# IMPLICATIONS OF KIDNAPPING ON ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF VICTIMS IN CHIKUN AND KAJURU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS, KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA

**Patrick Joseph Matthias[1]Nuhu Marshal Yakusak[2] Gambo Pius Ishaya[3]Dr Haruna Umar Yashim[4]**

[1]Department of Sociology Nasarawa State University, Keffi

[2]Department of Security Studies Green-Field University Kaduna, Kaduna State, Nigeria [3,4]Department of Sociology Faculty of Social Sciences Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Nigeria

Corresponding Email: patrickjosephmatthias@gmail.com

08027094898

**Abstract**

*This study investigates the implications of kidnapping on the economic activities of victims in Chikun and Kajuru Local Government Areas of Kaduna State. Kidnapping poses a significant threat to economic stability in Nigeria, particularly in Chikun and Kajuru Local Government Areas of Kaduna State. For instance, scores of farmers have abandoned their farming activities and fled their ancestral homes to seek refuge due to ceaseless attacks on their communities by bandits and kidnappers. In addition, economic activities have been affected as government took proactive measures leading to closures of bush markets. The menace of kidnapping has also led to the disruption of tourism and hospitality businesses as many tourists are afraid to patronize tourist attraction sights and hotel services due to fear of being kidnapped. The study adopted quantitative approach using a targeted vulnerable population of 17000 victims living in Chikun LGA while 15,292 victims living in Kajuru LGA. The study population comprised of farmers, business people, and transporters and among others. A sample size of 395 was obtained using Taro Yamane's formula. The material used for data collection was the structured close-ended questionnaire. The result shows that kidnapping affects Agricultural production, business activities, tourism and hospitality businesses, and manufacturing operations in Kaduna Central Senatorial District. The study recommends multifaceted interventions, including victim support and counselling programs, financial assistance for economic boosts and recovery, and community-based initiatives to mitigate the effects of kidnapping on various businesses.*

*Keywords: Economicactivities,Businesses,Kidnapping,Ransom,Victims*

*Kasujeds 2025 v11(2)1-5*

## 1. Introduction

Kidnapping is a global phenomenon affecting millions of people worldwide. According to the United Nations (UN), kidnapping is a serious human rights violation and a significant threat to global security (UNODC, 2020). The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) reports that kidnapping affects over 100,000 people annually, with long-lasting psychological and emotional impacts (ICRC, 2020).

Kidnapping has become a global issue, affecting individuals, businesses, and economies worldwide. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO) 2020, kidnapping generates approximately $1.5 billion annually in ransom payments. This has significant implications for global economic stability.

In Africa, kidnapping is a pervasive issue, particularly in countries with conflict zones or weak governance. The African Union (AU) estimates that kidnapping affects over 10,000 people annually in Africa (AU, 2020). Kidnapping in Africa, has become a major economic burden. The African Development Bank (AfDB) reports that kidnapping costs African economies over $3.5 billion annually (AfDB, 2020). Nigeria, Somalia, and Democratic Republic of Congo are among the countries with the highest kidnapping rates (Global Security Report, 2022).

Nigeria has experienced a surge in kidnapping cases, with devastating economic impacts. The Nigeria Police Force (NPF) reports that kidnapping cases increased by 34% between 2019 and 2020 (NPF, 2020). The daily economic losses due to kidnapping in Nigeria is amounted to ₦3.5 million while the annual economic losses costs over ₦1.3 trillion annually (NBS, 2020).

Kaduna State has been plagued by kidnapping, particularly in rural areas inChikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas.The Kaduna State Government reports that 5042 kidnapping cases were recorded in 2020, and 774 victims abducted within the first three months of 2021 resulting in significant economic losses (Kaduna State Government, 2020). This menace of kidnapping has caused severe hardship on the victims and their families. Sixty (60%) of kidnapping victims experience economic hardship (Olaniyi et al., 2020).Chikun and Kajuru Local Government Areas are among the most affected areas in Kaduna State askidnapping of farmers has led to 30% decrease in agricultural production (The Punch, 2020).

### 2.1 Conceptual Review

The conceptual review of this study is comprised of the concept of kidnapping, victim, primary victim and secondary victim.

#### 2.1.1 Concept of Kidnapping

Holistically, the concept of kidnapping is relative which lies on the pattern of kidnapping that is ubiquitous among the kidnappers or the victims themselves. A number of researchers view kidnapping encompassing arbitrary denial of an individual's freedom of movement or some cases of minor denying a parent/guardian control or custody of the child. The emphasis is on the individual's right to private liberty and the breaking of this right through force, threats or fraud. In relation to the above general overview, Samuel (2019) views kidnapping as a crime of seizing, abducting or carrying away and confining, of persons against their consents or fraud often subjecting him or her to forced slavery in order to demand for ransom or in furtherance of another crime.

But Okoli (2019) argues that contemporary Nigeria represents a paradigmatic period in the Nigerian social engineering and political unification and Child kidnapping for ransom is endemic in Nigeria since it has one of the world's highest rates of kidnap-for-ransom cases". This is corroborated by Perlberg (2019) who reported that statistics also placed Nigeria as the third and fifth country in the world with reported cases of kidnapping. This crime poses serious threat to social order and has become defamation, not only to many children and parents (or guardians) but also to community safety, cohesion and national security. Based on the above various definitions of kidnapping however, this study views kidnapping as a deliberate act of infringing on the fundamental human rights aimed at incarcerating an individual for the purpose of achieving political, religious, economic, ethnic gains and among others.

In another definition which is given by Fage & Alabi (2017) perceived kidnapping as "forceful or fraudulent abduction of an individual or a group of individuals for reasons ranging from economic, political, and religious to (struggle for) self-determination".

#### 2.1.2 Victims of Kidnapping

For the purpose of this study, it is important to clearly define who is a victim of kidnapping. Victims of kidnapping are people who directly or indirectly suffer the effect of kidnapping during and after captivity. Victims of Kidnapping, is a complex and multifaceted concept, has been defined in various ways by researchers.

Though there is no single, universally agreed definition of the concept of 'victim'. There are however, several important international instruments which identify the essential elements being a 'victim' that is commonly referred to by the international community. One such instrument is the Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power which defines 'victim' as a person 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 violation of criminal laws operative within Member States, including those proscribing criminal abuse of power.

### 2.1.3 Primary Victim

There are two categories of victims of kidnapping encompassing primary and secondary victims. The Primary victims are persons who directly experience the traumatic incidence of any physical harm or danger as a result of kidnapping. They are directly involved in the kidnapping incident and suffer physical or psychological harm during kidnapping raid.In addition, the primary victims are those kidnapped and held captive by the kidnappers or bandits.

Based on my view, it is sacrosanct to acknowledge that primary victims are not all the time abducted against their will but also wilfully and voluntarily accepting to be kidnapped through arrangement and agreement with the kidnappers. From the above definitions, primary victims do not only experience physical, emotional and psychological trauma but also experience devastating and dehumanizing treatment in the hands of their abductors when taken away from their loved ones.

Extending this perspective, Lee (2019) defines a kidnapped victim as "an individual who is subjected to physical and psychological abuse, including threats, intimidation, and violence, during their captivity" (p. 20). Going by this definition, kidnapped victims are not only those who undergo physical, emotional and physical abuse but are those who suffer material, financial losses and near-death experiences while in captivity.

### 2.1.4 Secondary Victims

Secondary victims are persons who witness the traumatic incidence or its immediate aftermath and suffer psychological harm as a result. They are not directly involved in the incident but may experience emotional distress, such as post-traumatic stress

disorder (PTSD) or depression. Secondary victims could refer to the relatives of the primary or direct victims.

Smith (2023) defines secondary victims of kidnapping as those individuals who in one way or the other share the same consequences of kidnapping experienced by the abductees in captivity. These consequences could include financial losses, material losses and collateral damage incurred as a result of kidnapping.Kim (2023) defines secondary victims as " individuals who experience long-term social and economic consequences, including stigma, social isolation, and economic instability" (p. 12). Moreover, Thompson (2020) defines a secondary victim of kidnapping as "an individual who experiences a range of emotions, including fear, anxiety, and helplessness,

### 2.2 Theoretical Framework

This section focuses on the theoretical framework for the study. There exists various theories and some researchers and scholars have used some to explain the phenomenon under study. The theoretical framework adopted one model of Hans Von Hentig's victimization theory.

#### 2.2.1 Hans Von Hentig's Theory of Victimology

Von Hentig's theory of victimology was propounded in 1948 by Von himself who was a German Criminologist. The theory of victimization generally concerns about the psychological effects of crimes on the victims, the interactions between the victims and the criminal justice system and the relationships between the victims and offenders.

The major principle of Von's theory of victimology states that victims themselves contribute largely to their victimization through their precipitation and provocation of actions and behaviours. Secondly, the culpability or propensity of the victim depends on the victim's socio-demographic pedigree which Von tagged as victim's taxonomy of victimization and thirdly, Von's theory of victimology concerns about gravity of the crime committed against the victim and the corresponding direct social and psychological effects on the victim which emanates from the interaction between the victim and the offender. Von is more emphatic on the effects of the crime itself than the crime commission. Therefore, the social and psychological effects of crime on the victims depend on the gravity of the crime committed by the offender.

Von Hentig's theory can be applied to explain the implications of kidnapping on the economic activities of victims in Chikunand ChikunLocal Government Area of Kaduna State. Applying the first principle, Kidnapping can disrupt the economic activities of victims by exerting a negative impact on their income. For instance, rural markets can be closed down by government as proactive measure taken to mitigate prevailing kidnapping incidents. When such happens, farmers and petty traders can neither sell or nor buy goods from the markets. Most of them rely on these markets as means of their livelihoods. Kidnapping has direct negative influence on farming activities of farmers who are the worst hit victims of kidnapping. Most farmers' means of livelihood is dependent on subsistence agriculture and most of them abandon farming due to fear of being kidnapped. This scenario leads to food scarcity and high cost of living.

The second principle states that, the culpability or propensity of the victim depends on the victim's socio-demographic pedigree. Applying this principle, when victims of kidnapping display their economic wealth unintentionally, this invariably attracts kidnappers to abduct such victims. In other words, kidnappers may target victims with valuable economic resources such as business tycoons and farmers and not only that, but also lack of economic empowerment may make victims vulnerable to exploitation by kidnappers.

In addition, business rivalry between business partners can influence kidnapping. For instance, kidnappers can target very successful business owners or entrepreneurs sponsored by their business opponents or rivals. Lastly, kidnapping can increase already existing socio-economic disparities among residents. For example, victims of kidnapping become financially bankrupt after paying huge ransoms before getting freedom from their captivity from the kidnappers. There are occasions where victims have to sell all their possessions or properties such as houses, plot of lands, cars and among all other assets. Frantically, some collect bank loans to settle their ransoms. This circumstance can make victims of kidnapping loss all their possessions and become very poor and assume a low socio-economic status.

**2.3 Empirical Review**

The empirical review is done to capture the authors' names, the purpose of the study, the methodology, the findings, the conclusion and recommendation of each study based on the objectives of the study which encompasses the implications of kidnapping on the economic activities of victims in Chikun and Kajuru LGAs of Kaduna State.

Kidnapping can have severe and prolonged effects on the economic activities of victims encompassing loss of income, medical expenses, disruption of businesses, debt accumulation, and reduced productivity and also on the purchasing power of the victims and among others. Building on this overview, in a study conducted by Ibrahim (2022) titled: Impact of Kidnapping on Business Operations in Kaduna State to investigate how kidnapping affects business activities in the region using surveys and interviews with business owners and employees. It was gathered that kidnapping in Kaduna State has diminished investment, reduced business operations and increased security costs. In conclusion, the study revealed that kidnapping has negative impact on the business milieu. The study recommended business continuity planning, government, support for the affected businesses and improved security measures.

Despite these findings, Ibrahim's study failed to pinpoint how kidnapping affected victims of kidnapping. This research revealed that victims' economic activities may be disrupted through constant attacks on the people by bandits and kidnappers leading to the closure of rural markets where people go to sell and buy their goods and among other services which are their main sources of income. The closure of the markets by government serves as proactive measures taken to avoid future attacks on the people.

Similarly, Obinna (2019) conducted a study titled: Economic Costs of Kidnapping in Kaduna State: A Household Perspective to quantify the economic costs of kidnapping on households using Economic analysis and surveys with 25 affected households. It was discovered that significant financial losses due to ransom payments and medical expenses were some of the effects on victims. The study concluded that kidnapping imposes heavy economic burdens on families on all victims of kidnapping and recommended financial assistance and insurance schemes for affected households. It should be noted that the ransom for kidnapping is huge and expensive as the ransom does not only involve financial losses but also loss of livelihood and properties of the victims leading to severe poverty.

In a similar study conducted by Yahaya (2020) titled: Kidnapping and Its Socioeconomic Impact on victims in Kaduna State aimed to evaluate the broader socioeconomic impact of kidnapping using economic and social impact analysis, surveys with 50 residents. The study revealed that negative impact of kidnapping on investment, business operations, and social cohesion was among the effects of kidnapping on victims in Kaduna State. The study concluded that kidnapping has far-reaching socioeconomic effects on victims of kidnapping and therefore, recommended comprehensive security reforms and socioeconomic development programs for all affected victims.

A study conducted by Danladi (2018) titled: Kidnapping and its Impact on Rural Development in Kaduna State aimed to examine the effects of kidnapping on rural development. The study adopted surveys and interviews techniques with rural residents and development workers. The finding showed that stunted development projects and migration to urban areas were mostly the effect of kidnapping on rural development. The study concluded that kidnapping hampers rural development significantly and also recommended security improvements and support for rural development initiatives for all affected rural areas being ravaged by kidnapping and banditry. This research work also revealed that most victims of kidnapping in the rural areas abandoned their ancestral homes and farms and migrated to other rural and urban areas they considered safer for them.

In addition, a study conducted by Femi (2019) titled: The Economic Impact of Kidnapping on Small Businesses in Kaduna State to investigate the impact of kidnapping on small businesses using surveys and interviews with small business owners. The finding showed that decreased profitability, increased security costs, and business closures among the others were the major effects of kidnapping on the small businesses in Kaduna State. The study concluded that kidnapping severely affects small business viability in Kaduna State and therefore, recommended Government's support and security measures for small businesses in Kaduna State.

## 3. Methodology

The methodology of this study is comprised of quantitative method, sample size and sampling technique. This study adoptedquantitative research method to collect information through the help of structured questionnaires designed based on the research questions of this study. 395 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents through stratified probability sampling technique. The sample size was gotten via Taro Yamane's sample size determining formula.

## 4. Results and Discussions

The results of this study were analyzed using frequencies and percentages and are interpreted and presented in tables below. Each table analysis is preceded by detailed preambles for proper understanding of the results. The discussion of the results was done accordingly based on the .data analyzed.

**Table 1: How Kidnapping Affects Farming Activities of Victims**

| Variables | Yes Freq | % | No Freq | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loss of farm produce | 390 | 99 | 5 | 1 |
| Loss of livestock to rustlers' | 325 | 82 | 70 | 18 |
| Decreased agricultural productivity | 380 | 96 | 15 | 4 |
| Increased poverty level among victims | 345 | 88 | 50 | 12 |
| Constants abduction of farmers | 295 | 75 | 100 | 25 |
| Killing of Farmers by kidnappers | 3 65 | 92 | 30 | 8 |
| **Total Frequency & perc. per row: 395** | | | | |

**Source: Field Work 2024**

Kidnapping has become a widespread and debilitating threat to rural communities in Nigeria, particularly in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas of Kaduna State. The agricultural sector, a mainstay of the local economy, has been severely impacted by this menace. Farming activities, crucial for food security and livelihoods, have been disrupted, leaving victims and their families vulnerable to economic hardship and food insecurity.It is against this backdrop as shown in table 1 that majority (99%) of the victims agreed that kidnapping leads to loss of farm produce while few (1%) disagreed. Based on this finding, it can be deduced that majority (99%) of victims of

kidnapping in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas agreed that kidnapping results in loss of farm produce of victims.

The implication of this finding shows that the effects of kidnapping on farming activities are multifaceted and far-reaching. Beyond the immediate trauma and physical harm inflicted on victims, kidnapping disrupts agricultural production, processing, and marketing. Farmers, unable to tend to their farms, experience reduced yields, crop loss, and decreased livestock productivity. This, in turn, exacerbates poverty, hunger, and malnutrition in already vulnerable communities.

**Table 2: How Kidnapping Disrupts Trade/ Business Activities of Victims**

| Variables | Yes Freq | % | No Freq | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Closure of rural Markets | 279 | 71 | 116 | 29 |
| Low distribution of goods and services | 249 | 63 | 146 | 37 |
| Disruption of importation of goods | 274 | 69 | 121 | 31 |
| Disruption of exportation of goods | 273 | 69 | 122 | 31 |
| Disruption of economic stability | 320 | 81 | 75 | 19 |
| **Total Frequency & percentage per Row:395/100** | | | | |

**Source: Field Work 2024**

Kidnapping has become a ubiquitous threat to entrepreneurs and business owners in ChikunandKajuruLocal Government Areas of Kaduna State, Nigeria. The alarming rate of kidnappingincidents has severe consequences on trade and business activities, undermining the economicfoundation of the community. Beyond the immediate trauma and physical harm inflicted onvictims, kidnapping disrupts business operations, distribution of goods and services and closure of markets especially in rural markets where there is an erosion of security for the vulnerable victims.

It was against this overview, table 2 shows the distribution of responses on how kidnapping affects trade/business activities in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas. Majority of the victims constituting (81%) agreed that kidnapping disrupts

economic stability in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas while few (19%) disagreed. Based on these findings, it implies that majority (81%) of victims of kidnapping agreed that kidnapping disrupts economic stability of victims in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas of Kaduna State. The implication of this finding depicts that the economic instability is attributed to kidnapping affecting the income level of victims and increasing their poverty level.

**Table 3: How Kidnapping Affects Tourism and Hospitality Activities?**

| Variables | Yes Freq | % | No Freq | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reduced tourist arrivals | 340 | 86 | 55 | 14 |
| Tourist cancelled hotel and tour bookings | 349 | 88 | 46 | 12 |
| Tourist shortened their stays | 350 | 89 | 45 | 11 |
| Negative image discourages future tourism | 373 | 94 | 22 | 6 |
| Staff layoffs due to poor patronage | 339 | 86 | 56 | 14 |
| Closure of tourist attraction/ hospitality businesses | 379 | 96 | 16 | 4 |
| Loss of local income | 335 | 85 | 60 | 15 |
| Economic stagnation | 330 | 84 | 65 | 16 |

**Total Frequency& percentage Per Row:395/100**

**Source: Field Work 2024**

Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas, renowned for their rich cultural heritage and breathtaking natural attractions, have witnessed a significant decline in tourism and hospitality activities due to the escalating menace of kidnapping. The alarming rate of kidnappings in the area has cast a dark shadow over the tourism industry, deterring potential visitors and undermining the local economy. Building on this

backdrop, in table 4 illustrates responses on how kidnapping disrupts tourism and hospitality activities in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government areas of Kaduna State.

From the survey, it was discovered that majority (96%) of the respondents agreed that disruption of tourism and hospitality activities has led to the closure of tourist attraction and hospitality businesses. On the other hand, few (4%) respondents disagreed. Based on these findings, it implies that majority (96%) of victims kidnapping in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Area affirmed that disruption of tourism and hospitality activities resulted to the closure of tourism and hospitality businesses.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

### 5.1 Conclusion

The study concludes that the scourge of kidnapping in Chikunand KajuruLocal Government Areas presents a multifaceted challenge with far-reaching implications for both victims and society at large. This paper sheds lights on the complex dynamics driving kidnapping and banditry activities on the economic activities of victims. From socio-economic disparities to security lapses, demanding comprehensive way forward.

### 5.1 Recommendations

The study suggested the following recommendations as follows:

i. Government should establish comprehensive victim support services, encompassing counseling, and rehabilitation.
ii. Government should give financial assistance to the victims of kidnapping to offset financial expenses
iii. Communities should organize awareness campaigns, advocacy initiatives, and fund-raising events.
iv. Non-Governmental Organizations should render medical assistance to kidnapped victims.
v. Government should provide adequate security on highways and Railway lines where kidnapping is daily occurrence.

## References

African Development Bank Group Annual Report. (2022). The Economic Costs of Kidnapping in Africa, African Development Bank Publication, *Abidjan,Cote d'voire. ISBN:978-9973- 9412-6-9*

African Union (2020) Report of the African Union Commission on the Impact of Banditry and Kidnapping on Human Security in Kaduna State, Nigeria.*AU Report No. 2020/001. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: African Union Commission.*

Akintoye, I.R; Olaniyi R. O. and Oyedele O. A (2020) Social Support Networks andKidnapping Coping Mechanisms in Nigeria. *Journal of Community Psychology, 48(1), 50-62.*

Danladi, A. Z. (2018) Kidnapping and Its Impact on Rural Development in Nigeria. *Rural Development Journal, 10 (2), 99-115.*

Fage, K. S. & Alabi, D. O. (2017). Nigerian government and politics. Abuja: BasfaGlobal Concept Ltd.

Femi, K. A. (2019) The Economic Impact of Kidnapping on Small Businesses in Nigeria. *Journal of Economic Studies, 11(1),88-104*

Human Rights Watch World Reports (2022) Nigeria: Kaduna State Kidnapping and Killing Epidemic. *Human Rights Watch Report, Vol. 34, No. 4. New York: Human Rights Watch .ISBN: 978-1-6231-3737-4*

Ibrahim, J. K. (2022) Impact of Kidnapping on Business Operations in Birnin-Gwari. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders vol.1 Issue 2.*

International Labour Organization (ILO) (2020) Global Report on Annual Kidnapping for RansomPayment. International Labour Organization Publication, Geneva, Switzerland.ISBN: 978-92-2-034315-8

Inyang, D. J. & Abraham, U. E. (2019). The social problem of kidnapping and its implications the socio-economic development of Nigeria: A study of Uyometropolis.*Mediterranean journal of social sciences, 4 (6). 531-544.Doi:10.5901/mjss. 2019.v4n6p531*

Kaduna State Government (2020) Report of the Kaduna State Government on the Incidence of Kidnapping in the State. Kaduna, Nigeria: Kaduna State Government Press.

Kim J.(2023) The psychology of Kidnapping: Understanding the Motivations and Consequences. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology V2: Issue: 3 David Publishing Company DOI:10:17265/2158-7051/2023.03.003*

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2020) Kidnapping and Business inn Nigeria.

National Bureau of Statistics Publication, Abuja, Nigeria. ISBN:978-978-55623-9-5

Nigeria Police Force (2020) Annual Reports on Kidnapping Incidents in Nigeria.

Nigeria Police Force Crime Statistics and Research Department, Abuja, Nigeria. ISBN:978-978-81234-9-1

Olaniyi R.O, Oyedele O.A, Akintola I.R. (2020) Coping Mechanisms of Kidnapping Victims' Families in Nigeria. *Journal of Social and Economic Studies, 10(1), 1-12.*

Obinna, A. F. (2019) Economic Costs of Kidnapping in Nigeria: *A Household* Perspective.*Journal of Law and Judial System Vol.II.Issue 1, 2019 Sryahwa Publications*

Okoli, A. C., & Agada, F. (2019). Kidnapping and National Security in Nigeria.
Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(6), 137-146.

Perlberg S. (2019) Police Fear Kidnapped of Tycoon's Wife,Anne-Elizabeth Hagan is Murdered the Covered –Up-Sunday Times

Samuel. D. O. (2019). Organized crime, kidnapping and Nigerian national security. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention, 6(6),54725475.*

Smith j. (2023) Kidnapping Epidemic in Nigeria: Trends, Causes,and Consequences *Journal of Human Resource Management*

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (2020) Global Report on Kidnapping for Ransom. United Nations Publication, Vienna. ISBN 978-1-148276-3,

Yahaya, K. T. (2020) Kidnapping and Its Socioeconomic Impact on Victims in Nigeria's North –West *Zamfara Journal of Politics and Development*