, the express

kidnappers sometimes pose as taxi drivers or even police officers in order to fool their unsuspecting victim.

Ibrahim and Ahmad (2020) blamed the rising incidences of kidnapping and related crimes on the government's reluctance to address the problems associated with youth unemployment (Inyang, 2009), the influence of hard drug consumption (Okoli, 2009; Ene, 2018), quick money syndrome (Dodo, 2010), and the influence of corrupt politicians on vulnerable youths (Ibeanu, 1997). According to Soyombo (2016), kidnapping has psychological effects on people as it hampers so social relations among people and their social lives disrupted as they are kept indoors most times of the day and night. Kidnapping also has socio-economic effects in the society because of the money paid to these criminals as ransom (Ibrahim & Ahmad, 2020). Blaming the rising cases of kidnapping on the problems of unemployment and poverty, Ogabido (2009, p.7) had this to say; "the issue of poverty and unemployment of youths as well as social injustice and 'unfair distribution of the nation's resources are potent causes of kidnapping in Nigeria. These factors have caused the youths to engage in kidnapping and criminal activities as a way of getting their share of nation's wealth"

Review of Empirical Studies

Inyang and Abraham (2013) interrogated the problem of kidnapping and its consequences on Nigerians in general and Uyo dwellers of Akwa-Ibom State in particular. The study elicited data through questionnaire from 260 randomly selected respondents comprising of Police officers from various departments at the State Police Headquarters at Ikot Akpan Abia, Uyo, in Akwa Ibom State, lawyers from the State Judiciary Headquarters as well as clergymen and members of the public in the study area. Chi-square analytical tool was used to analyze elicited data at 5% level of significance. The result from the test of hypothesis one shows that there is a significant relationship between the recurring rates of kidnapping and the people's culture. Test of hypothesis two shows that there is no correlation between kidnapping and the disposition of government. Test of hypothesis three shows that kidnapping is significantly dependent on the provisions of the Nigerian Constitution; while result from hypothesis four shows that there is no significant relationship between kidnapping and political activities. Findings from the study show that, the prevalence of kidnapping in Nigeria is as a result of laxity in the law implementation process to prosecute offenders. Consequent upon these findings, it is suggested that the issue of ransom payment to kidnappers by victims' families/relatives should be seriously condemned. Government also should endeavor to create employment opportunities for the teeming population of youths as this will assist to check the rate of the kidnapping in Akwa-Ibom State in particular and the country at large.

Chukuigwe and Albert (2015) examined the socio-economic effects of kidnapping on the development of Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni Local Government Areas (LGAs) of Rivers State. A multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select 150 respondents from 10 communities in the study area. Questionnaire and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were the research instruments employed to collect data. Both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were used for data analysis. Descriptive tools include frequency counts, percentage and mean. The inferential tools used are the t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results of the study show that the major causes of kidnapping in the study area are moral decadence, quest to get rich quick without work, proliferation of arms, unemployment, cultism/quest for supremacy, politics and insecurity. The results also show that kidnapping pose serious challenge to socio-economic indices such as loss of lives and property, psychological/emotional trauma, unplanned relocation of people, and financial loss through payment of ransom among others. Further findings show that efforts at eradicating kidnapping in the study area are being inhibited by challenges such as inadequate/ill equipped anti-kidnapping squad, army of unemployed youth, complicity of some security agents and poor security network. Based on these findings, the study therefore recommended among others that there should be collaboration between government, communities and other stakeholders for value reorientation.

Ordu (2015) examines the phenomenon of kidnapping, security challenges and obstacles to the control of hostage taking in Nigeria. The study adopted a qualitative research design. Findings of the study showed that poor governance trends as long as there exists absence of provisions of basic amenities; good roads, hospitals, good schools, modern commercial trading centers and good drinking water system are essential ingredients in the governance of the society. National Crime Research Centre (2017) on the other hand deployed Social Control Theory to assess emerging crimes and cases of kidnappings in Kenya. The study

administered snowball sampled questionnaire in twenty randomly selected counties. Data generated from the field survey were analyzed and presented using frequency counts, percentages and tables. Findings of the study indicates that the creation of employment opportunities for the teeming youth a panacea to the challenge of kidnapping.

Ibrahim and Mukhtar (2017) deployed a synergy of social exchange and lifestyle theories in a qualitative study to investigate the causes and consequences of kidnapping in Nigeria. The study utilized secondary data generated from available literature. Findings from the study revealed that corruption as an act of bad governance has indirect connection to kidnapping, whereby political thugs who were mainly youths served corrupt political leaders and turned out to become kidnapers, sometimes for ransom from political opponents. Emanemua and Akinlosotu (2017) interrogated the waves of kidnapping for ransom, its implications and quest for a lasting solution in Nigeria. The study deployed a qualitative research design which entails extensively reviewing literature on kidnapping. The findings of this study revealed that the Nigerian government needs to take realistic steps in its policy decisions to address economic hardship and unemployment problems through good governance at all levels including in non-public enterprises.

Saidu *et al* (2018) thematically examined the escalating spate of insecurity and kidnapping in Nigeria with particular reference to Kaduna State. The study generated relevant data from secondary sources such as books, journals and web-based materials among others. Findings from the study revealed that good governance by way of coordinated proactive economic and political policies and programs are vital tools for curtailing economic hardship, political and moral decadence; which are all triggers of kidnapping and violent crimes as evidenced in Kaduna State in particular and the country at large.

Theoretical Framework

Kidnapping is a crime. Therefore, this paper adopts Marcus Felson and Lawrence Cohen's Routine Activity Theory (RAT) of crime in explaining the menace of kidnapping and its effects on the socio-economic development of Katsina state in Nigeria's north-west region. The theory was propounded in 1979 (Hsieh & Wang 2018). Felson and Cohen used the theory to explain the changes in the rate of crime in the United States of America for the past four decades. Since its formulation, the theory has been extensively applied to studies on crimes, and has become one of the most cited theories in criminology. Unlike criminological theories of criminality, RAT studies crime as an event; it closely relates crime to its environment and emphasizes its ecological process thereby diverting academic attention away from mere offenders.

The theory holds that crime is likely to occur when there is a spatial-temporal convergence of three essential elements of crime, namely a motivated offender, an attractive target, and the absence of capable guardianship. According to the exponents of the theory, motivated offenders are individuals who are capable and willing to commit a crime while suitable targets can be persons or objects that are considered by offenders as vulnerable or attractive. On the other hand, guardianship can be a person or an object that is effective in deterring offense to occur. Mere physical presence of guardianship in space and time can deter crime committal.

Basic Assumptions of RAT

The following are the basic assumptions of RAT:

- a. Crime is likely to occur when there is a spatial-temporal convergence of three essential elements of crime, namely a motivated offender, an attractive target, and the absence of capable guardianship;
- b. The factors that render a particular target attractive are situational and crime-specific;
- c. Crime can be perpetrated by anyone who has the opportunity in terms of capability and availability of vulnerable target;
- d. Victims have choices on whether to be victims mainly by possibly avoiding situations where a crime can be committed against them. (Cohen & Felson 1979)

Application of RAT to the Study

According to this theory, crime is likely to occur when there is a spatial-temporal convergence of three essential elements of crime, namely a motivated offender, an attractive target, and the absence of capable guardianship. A motivated offender in this case is the kidnapper who is motivated to commit crime because of frustration caused by unemployment, poverty and economic hardship among others. This

explains why these kidnapers ask for ransom from their victims’ families. Attractive targets are vulnerable persons such as innocent travelers on the highways or those considered to be rich enough or capable of paying ransom. Some of these attractive targets are even kidnapped from the comfort of their homes. Absence of capable guardianship means the absence of law enforcement agents (security officers) that are supposed to provide security for the lives and property of the citizens. The absence of these security agents makes the citizens even more vulnerable since protection is lacking. This is typically the situation in Katsina state where kidnapers are having a sustained field day in criminal escapades that is threatening to overrun the North-West in particular and the Northern region in general.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted in Katsina state of north-western Nigeria. The state was created on 23rd September, 1987 and it is structured into 34 Local Government Areas (LGAs). The major occupations of the people are rain-fed crop farming during the rainy season and irrigation farming during the dry seasons along the rivers and dams in the state. Cattle rearing are also practiced on the grassland areas by the Fulani and the native Hausa people of the state. Trading activities are also a major occupation that involves travelling for buying and selling at the weekly markets in towns and villages in the state.

Yamani (1967) statistical formula for sample size determination was used to determine a sample size of 400 respondents. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to draw the sample for the study. The first stage involves using purposive sampling technique to selected 3 out of the 8 most affected LGAs by the activities of kidnapers in the state. The LGAs include: Jibia, kankara and Safana. The second stage involves administering Structured Questionnaire (SQ) to target respondents using convenience or accidental sampling technique. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze data collected via SQ while non-parametric statistics (chi-square) was used to test the research hypotheses at 5% (0.05) level of significance.

$$n = N / 1 + N (e)^2$$

Where N represents population size
 n represents minimum sample size
 e represents the degree of error expected (0.05)

$$n = 804,400 / 1 + 804,400 (0.05)^2$$

$$n = 804,400 / 2012$$

$$n = 399.8$$

n is approximately = 400

Table 1: Sampled LGAs and their Respective Respondents

LGAs	Population (2016)	Number of Respondents
Jibia	226,000	226,000/804,400*400=113
Kankara	328,400	328,400/804,400*400=163
Safana	250,000	250,000/804,400*400=124
Total	804,400	400

Source: NPC, 2016 projected population

Results and Discussion

The respondents were asked to express their opinions based on the statements given in the SQ as tabulated below using 5-point Likert Scale of SA (5), A (4), U (3), D (2), (1). The **Relative Importance Index (RII)** of the respondents is computed thus: 5+4+3+2+1=15/5=3.0

Decision Rule: If the **RII** is less than 3.0, the respondents disagreed; if the **RII** is equal to 3.0, the respondents are undecided; if the **RII** is greater than 3.0, the respondents agreed and as such the statement is taken as important.

Table 2: Relative Importance Index of the Causes of Kidnapping

CAUSES	5	4	3	2	1	TWV	RII	RANK
Unemployment/Poverty	187	176	07	17	13	1707	4.27	1 st
Weak security system	178	173	19	11	19	1680	4.20	2 nd
Get rich quick syndrome	175	169	12	21	23	1652	4.13	3 rd
Bad governance	171	165	16	19	29	1630	4.08	4 th
Politicization of kidnapping	166	163	07	37	27	1604	4.01	5 th
High rate of drug abuse	159	157	11	38	35	1567	3.92	6 th

Source: Field Work, 2022

Analysis of the data in table 2 shows that the most important factor responsible for the increasing incidences of kidnapping in Katsina State is unemployment/poverty with **RII (4.27) ranked 1st**. This finding is consistent with the findings of similar study carried out by Inyang (2009), Ogabido (2009), and Chukuigwe and Albert (2015)

Weak security system which has **RII (4.20)** is the second most important cause of the rising cases of kidnapping in the State. This finding is in tandem with the findings of similar study carried out by Yusufu and Ilevbare (2021) who found that inadequate security is responsible for the rising incidences of armed banditry in Katsina State. Also found to be an important cause of kidnapping in the State is the issue of get rich quick syndrome with **RII (4.13) ranked 3rd**. This finding agrees with the finding of similar study conducted by Ibrahim and Ahmad (2020) who blamed the negligence of the Nigerian government to address the root causes of kidnapping such as youth unemployment, quick-money syndrome and hard drugs among others as being responsible for the rising spate of the phenomenon. Another factor considered as an important cause of kidnapping is bad governance with **RII (4.08) ranked 4th**.

Also found to be a significant factor responsible for the rising cases of kidnapping in the State are politicization of kidnapping with **RII (4.01) ranked 5th**. This finding agrees with the work of Ibeanu (1997) who found that Nigerian politicians hire idle youths and use them as political thugs. Politicians also hire the services of these youths for the purpose of getting at their opponents. Further findings show that high rate of drug abuse among the teeming youths in the State with **RII (3.92) ranked 6th** is also a major factor responsible for the rising cases of kidnapping in the State. This finding is in tandem with the findings of similar studies conducted by Ene (2018), Okoli (2009), Ibrahim and Ahmad (2020) who found that the upsurge of kidnapping in Nigeria is as a result of high consumption and trafficking of hard drugs.

Table 3: Relative Importance Index of Socio-Economic Effects of Kidnapping

EFFECTS	5	4	3	2	1	TWV	RII	RANK
Loss of the lives of some victims	183	181	13	10	13	1711	4.28	1 st
Financial loss through payment of ransom	179	177	26	12	06	1707	4.27	2 nd
Indebtedness of victims' families	176	184	22	8	10	1708	4.27	2 nd
Restrictions in farming activities	188	173	09	14	16	1703	4.26	4 th
Forceful closure of schools	165	162	27	24	22	1624	4.06	5 th
Forceful closure of businesses	164	155	28	35	18	1612	4.03	6 th
Unplanned relocation of people	160	157	33	27	23	1604	4.01	7 th

Source: Field Work, 2022

Analysis of data in Table 3 reveals that the socio-economic effect of kidnapping with the highest **RII (4.28)** is loss of the lives of some victims ranked **1st**. Findings also reveal that financial loss through payment of ransom with **RII (4.27)** is another significant socio-economic effect of kidnapping in the State ranked **2nd**.

This finding is in consonance with the findings of similar study conducted by Inyang and Abraham (2013) who found that much money is usually spent on the payment of ransom to kidnappers. Also ranked 2nd as a significant socio-economic effect of kidnapping in the State is indebtedness of victims’ families with RII (4.27). Another significant socio-economic effect of kidnapping in Katsina State is restriction on farming activities which has RII (4.26) ranked 4th. Other significant socio-economic effects include: forceful closure of schools with RII (4.06) ranked 5th, forceful closure of businesses RII (4.03) ranked 6th and unplanned relocation of people with RII (4.01) ranked 7th.

Table 4: Effectiveness of Government’s Response to the Menace of Kidnapping

GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSE	EFFECTIVE	NOT EFFECTIVE	NOT SURE	TOTAL
The use of amnesty programme	19 (4.75%)	378 (94.5%)	03 (0.75%)	400
The use of dialogue	30 (7.5%)	359 (89.75%)	11(2.75%)	400
Deployment of security agents	389 (97.25%)	10 (2.5%)	01 (0.25)	400
The use of vigilante groups	392 (98%)	6 (1.5%)	02 (0.5%)	400
Shutting down of communication networks	361 (90.25%)	35 (8.75%)	04 (1%)	400

Source: Field Work, 2022

Analysis of data in Table 4 shows that 378 respondents representing 94.5% are of the opinion that government’s response to kidnapping through amnesty programme was not effective in addressing the menace. 19 respondents representing 4.75% are of the opinion that the amnesty programme was effective in addressing the menace of kidnapping. 3 respondents representing 0.75% are not sure whether the amnesty programme was effective or not. These findings indicate that the Katsina government’s response to kidnapping through amnesty programme was not effective in addressing the menace of kidnapping. This finding agrees with the results of similar study conducted by Ochi, Ortindi & Arinze (2022) who found that the use of amnesty programme has not made any difference as the situation has rather worsen in recent times.

Also, analysis of data in Table 4 reveals that 359 respondents representing 89.75% of the respondents are of the opinion that the use of dialogue to address the menace of kidnapping was not effective in addressing the scourge. 30 respondents representing 7.5% are of the opinion that the use of dialogue by the government was effective in addressing the menace of kidnapping while 11 respondents representing 2.75% are not sure whether the use of dialogue was effective or not. These findings therefore suggest that the use of dialogue by the government was not effective in addressing the menace of kidnapping in the state. This finding agrees with the results of similar study conducted by Ochi, Ortindi & Arinze (2022) who found that the use of peace initiatives not made any difference as the situation has rather worsen in recent times.

Furthermore, analysis of data in Table 4 shows that 389 respondents representing 97.25% are of the opinion that government’s response to the menace of kidnapping through the deployment of security agents was effective while 10 respondents representing 2.5% felt it was not effective. A respondent representing 0.25% was not sure whether the use of force was effective or not. This finding suggests that the deployment of security agents by the government to tackle the menace of kidnapping in the state remains the most effective strategy for curtailing the rising incidences of security challenges, especially kidnapping for ransom in the state. This finding agrees with the results of similar study conducted by Rosenji & Adeniyi (2021) who found that the deployment of security agents has been the most effective strategy as it has led to the recovery of a total of 118 cows and 28 sheep from armed bandits in Niger state.

Analysis of data in Table 4 also reveals that 392 respondents representing 98% agreed that the use of vigilante groups by the government to manage the menace of kidnapping was effective while 6 respondents representing 1.5% felt it was not effective. However, 2 respondents representing 0.5% were not sure whether the use of vigilante was effective or not. From the analysis of data in Table 4 above; 361 respondents

representing 90.25% agreed that shutting down of communication networks in some selected LGAs by the government was an effective response to the menace of kidnapping in the state while 35 respondents representing 8.75% felt it was not effective. However, 4 respondents representing 1% were not sure whether shutting down of communication network was effective or not.

Table 5: Relative Importance Index of Solutions to the Menace of Kidnapping

SOLUTION	5	4	3	2	1	TWV	RII	RANK
New policy on job creation	191	186	03	12	08	1740	4.35	1 st
Identifying and prosecuting sponsors of kidnappers	185	178	14	10	13	1712	4.28	2 nd
Strengthening the security system in the state	183	181	09	11	16	1704	4.26	3 rd
Good governance at all levels of government	179	166	05	24	26	1648	4.12	4 th

Source: Field Work, 2022

Analysis of data in Table 5 shows that new policy on job creation with **RII (4.35) ranked 1st** is the most significant solution to the problem of kidnapping in the state. Identifying and prosecuting the sponsors of kidnappers with **RII (4.28) ranked 2nd** is also considered a significant solution to the menace of kidnapping as evident in the responses of the respondents. Other significant solutions to the menace of kidnapping in state, according to the respondents include: strengthening the security system in the state with **RII (4.26) ranked 3rd** and good governance at all levels of government in the state with **RII (4.12) ranked 4th**.

Test of Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses stated below were tested with the aid of non-parametric statistical tool known as chi-square (X²) at 5% (0.05) level of significance.

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

$\alpha = 5\% (0.05)$

$df = (c-1) (r-1)$

H0: The menace of kidnapping does not affect the socio-economic development of Katsina state.

H1: The menace of kidnapping affects the socio-economic development of Katsina state.

General Decision Rule

The decision rule for statistical significance states that wherever the calculated chi-square is greater than the table value, the alternate hypothesis should be accepted, while the null hypothesis should be rejected. On the other hand, whenever the table value is greater than the calculated value, the null hypothesis should be accepted, while the alternate hypothesis should be rejected (Spiegel, Schiller & Srinivasan, 2004).

Table 6: Test of Hypothesis Table (Variables 2 & 5 on Table 3)

VARIABLE	SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL
2	179	177	26	12	06	400
5	165	162	27	24	22	400
TOTAL	344	339	53	36	28	800

Source: Authors’ own computation, 2022

$df = (c-1) (r-1)$

$df = (5-1) (2-1)$

$df = (4) (1)$

df= 4

$\alpha = 5\%$ (0.05)

$$f_e = \frac{\text{Column Total} \times \text{Row Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$$

Table 7: Observed Frequency (F₀) & Expected Frequency (F_e) Table

F ₀	F _e	(F ₀ -F _e)	(F ₀ -F _e) ²	$\frac{(F_0-F_e)^2}{F_e}$
179	172	07	49	0.28
177	169.5	7.5	56.25	0.33
26	26.5	-0.5	0.25	0.01
12	18	-06	36	02
06	14	-08	64	4.57
165	172	-07	49	0.28
162	169.5	-7.5	56.25	0.33
27	26.5	0.5	0.25	0.01
24	18	06	36	02
22	14	08	64	4.57
TOTAL				14.38

Source: Authors' own computation, 2022

$X^2_c = 14.38$

$X^2_t = 9.49$

df= 4

Decision

Since the calculated chi-square is greater than the table value ($X^2_{cal.} = 14.38 > X^2_{tab.} = 9.49$), the alternate hypothesis (H₁) is accepted while the null hypothesis (H₀) is rejected. Therefore, the test of hypothesis suggests that the menace of kidnapping affects the socio-economic development of Katsina state in particular and the north-west in general

Conclusion and Recommendations

The paper assessed the socio-economic effects of kidnapping in Katsina state of north-western Nigeria from the perspective of Routine Activity Theory of crime. The paper deployed mixed methods approach in data collection and analysis with quantitative dominance. While descriptive statistics was used to analyse data generated via SQ, non-parametric statistics (chi-square) was used to test the research hypotheses at 5% (0.05) level of significance. Findings reveal that unemployment and poverty are the major factors responsible for the rising incidences of kidnapping in the state. Findings also show that, loss of the lives of some victims, financial loss through payment of ransom, forceful closure of businesses, forceful closure of schools, and restrictions in farming activities among others are the major socio-economic effects of kidnapping in Katsina state. The paper equally found that the deployment of formal security agents, the use of local vigilante groups and shutting down of communication networks in affected LGAs in the state were effective to some extent in managing the menace of kidnapping. Further findings however reveal that the state government's responses to the menace of kidnapping in particular and armed banditry in general

through amnesty programme and dialogues among others strategies have not really yielded the desired results. The paper thus concludes that kidnapping will remain a major security challenge in the state in particular and the north-west in general as long as the sponsors/handlers of kidnappers are not identified and made to face the full wrath of the law.

On the basis of these findings and conclusion drawn, the following recommendations were made:

- a. The government should come up with new policies on employment creation and poverty reduction so as to reduce the number of idle hands on the streets.
- b. The government should strengthen its security system. More security agents need to be urgently recruited, trained, motivated and provided with modern weapons of warfare to enable them win the war against kidnapping in particular and armed banditry in general.
- c. There is an urgent need for the government to identify and prosecute sponsors/handlers of kidnappers so as to serve as deterrent to others.
- d. Good governance is very important if the menace of kidnapping is to be curtailed. Governments at all levels should be proactive and just/fair in the distribution of the resources of the society. Dividends of democracy should not only be on paper; they should be visible for all to see. Government needs to formulate and implement masses-friendly policies that would touch the life of the common man and improve his standard of living/

References

- Adebanjo, K. (2021, July 12). Data: More Nigerians kidnapped in first 6 months of 2021 than all of 2020 - <https://humanglemedia.com/data-more-nigerians-kidnapped-in-first-6-months-of-2021-than-all-of-2020>
- Akpan, N. S. (2010). Kidnapping in Nigeria's Niger Delta: An exploratory study. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 24(1), 33-42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2010.11892834>
- Asuquo, M. E. (2009). The upsurge of kidnapping and its influence on public order in AkwaIbom State. Unpublished Paper, Department of Sociology/Anthropology, University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwalbom State, Nigeria
- Ayuba, M. R (2020). Trajectories, typologies and implications of kidnapping in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management, Social Sciences, Peace, and Conflict Studies*, 3 (2), 144-160
- Chukwigwe, N & Albert, C.O (2015). Socio-economic effects of kidnapping on the development of Ogba/Egbema/Ngodi Local Government Area of Rivers State Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology*, 16 (2), 51-57
- Cohen, L. E. & Felson, M. (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: A Routine Activity Approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44 (4): 588–608; doi: [10.2307/2094589](https://doi.org/10.2307/2094589).
- Dodo, W. A. (2010). The causes and remedies of kidnapping in Nigeria. *The Nigerian Academic Forum*, 19(1), 56-60
- Emanemua, A. B., & Akinlosotu, T. N. (2017). Kidnapping for ransom in Nigeria: Implications and quest for permanent solution. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities (IJAH)*, 5(2), 20-27
- Ene, W. R. (2018). Kidnapping and the Nigerian society: A sociological insight. *International Journal of Development and Management Review*, 13(1), 161-172. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Fage, K. S. and Alabi, D. O. (2017). *Nigerian Government and Politics*. Abuja: Basfa Global Concept Limited
- Garner, A. G. (2009). *The Black's Law Dictionary*. U.S.A: Thomson Reuteur
- Ibrahim, Y.K & Ahmad, A.A (2020). The causes of kidnapping and its implications in Nigeria. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal*, 4 (1), 1-9
- Ibrahim, B., & Mukhtar, J. I. (2017). An analysis of the causes and consequences of kidnapping in Nigeria. *Africa Research Review Journal*, 11(4), 134-143

- Inyang, J. D & Abraham, U.E (2013). The social problem of kidnapping and its implications on the socio-economic development of Nigeria: A study of Uyo metropolis. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (6), 531-544.
- Knoema, (2019). Total types of violence to crew-kidnapping. <https://knoema.com/PARS2018/piracy-and-armed-robbery-against-ships?tsId=1007370>
- Kyrian, I. (2009). Intelligence reports and kidnapping. *Dawn*, May 17, 9
- Mungadi, D.D *et al* (2020). Roadmap to tackling insurgency, armed banditry and kidnapping in the North-West Region of Nigeria. *Journal of Indian University*, 14 (10), 914-928
- National Crime Research Centre (2017). Emerging crimes: The case of kidnappings in Kenya.
- Nseabasi, S. A. (2010). Kidnapping in Nigeria's Niger Delta: An exploratory study. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 24(1), 33-42
- Nwaorah, N. (2009). Are kidnapers worst criminals? *Vanguard*, March 29, p. 14.
- Ochi, I.B, Ortindi, B & Arinze, E.O (2022). Crisis of banditry and the internally displaced persons in Nigeria: A political economy approach. *Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 247-256. DOI: 10.36347/sjebm.2022.v09i11.001
- Ogabido, G. O. (2009). Kidnapping: New brand of terrorism. *Saturday Sun*, October 31,
- Onwuatuegwu, I. N (2020). Human life versus the culture of death: Kidnapping, Boko Haram and Fulani herdsmen: A case study of Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 25 (5), 33-41.
- Ordu, G. E (2015). Kidnapping, security challenges and obstacles to the control of hostage taking in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Art*, 5(1), 14-24.
- Rosenje, M., & Adeniyi, O. (2021). The impact of banditry on Nigeria's security in the fourth republic: An evaluation of Nigeria's north-west. Available @ <https://zjpd.com.ng> > zjpd > article
- Saidu, B., Binti, U. A. B., Zakuan, A., Zaman, K., & Yusoff, B. H. (2018). Kidnapping and rise of insecurity in Nigeria: A case of Kaduna state. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 6(4), 41-48.
- Spiegel, M. R., Schiller, J. & Srinivivasan, R. A. (2004). *Probability and Statistics (2nd Edition)*. New York, U.S.A: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Ugwuoke, C. U. (2011). Nigeria and the menace of kidnapping: The way forward. *The Nigerian Journal of Research and Production*, 18(2), 1-14.
- Uzorma, P. N. and Nwanegbo-Ben, J. (2014). Challenges of hostage-taking and kidnapping in the South-Eastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature*, 2 (6), 131-142
- Walsh, D., & Poole, A. (2019). *A Dictionary of Criminology* (6th ed.). Dermot Rout ledge
- Yusufu, A.A & Ilevbare, I.T (2021) Persistence of armed banditry in Northern Nigeria as a threat to internal security in Katsina State, 2015-2019. *VUNA Journal of History and International Relations*, 5 (2), 27-41
- Zannoni, I. E. (2003). Understanding and managing the threat of kidnapping. Retrieved from:<http://securitysa.com/article.asp?pkIArticleID=2443&pkIIssueID=333&pkICategoryID=8>