Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization
ISSN 2224-3240 (Paper) ISSN 2224-3259 (Online)
Vol.142, 2024

Influence of Incident Location on Reporting of Property Crime to the Police by Victims in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya

Erick M. Mwangi

Department of Peace, Security, and Social Studies Egerton University

Abstract

The increase in property crimes is a significant issue impacting national security and economic growth, often linked to the reluctance of victims to report crimes. In Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya, property crimes are the most prevalent, yet they constitute a low percentage of the crimes reported to the police. The reasons for this discrepancy are unclear, particularly regarding the influence of the crime location on the victims' decision to report. This study aimed to examine how the location of a crime influences the reporting of property crimes to the police by victims in Gilgil Ward. A mixed-method research design was adopted, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Data were collected through questionnaires and interview schedules from a sample of 96 property crime victims using stratified random sampling, purposive sampling, and snowball sampling techniques. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data, including frequency distribution tables and percentages. The study found that the incident location had varying effects on different property crimes. While proximity to the police station did not significantly influence most respondents' decisions to report property crimes, certain crimes like theft of farming tools and building construction tools were reported to be influenced to a small extent by the incident location. The study recommends establishing more police posts and introducing mobile police units in Gilgil Ward to improve crime reporting rates. Additionally, community awareness campaigns on the importance of reporting crimes and increased police visibility are necessary to enhance the reporting of property crimes.

Keywords: Crime Reporting, Incident Location, Property Crime

DOI: 10.7176/JLPG/142-05
Publication date: September 30th 2024

I. INTRODUCTION

The influence of incident location on victims' reporting behavior is a crucial yet underexplored area in criminological research, particularly concerning property crimes. While existing studies have extensively examined factors influencing the reporting of violent crimes, such as sexual offenses (Goudriaan, 2006), there is limited empirical attention on how the location of property crimes impacts reporting behaviors. Property crimes, which are prevalent in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya, often constitute a small percentage of reported crimes despite their frequency. Understanding how incident location affects the likelihood of reporting property crimes is vital for developing effective crime management strategies and enhancing community safety.

Research on crime reporting has predominantly focused on violent crimes, leaving a gap in knowledge about property crimes and the influence of crime location. Studies by Felson et al. (2002) and Baumer et al. (2003) suggest that victims are more likely to report crimes that occur in private settings, such as homes, although findings vary across different crime types and contexts. For instance, while Felson et al. (2002) found a higher likelihood of reporting violent crimes in private settings, Baumer et al. (2003) reported no significant difference for rape incidents. This disparity in findings highlights the need for a nuanced understanding of how crime location affects reporting, particularly for property crimes, which have distinct characteristics compared to violent crimes.

Furthermore, the relationship between victims and offenders, as well as the nature of the crime, plays a significant role in reporting behaviors. Research indicates that crimes committed by strangers are more likely to be reported than those involving acquaintances (Cheng & Smyth, 2015; Hautala et al., 2015). However, studies focusing on property crimes are sparse, and existing literature often lacks a comprehensive analysis of various factors, including incident location, impact reporting. This study addresses these gaps by exploring the influence of crime location on the reporting of property crimes in Gilgil Ward, aiming to contribute valuable insights to the

field and inform strategies to improve crime reporting and management.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Victims are more likely to report a violent crime if it occurred in a private setting such as a home (Felson et al., 2002). However, Baumer et al. (2003) found no difference between a private and non-private crime incident in the case of rape reporting. Also, individuals are more likely to report a crime if it occurred inside or near their homes (Xie et al., 2006). The above studies Baumer et al. (2003), Felson et al. (2002), and Goudriaan (2006), mainly looked at violent crimes, in particular sexual offenses. Most of the studies dealing with the influence of incident location have focused on sexual offense. Thus, resulting in a gap due to insufficient literature on offenses such as property crimes. However, there is a variation in literature where different scholars had different outcomes in their research. Felson et al. (2002) suggestion was that violent crimes in a private setting were more likely to be reported. Contrary, Baumer et al. (2003) found no difference between the private and public settings when victims opt to report a crime. Thus, providing a foundation for the research argument that each population has its way of responding to a specific behavior in a given scenario. Also, there is no documented study in Gilgil that has looked at the influence of incident location on property crime reporting. Hence, this study is required; in understanding the behavior of property crime reporting among the residents in Gilgil.

In crimes that occurred in private locations; victims more often knew the offender, and in those that happened in a public place, the offenders were most often strangers to the victim (Felson et al., 2002), but this cannot be generalized since it supports specific crimes such as sexual offenses. Crimes such as housebreaking and burglary in most cases- are committed by offenders who are strangers to the victim. Besides, crime committed by an intruder is more likely to be reported than when the victim knows the offender (Cheng & Smyth, 2015; Hautala et al., 2015; Henson et al., 2013; Steinmetz & Austin, 2014). Hautala et al. (2015) found out that incidents that involved black primary assailants were less likely to be reported to the police than incidents that involved assailants perceived to be of Hispanic origin. Besides, the type of crime or the victim's relationship with the assailant was a motivating factor in reporting a crime (Hautala et al., 2015). The study by Hautala et al. (2015) also explains why victims don't report crimes when the offenders are well known to them. Although the study looks at the race factors, black primary assailants and the Hispanic, it is clear that people may feel some form of remorse for those individuals they know. This has contributed to this knowledge by establishing how the victim-offender relationship motivates property crime reporting.

Stokbaek et al. (2021) conducted a 10-year study of reported cases, unreported cases, and cases with delayed reporting in Denmark. They discovered that the victim chose not to report the crime if the offender was well known to them. This could be because they are afraid of upsetting their social bond with a said acquaintance, so they do not file a complaint with the police. The findings of Stokbaek et al. (2021) were limited to women who had experienced sexual assault. The study's findings ignore male gender perception, although men can be victims of sexual assault. Furthermore, the findings are focused on sexual offenses, leaving a gap in the literature on other crimes such as property crime. The study in Gilgil Ward incorporated both gender perceptions of the extent to which acquaintance offenders influence property crime reporting.

Victims who live in multi-person households are more likely to report a crime to the police (Goudriaan, 2006). The baseline of Goudriaan argument is that victims report a crime in a multi-person household because the offender is someone who is just within the vicinity of the family and can attack at any instance hence apprehension of the offender creates a safe environment for the victim. However, according to different scholars, victims tend not to report crimes when they have a close relationship with the offender. As a result, they suffer in silence so as to maintain the family reputation, which is sometimes the idea of their elders. The findings of Goudriaan provide this study with an understanding of what might cross the mind of a victim before taking a step to report a crime. However, the study was more specific on sexual offenses hence it won't be thoughtful to generalize the same findings on property crime reporting.

Sidebottom (2015) had a different view on the influence of the offender-victim relationship on reporting crime. In cases of unknown offenders, victims opted not to report a crime (Sidebottom, 2015). The victims never reported since they had less knowledge about the identity of the perpetrators (Sidebottom, 2015). However, the explanation of those findings was unclear. The work of Sidebottom shows that victims might see no reason to report a crime if they don't know the offender because of lack of evidence that may be used in criminal prosecution. In cases like burglary and housebreaking, the crime usually takes place when the victim is not in the building or in a house. However, we find the same crimes being reported to the police (GPS, 2020). The study did find out the extent at which victim-offender relationship and place of crime occurrence motivates the victims of property crime to report crime to the police. Besides, the outcomes of the study done by Sidebottom can't be generalized to all property crimes since he focused on assault crimes. Every crime is unique, hence the need to carry out the study

on property crime reporting.

In South Africa, Kempen (2018) suggested that victims of property-related crimes, such as housebreaking, living in an urban area, or having relative access to a police station, have a high likelihood of reporting to the police. According to Kempen, the main reason for many victims reporting such crimes is simply the requirement of their short-term insurance cover to obtain a police case number to submit a case. Kempen then asks whether victims would report a crime if they didn't have insurance or easy access to the police. The primary motivation for obtaining insurance coverage is the value of one's home. Most studies have discovered that the value of the property has an impact on crime reporting. The study by Kempen (2018) provided this study with the idea that the proximity of the police station could be a reason for reporting, but it could only have a minor impact on crime reporting. The study in Gilgil Ward discussed the level of impact that proximity to the police station influences reporting property crime.

In the Uasin Gishu District of Kenya, research carried out by Bunei et al. (2012) revealed that 46% of victims of agricultural crimes never reported the case because the offender was either known by the victim or a relative to the victim. However, crimes involving machinery (more than 59%), and livestock theft (more than 80%), were highly reported. The high crime reporting rates contradict whether crime reporting was influenced by; the victim-offender relationship or the crime severity. The study of Bunei et al. (2012) mainly focused on agricultural crimes. The agricultural crimes discussed give this study a sense of what to expect from the final report. Although the study focused on some aspects of property crime, it only focused on agricultural crimes. Leaving aside property crimes such as robbery, burglary, and housebreaking. Hence, this research will seek to understand the nature of reporting property crime (robbery, burglary, and housebreaking) under the influence of incident location in Gilgil Ward.

According to different authors, as discussed above, crime location is often linked to the victim- offender relationship. There are two different ideas; victims are more likely to report a crime when they know the offender, and victims are more likely to report a crime when it's committed by an intruder. Also, the physical location predetermined if the victim of the crime could report the crime (Xie et al., 2006). The contradiction is that different research studies have come up with different suggestions regarding the victim-offender relationship in relation to reporting of crime by victims. Hence, it will not be wise to conclude using the above literature and generalize on the residents of Gilgil. In that case, it would be thoughtful to conduct the study on a sample of victims of property crime in Gilgil.

Chebii (2019) conducted research at Egerton University, and one of his objectives was to establish the reporting levels of crime among students. He found out that crimes that took place in school had less reporting to the police. These could be as a result of the victims having an alternative to report to the school officials. For example, undergraduate students reporting a crime to the police was at 15%, reporting a crime to campus security personnel was at 30.7% and reporting a crime to their friends was 48.6% (Chebii, 2019). The findings showed that students opted to report a crime to other persons rather than the police. School-level interventions can assist in the reduction of crime (Masho et al., 2019). The percentage of crime reporting at Egerton University provides us with a rough idea of the nature of crime reporting. However, the study was not specific on crimes that received high reportings to the police. Property crimes were the leading in terms of victimization but, it's not shown to what percentage of the victims reported property crime to the police. Also, the study focused on the students at Egerton University, which cannot be generalized to other populations. Hence, this study was specific on property crime to understand how the location influence victims reportingto the police.

The current study sought to establish the influence of incident location on property reporting crime since there have been contradictions on whether incidents influence crime reporting. For example, in cases of violent crimes, robbery hasn't been excluded; some scholars say that incident location influences reporting crime, while others say it does not affect reporting. Moreover, there are limited pieces of empirical literature regarding the effect of incident location on property crime reporting, hence the current study has contributed to the body of knowledge. Moreover, studies on incident location have majorly focused on sexual crimes, causing a gap in the literature on crimes like property crime. It was thoughtful to look at most aspects of the incident location since they can trigger each other in one way. Hence, the study looked at characteristics of the crime location.

III. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a mixed-method research design. The Mixed-method research Design uses both; quantitative and qualitative approaches in data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2012). Also, it provides detailed and comprehensive data to achieve the research objectives (Creswell, 2012). The justification for using both

quantitative and qualitative is that; -neither of them is sufficient by itself to describe well the problem (property crime reporting) under study. The researcher used a concurrent embedded approach. The concurrent embedded technique has a primary method, quantitative or qualitative, that guides the research study and a secondary method that offers support for the research study (Creswell, 2009). In this research study, the quantitative approach was the primary method of obtaining information from the target population. The secondary method was the qualitative approach, which was-meant to seek information that could support the research study. The researcher aimed at studying the influence of incident location on reporting of property crime to the Police by victims in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya.

Location of Study

The study was conducted at Gilgil Ward. Gilgil Ward is in Nakuru County, Kenya. The area borders the other four County Assembly Wards, which are within Gilgil Sub- County; they include Murindat, Elementaita, Mbaruk/Emburru, and Malewa West. Gilgil population, as per the 2019 census, has a total population of 68,012 (KNBS, 2019). In terms of gender, males were 34,800, and females were 33,211 (KNBS, 2019). In Gilgil Ward, property crimes have topped the list of crimes in the area (GPS, 2020). Also, it has experienced rising levels of property crimes to the point of creating stories in news media (Asiba, 2018; Ogemba, 2020). However, approximately 20% of the reported crimes in Gilgil Ward are property crimes (GPS, 2020). The rise in property crimes is sometimes associated with the reluctance of victims to report a crime. It is unclear why victims are not reporting property crimes, yet crimes are supposed to be reported to the police for action. Also, it is not clear if the high rates of convicted property crimes are a result of high or low reporting rates due to the distance to the nearest police station. Besides, there is no research study on the influence of incident location on reporting of property crime to the Police by victims in Gilgil Ward, hence making Gilgil Ward a unique area that needs to be studied.

Sample Size

The sample size of the study comprised of 96 respondents. The sample size was selected using Cochran's (1977) formula for determining the sample size for the unknown population. Cochran (1977) formula:

$n0 = (z^2pq) \div e^2$

$n0 = \{(1.962)\ (0.5)\ (1\text{-}0.5)\} \div 0.12$

$n0 = 96$

Where n0 is the sample size, z is the selected critical value of the desired confidence level, p is the estimated proportion of an attribute that is present in the population, q=1-p, and e is the desired level of precision. The researcher intends used a p value of 0.5 since it's the most often used in determining a more conservative sample size, a confidence level of 95% whose critical value is z 1.96, and desired level of precision e 0.1. Out of the 96 distributed questionnaires only 81 responded to the questionnaires, making a response rate of 84.4%, which was sufficient as recommended by Kothari (2010).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The objective of the study sought to examine the influence of incident location on reporting property crime to the police in Gilgil Ward. Influence of incident location was measured using descriptive statistics (Frequencies, percentages, means, and Standard deviation). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent at which incident location influenced their decision in reporting property crime (Robbery, burglary, housebreaking, theft) to the police. A 5-point scale was used, where; - 0=not at all, 1=small extent, 2=moderate extent, 3=large extent, and 4=very large extent. The findings are as presented below:

A. Robbery

Table I: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Robbery to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Robbery committed by an acquaintance	11.1% 1	33.3% 3	33.3% 3	22.2% 2	0.0% 0
Robbery committed by a stranger	60.0% 12	15.0% 3	20.0% 4	5.0% 1	0.0% 0
Robbery took place in a private place	50.0% 3	50.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0 0
Robbery took place in a public place	86.4% 19	9.1% 2	4.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0 0

The influence of incident location on reporting robbery crime to the police was determined using four items as shown in Table I. Robbery committed by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 11.1%, small extent 33.3%, and moderate extent 33.3%. In respect to robbery committed by a stranger, majority of the respondents' response was at not at all 60.0%. On the other hand, robbery took place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 50.0% and small extent 50.0%. Robbery took placein a public place had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 86.4% and small extent 9.1%.

Table II: Means and Standard Deviation of influence of location on Reporting Robberyto the Police

	N	Mean	Respondents on average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Robbery was committed by an acquaintance	9	1.67	Moderate extent	1.000	Widely
Robbery was committed by astranger	20	.70	Small Extent	.979	Moderate
Robbery took place in a privateplace	6	.50	Small Extent	.548	Moderate
Robbery took place in a publicplace	22	.18	Small Extent	.501	Moderate
Valid N (list wise)	28				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of robbery crime was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric. On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in Table II, the respondents tended to be "small extent" in relation to the incident location metrics except "Robbery was committed by an acquaintance" which had a "moderate" extent. In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had their responses "moderately" distributed except in relation to robbery was committed by an acquaintance which had its' responses "widely" distributed due to standard deviation of 1.000 which was equal to standard deviation of 1.000.

B. Burglary

Table III: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Burglary to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Burglary committed by an stranger	73.1%	23.1%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	19	6	1	0	0
Burglary committed by a private place	75.0%	16.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	18	4	2	0	0
Burglary took place in a public place	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
	4	0	0	0	0

The influence of incident location on reporting burglary crime to the police was determined using three items as shown in Table III. Burglary committed by a stranger had most of the respondents' response at not at all 73.1% and small extent 23.1%. On the other hand, burglary taking place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 75.0% and small extent 16.7%. A burglary that took place in a public place had most of the respondents' response not at all 100.0%.

Table IV: Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Burglary to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondents on average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Burglary committed by a stranger	26	.31	Not at all	.549	Moderate
Burglary took place in a private place	24	.33	Not at all	.637	Moderate
Burglary took place in a public place	4	.00	Not at all	.000	Perfect Consensus
Valid N (list wise)	26				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of burglary crime was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in Table IV, the respondents tended to be "not at all" in relation to the incident location metrics. In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had their responses "moderately" distributed except in relation to burglary took place in a public place which had its' responses "perfectly distributed" due to standard deviation of 0.000 which was equal to standard deviation of 0.000.

C. Housebreaking

Table V: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Housebreaking to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
House breaking committed by an acquaintance	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	2	3	2	0	0
House breaking committed by a stranger	84.6%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	22	4	0	0	0
House breaking took place in a private place	87.1%	9.7%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0
	27	3	1	0	0

The influence of incident location on reporting housebreaking crime to the police was determined using three items as shown in Table V. Housebreaking committed by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 28.6% and small extent 42.9%. Housebreaking committed by a stranger had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 84.6% and small extent 15.4%. On the other hand, housebreaking took place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 87.1% and small extent9.7%.

Table VI: Means and Standard Deviation for Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Housebreaking to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responsesdistributed
House breaking committed by an acquaintance	7	1.00	Small Extent	.816	Moderate
House breaking committed by astranger	26	.15	Not At All	.368	High Consensus
House breaking took place in aprivate place	31	.16	Small Extent	.454	High Consensus
Valid N (list wise)	31				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of housebreaking crime was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in the Table VI, the respondents tended to be "small extent" in relation to the incident location metrics except "housebreaking was committed by a stranger" which had a "not at all". In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had their responses at "high consensus" distributed except in relation to burglary was committed by an acquaintance which had its' responses "moderately" distributed due to standard deviation of 0.816 which was equal to or above standard deviation of 0.5.

D. Theft

Vehicle Theft

Table VII: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of a Vehicle to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Theft of vehicle committed by an acquaintance	0.0 %	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	0	2	0	0	0
Theft of vehicle committed by a stranger	42.9%	14.3%	28.6%	1.2%	0.0%
	3	1	2	1	0
Theft of vehicle took place in a private place	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
	1	3	0	0	0
Theft of vehicle took place in a public place	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
	5	1	0	0	0

The influence of incident location on reporting theft of vehicle to the police was determined using four items as shown in Table 4.15. Theft of vehicle committed by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 100%. In respect to theft of vehicle committed by a stranger, majority of the respondents' response was at; - not at all 60.0%, small extent 14.3%, and 28.6%. On the other hand, theft of vehicle took place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 25.0% and small extent 75.0%. Theft of vehicle took place in a public place had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 83.3% and small extent 16.7%.

Table VIII: Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of a Vehicle to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Theft of vehicle committed by an acquaintance	2	1.00	Small Extent	.000	Perfect Consensus
Theft of vehicle committed by a stranger	7	1.14	Small Extent	1.215	Widely
Theft of vehicle took place in a privateplace	4	.75	Small Extent	.500	Moderate
Theft of vehicle took place in a publicplace	6	.17	Not at All	.408	High Consensus
Valid N (list wise)	0				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of theft of vehicle was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in Table VIII above, the respondents tended to be "small extent" in relation to the incident location metrics except "theft of vehicle took place in a public place"which had a "not at all".

In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had different responses distribution at; - perfect consensus, widely, moderate, and high consensus in relation to; theft of vehicle committed by an acquaintance, theft of vehicle committed by a stranger, theft of vehicle took place in a private place, and theft of vehicle took place in a public place respectively due to a standard deviation of 0.000, 1.215, 0.500, and 0.408 respectively. The standard deviation were equal to standard deviation of 0.000, greater or equal to standard deviation of 1.000, greater or equal to standard deviation of 0.5, and greater than standard deviation of 0.000 and less than standard deviation of 0.5 respectively.

Electronic Gadget/s Theft

Table IX: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of Electronic Gadget/s to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Theft of electronic gadget/s committed by anacquaintance	45.5 %	36.4%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%
	10	8	2	2	0
Theft of electronic gadget/s committed by astranger	61.1%	27.8%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	22	10	4	0	0
Theft of electronic gadget/s took place in aprivate place	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
	18	4	0	0	0
Theft of electronic gadget/s took place in a publicplace	75.0%	25%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
	24	8	0	0	0

The influence of incident location on reporting theft of electronic gadget to the police was determined using four items as shown in Table IX. Theft of electronic gadget committed by an acquaintance had most of the respondents' response at; - not at all 45.5% and small extent 36.4%. In respect to theft of electronic gadget committed by a stranger, most of the the respondents' response was at; not at all 61.1% and small extent 27.8%. On the other hand, theft of electronic gadgets that took place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 81.8%. Theft of electronic gadgets that took place in a public place had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 75.0%.

Table X: Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of Electronic Gadget/s to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Theft of electronic gadget/s committed by an acquaintance	22	.82	Small Extent	.958	Moderate
Theft of electronic gadget/s committedby a stranger	36	.50	Small Extent	.697	Moderate
Theft of electronic gadget/s took placein a private place	22	.18	Not at All	.395	High Consensus
Theft of electronic gadget/s took placein a public place	32	.25	Not at All	.440	High Consensus
Valid N (list wise)	22				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of theft of electronic gadget was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in the Table X, the respondents tended to be "small extent" in relation to the incident location metrics; theft of electronic gadget committed by an acquaintance and theft of electronic gadget committed by a stranger. On the other hand, respondents tended to be "not at all" in relation to the incident metrics; theft of electronic gadget took place in a private place and theft of electronic gadget took place in a public place. In the context of the standard deviations, the incident location metrics had of their responses at "moderate" which included; theft of electronic gadget committed by an acquaintance and theft of electronic gadget committed by a stranger, while theft of electronic gadget took place in a private place and theft of electronic gadget took place in a public place had their responses at high consensus. This was due to the fact that the standard deviation were greater or equal to standard deviation of 0.5 and greater than 0.000 and/or less than standard deviation of 0.5 respectively.

Theft of Building Construction Tools

Table XI: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of Building Construction Tool/s to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Theft of building construction tool/s committedby an acquaintance	10.5 % 2	36.8% 7	42.1% 8	10.5% 2	0.0% 0
Theft of building construction tool/s committedby a stranger	37.5% 9	33.3% 8	25.0% 6	4.2% 1	0.0% 0
Theft of building construction tool/s took placein a private place	62.5% 15	20.8% 5	8.3% 2	8.3% 2	0.0 0
Theft of building construction tool/s took placein a public place	50.0% 5	50.0% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0 0

The influence of incident location on reporting theft of building construction tools to the police was determined using four items as shown in Table XI. Theft of building construction tools committed by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; small extent 36.8% and moderate extent 42.1%. In respect to theft of building construction tools committed by a stranger, majority of the respondents' response was at; not at all 37.5% and 33.3%. On the other hand, theft of building construction tools took place in a private place and had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 62.5% and small extent 20.8%. Theft of building construction tools took place in a public place had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 50.0% and small extent 50.0%.

Table XII: Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence of Incident Location on reporting Theft of Building Construction Tool/s to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Theft of building construction tool/s committed by an acquaintance	19	1.53	Moderate	.841	Moderate
Theft of building construction tool/scommitted by a stranger	24	.96	Small Extent	.908	Moderate
Theft of building construction tool/stook place in a private place	24	.63	Small extent	.970	Moderate
Theft of building construction tool/stook place in a public place	10	.50	Small Extent	.527	Moderate
Valid N (list wise)	19				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of theft of building construction tools was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in Table XII, the respondents tended to be “small extent” in relation to the incident location metrics except “theft of building construction tools committed by an acquaintance” which had “moderate”. In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had their distribution of responses at “moderate” due to standard deviation of 0.841, 0.908, 0.970, and 0.527 which were equal to or above standard deviation of 0.5.

Theft of Farming Tools

Table XIV: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of Farming Tool/s to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Theft of farming tool/s committed by anacquaintance	12.5 %	31.3%	18.8%	37.5%	0.0%
	2	5	3	6	0
Theft of farming tool/s committed by a stranger	44.4%	33.3%	16.7%	5.6%	0.0%
	8	6	3	1	0
Theft of farming tool/s took place in a privateplace	70.0%	15.0%	5.0%	10.0%	0.0%
	14	3	1	2	0
Theft of farming tool/s took place in a publicplace	54.5%	36.4%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	6	4	1	0	0

The influence of incident location on reporting theft of farming tools to the police was determined using four items as shown in Table XIV. Theft of farming tools committed by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; small extent 31.3%, moderate 18.8%, and large extent 37.5%. In respect to theft of farming tools committed by a stranger, the majority of the respondents' response was at; not at all 44.4% and to a small extent 33.3%. On the other hand, theft of farming tools took place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 70.0% and small extent 15.0%. Theft of farming tools took place in a public place and had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 54.5% and small extent 36.4%.

Table XV: Means and Standard Deviation for Theft of Farming Tool/s

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Theft of farming tool/s committed by an acquaintance	16	1.81	Moderate	1.109	Widely
Theft of farming tool/s committed by astranger	18	.83	Small Extent	.924	Moderate
Theft of farming tool/s took place in aprivate place	20	.55	Small Extent	.999	Moderate
Theft of farming tool/s took place in apublic place	11	.64	Small Extent	.924	Moderate
Valid N (list wise)	11				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of theft of farming tools was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in the Table XV, the respondents tended to be "small extent" in relation to the incident location metrics except "theft of farming tools committed by an acquaintance" which had "moderate". In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had their responses at "moderate" distributed except in relation to theft of farming tools committed by an acquaintance which had its' responses "widely" distributed due to standard deviation of 1.109 which was equal to or above standard deviation of 1.000.

Theft of Livestock/s

Table XVI: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of livestock/s to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Theft of livestock/s committed by an acquaintance	0.0 %	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	0	1	0	0	0
Theft of livestock/s committed by a stranger	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	3	2	0	0	0
Theft of livestock/s took place in a private place	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	2	0	0	0	0
Theft of livestock/s took place in a public place	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	4	0	0	0	0

The influence of incident location on reporting theft of livestock/s to the police was determined using four items as shown in Table XVI. Theft of livestock/s committed by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at small extent 100%. In respect to theft of livestock/s committed by a stranger, the majority of the respondents' response was not at all 60.0%. On the other hand, theft of livestock/s took place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 100%. Theft of livestock/s took place in a public place had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 100%.

Table XVII: Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Theft of Livestock/s to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Theft of livestock/s committed by an acquaintance	1	1.00	Small Extent	.	Perfect Consensus
Theft of livestock/s committed by astranger	5	.40	Not at All	.548	Moderate
Theft of livestock took place in a privateplace	2	.00	Not at All	.000	Perfect Consensus
Theft of livestock took place in a publicplace	4	.00	Not at All	.000	Perfect Consensus
Valid N (list wise)	1				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of theft of livestock/s was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in Table XVII, the respondents tended to be “not at all” in relation to the incident location metrics except “theft of livestock/s was committed by an acquaintance” which had “small extent”. In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had their responses at perfect consensus distributed except in relation to theft of livestock/s committed by a stranger which had its’ responses moderately distributed due to standard deviation of 0.548 which was equal to or above standard deviation of 0.5.

Cheating, Conning, or Swindling out Money

Table XVIII: Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Cheating, Conning, or Swindlingout Money to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Cheating, conning, or swindling out money committed by an acquaintance	20.7 %	31.0%	34.5%	13.8%	0.0%
	6	9	10	4	0
Cheating, conning, or swindling out moneycommitted by a stranger	46.0%	38.0%	14.0%	2.0%	0.0%
	23	19	7	1	0
Cheating, conning, or swindling out money tookplace in a private place	71.4%	20.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	25	7	3	0	0
Cheating, conning, or swindling out money tookplace in a public place	75.0%	22.5%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%
	30	9	1	0	0

The influence of incident location on reporting Cheating, conning, or swindling to the police was determined using four items as shown in the Table XVIII. Cheating, conning, or swindling committed out money by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; small extent 31.0%, and moderate extent 34.5%. In respect to cheating, conning, or swindling out money committed by a stranger, majority of the respondents' response was at; not at all 46.0% and small extent 38.0%. On the other hand, cheating, conning, or swindling out money took place in a private place had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 71.4% and small extent 20.0%. Cheating, conning, or swindling out money took place in a public place had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 75.0% and small extent 22.2%.

Table XIX: Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Cheating, Conning or Swindling to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Cheating, conning, or swindling committed by an acquaintance	29	1.41	Small Extent	.983	Moderate
Cheating, conning, or swindlingcommitted by a stranger	50	.72	Small Extent	.784	Moderate
Cheating, conning, or swindlingcommitted in a private place	35	.37	Not at All	.646	Moderate
Cheating, conning, or swindlingcommitted in a public place	40	.28	Not at All	.506	Moderate
Valid N (list wise)	29				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of Cheating, conning, or swindling was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in the Table 4.26, the respondents tended to be "small extent" in relation to the incident location metrics; Cheating, conning, or swindling out money committed by an acquaintance and Cheating, conning, or swindling out money committed by a stranger. On the other hand, respondents tended to be "not at all" in relation to the incident metrics; Cheating, conning, or swindling out money took place in a private place and Cheating, conning, or swindling took place in a public place. In the context of the standard deviations, all the incident location metrics had their distribution of responses at "moderate" due to standard deviation of 0.983, 0.784, 0.646, and 0.506, which were equal to or above standard deviation of 0.5.

Influence of Distance between the Police Station and Crime Scene on Reporting Property Crime to the Police

Table XX: Influence of Distance between the Police Station and the crime Scene on Reporting Property Crime to the Police

Statement	NA %F	SE %F	ME %F	LE %F	VLE %F
Distance between the police station and thecrime scene	69.1%	25.9%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%
	56	21	4	0	0

The influence of distance between the police station and the crimes scene on reporting property crime to the police was determined using one item as shown in Table XX. The majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 69.1%, small extent 25.9%, and moderate extent 4.9%.

Table XXI: Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence of Distance between the Police Station and the crime Scene on Reporting Property Crime to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Distance between the police station and the crime scene	81	.41	Not at All	.738	Moderate
Valid N (list wise)	81				

The means and standard deviations of influence of incident location on reporting of housebreaking crime was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in Table XXI, the respondents tended to be "not at all" in relation to the incident location metrics. In the context of the standard deviations, the incident location metrics had its' responses distributed at "moderate" consensus due to standard deviation of 0.738 which was equal to or above standard deviation of 0.5.

Composite Index for the Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Property Crime to the Police

Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting housebreaking	87.1%	9.7%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
	27	3	1	0	0
Influence of relationship between the victimand the offender in reporting theft of vehicle	33.3%	33.3%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%
	3	3	2	1	0
Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting theft of vehicle	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	6	2	1	0	0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of electronicgadget	51.1%	24.4%	20.0%	2.2%	2.2%
	23	11	9	1	1
Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting theft of electronic gadget	75.6%	22.2%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
	34	10	1	0	0
Influence of relationship between the victimand the offender in reporting theft of building construction tools	20.7%	24.1%	31.0%	6.9%	17.2%
	6	7	9	2	5
Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting theft of building construction tools	55.2%	27.6%	10.3%	6.9%	0.0%
	16	8	3	2	0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of farming tools	25.0%	20.8%	25.0%	12.5%	16.7
	6	5	6	3	4
Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting theft of farming tools	66.7%	12.5%	12.5%	4.2%	4.2%
	16	3	3	1	1
Influence of relationship between the victimand the offender in reporting theft of livestock	50.0%	50.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0%
	3	3	0	0	0
Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting theft of livestock	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6	0	0	0	0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling out money	31.5%	35.2%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%
	17	19	6	6	6

Table XXII: Composite Index for the Influence of Incident Location on Reporting Property Crime to the Police

Statement	NA	SE	ME	LE	VLE
	%	%	%	%	%
	F	F	F	F	F
Influence of relationship between the victimand the offender in reporting robbery	42.9%	21.4%	25.0%	10.7%	0.0%
	12	6	7	3	0
Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting robbery	78.6%	17.9%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	22	5	1	0	0
Influence of relationship between the victimand the offender in reporting burglary	73.1%	23.1%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	19	6	1	0	0
Influence of place of crime occurrence inreporting burglary	76.9%	15.4%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	20	4	2	0	0
Influence of relationship between the victimand the offender in reporting housebreaking	71.0%	22.6%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%
	22	7	2	0	0
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling out money	66.7%	22.1%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	36	12	6	0	0

A composite index of the influence of incident location (relationship between victim and offender, place of victimization) on reporting property was determined using eighteen items as shown in the Table XXII. Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting robbery had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 42.9%, small extent 21.4%, and moderate extent 25.0%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting robbery had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 78.6% and small extent 17.9%. Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting burglary had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 73.1% and small extent 23.1%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting burglary had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 76.9% and small extent 15.4%. Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting housebreaking had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 71.0% and small extent 22.6%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting housebreaking had most of the respondents' response at; not at all 87.1% and small extent9.7%.

In respect to theft, the influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of vehicle had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 33.3% and small extent 33.3%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of vehicle had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 66.7% and small extent 22.2%. Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of electronic gadget had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 51.1% and small extent 24.4%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of electronic gadget had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 75.6% and small extent 22.2%. Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of building construction tools had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 20.7%, small extent 24.1%, and moderate 31.0%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of building construction tools had

a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 55.2 % and small extent 27.6%.

Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of farming tools had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 25.0%, small extent 20.8%, and moderate 25.0%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of farming tools had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 66.7%, small extent 12.5%, and moderate 12.5%. Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of livestock had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 50.0% and small extent 50.0%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of livestock had a majority of the respondents' response at not at all 100.0%. Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling out money had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 31.5% and small extent 35.2%. Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling out money had a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 67.2% and small extent 22.1%.

Key informant interviews confirmed that the victim-offender relationship influences reporting property crime to the police to some extent. Some victims may avoid reporting property crime to the police if the offender is a friend, so that the relationship is not harmed. In some cases, the offender admits to the criminal acts, seeks alternative dispute resolution methods, and promises to compensate the victim to keep their relationship intact.

Victim-offender relationship has an influence on decision of a victim to report property crime. The victim and the offender might be related by blood and they might view taking the matter to the police as not socially right, and the family will be a laughing stoke to the community since their family will be labelled as a "conflicting family". In this case you will find they might take the matter lightly to avoid embarrassment from the community (**K.I-001, Male**).

Yes, victim-offender relationship has an influence. Some victims find it hard to report a close friend to the police. Victims find it hard to do away with the fact that they are friends and remember that the offender took advantage of their friendship and denied them their rights to own their property (**K.I-002, Male**).

Yes, the relationship between the victim and offender has an influence on reporting property crime. There are some instances where the offender comes to our office and admits the crime they have committed to a person known to them, and pleads we talk to the victim not to take the matter to the police since they are willing to compensate the victim. For criminal cases we always encourage the victim to report to the police. However, we can inform the victim about the offender's statement but, we always encourage this to be done in writing so as to bind the offender to their promises. This written document can be used as an evidence when the offender fails to abide by the terms (**K.I-004, Male**).

Yes. This can happen in different ways. Example, a victim might opt to do away with the stolen property if he or she has a close relationship with the offender, to maintain their relationship. In some cases the victim might not consider this as a crime, or may consider it as soo petty to be reported to the police, as compared to when the crime is committed by a stranger. Another instance is, when the victim does not know the offender the victim may opt not to report because the offender is not known, hence the victim sees it as a waste of time. However, if the victim knows the offender it might be easy to report the case to the police and arrest of the offender is made and justice willbe served (**K.I-005, Female**).

One key informant, on the other hand, had a different perspective on the impact of the victim- offender relationship on reporting property crime. According to the informant, a victim- offender relationship could be advantageous if the victim knows the offender, implying that it would be a simple case for him/or her. However, for the key informant, the victim-offender relationship may have a minor impact on reporting property crime to the police.

Victims go through financial/emotional pain when their property is stolen or damaged. Hence, the biggest motivating factor is to find their property. Victims will opt to report the crime to the police with the hope that they will get their property back. Also, reporting the case to the police makes the offender, if it's his or her friend, to see that the victim is serious with the case. In most cases you will find the victim might be restituted or the offender will be arrested and charged with property crime (**K.I-003, Male**).

Regarding the influence of place on reporting of property crime. All of the informants disagreed, claiming that the place of the crime commission (private or public) never influenced victims' reporting of property crime to the police. According to one of the key informants,

What will cool the heart of the victim is getting their property back. Whether the crime took place in a public place or a private place that won't be a big issue as long as the property is returned to them (**K.I-004, Male**)

Besides, the key informants indicated that distance between the crime scene and the police station did not influence reporting of property crime. Some key factors emerged as they explained their points. Some of the factors include the time of crime occurrence and the value of the property stolen, this was considered as the

motivating factor to report property crime ascompared to the distance. Their views are as stated below:

No, it doesn't have an influence. The only problem could be the time. During the Covid 19 Pandemic, the government through the Ministry of Health, directed a nation-wide curfew. It might be hard for victims to report the property crime to the police if they don't have any contact details of a police officer in Gilgil so as to notify them of a crime during the late hours. However, most people tend to have contacts of their village elders or their chiefs. Once they contact us, we make sure that we first report the case to the police so as to ensure the case is attended to by the police with immediate effect (**K.I-001, Male**).

No. it depends with what has been stolen. If what has been stolen has less value compared to the transport the victim can use to report the case to the police station then the victim might opt not to report. Value of the property matters a lot (**K.I-002, Male**).

No, place of crime occurrence has no influence. The victims will eventually report a property crime regardless of the distance between the crime scene and the police station. It depends with the crime, for instance, a crime of robbery victims might contact the police through phone calls for them to come to their rescue. On the other hand, crimes of breakings or theft during late hours, victims might wait and go to the police station on the next day if the distance to the police station is far (**K.I-003, Male**).

No. There is no difference between a crime scene that is far from the police station and a crime scene that is close to the police station. There are some instances where this crimes take place just opposite to the police station and the victims fail to report property crime. In my view, I think it's the victims who weigh the probability of getting their property if they report to the police or weigh the worth of the property and the cost they might incur if they report the crime (**K.I-004, Male**).

No. victims will report the crime with the hope that they might get their property once criminal gangs are arrested and by good luck their property are found in possessionof this criminals (**K.I-005, Female**).

Table XXIII: Composite Index of Means and Standard Deviation for the Influence ofIncident Location on Reporting Property Crime to the Police

	N	Mean	Respondents on average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses distributed
Influence of relationship in reporting robbery	28	1.04	Small Extent	1.071	Widely
Influence of place in reporting robbery	28	.25	Not at All	.518	Moderate
Influence of relationship in reporting burglary	26	.31	Not at All	.549	Moderate
Influence of place in reporting burglary	26	.31	Not at Al	.618	Moderate
Influence of relationship in reporting housebreaking	31	.35	Not at All	.608	Moderate
Influence of place in reporting housebreaking	31	.16	Not at All	.454	High Consensus

Influence of relationship in reporting vehicle theft			Small Extent		Widely
Influence of place in reporting vehicle theft	9	1.11	Not at All	1.054	Moderate
Influence of relationship in reporting electronic theft	9	.44	Small Extent	.726	Moderate
Influence of place in reporting electronic theft	45	.80	Not at all	.991	High Consensus
Influence of relationship in reporting theft of building tools	45	.27	Small Extent	.495	Widely
Influence of place in reporting theft of building tools	29	1.76	Small Extent	1.354	Moderate
Influence of relationship in reporting theft of farming tools	29 24	.69 1.75	Moderate	.930 1.422	Widely
Influence of place in reporting theftof farming tools	24	.67	Small Extent	1.129	Widely
Influence of relationship in reportingtheft of livestock	6	.50	Small Extent	.548	Moderate
Influence of place in reporting theftof livestock	6	.00	Not at All	.000	Perfect Consensus
Influence of relationship in reportingconning	54	1.35	Small Extent	1.334	Widely
Influence of place in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling	54	.44	Not at All	.691	Moderate
Valid N (list wise)	6				

A composite index of the means and standard deviations of the influence of incident location (relationship between victim and offender, place of victimization) on reporting of property crime crime was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Small Extent (SE), Moderate Extent (ME), Large Extent (LE), and Very Large Extent (VLE) represented as 0,1,2,3, and 4 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores $0<\mu<0.5$, $0.5<\mu<1.5$, $1.5<\mu<2.5$, $2.5<\mu<3.5$, and $3.5<\mu<4$ where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, small extent, moderate extent, large extent, and very large extent respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores $0<\sigma X<0.5$, $0.5<\sigma X<1$, and $\sigma X>=1$ implied that the responses were concentrated around the mean (high consensus), responses were moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in the Table XXIII, in relation to the influence of relationship between the victim and offender on reporting property crime to the police metrics, respondents tended to be at "small extent" except; influence of relationship in reporting burglary and influence of relationship in reporting housebreaking which were "not at all", and influence of relationship in reporting theft of farming tools which was "moderate". On the other hand, in relation to the influence of place of victimization on reporting of property crime to the police metrics, respondents to be at "not at all" except; influence of place in reporting theft of building tools and influence of place in reporting theft of farming tools which were at "small extent".

In the context of the standard deviations, the incident location metrics had its' responses distributed at "moderate" consensus except; - influence of relationship in reporting robbery, influence of relationship in reporting vehicle theft, influence of relationship in reporting theft of building tools, influence of relationship in reporting theft of farming tools, influence of place in reporting theft of farming tools, influence of relationship in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling out money which were widely distributed due to standard deviation of 1.071, 1.054, 1.354, 1.422, 1.129, 1.334 respectively were equal to or above standard deviation of 1.000. Besides, influence of place in reporting housebreaking and influence of place in reporting electronic theft had high "consensus" due to standard deviation of 0.454 and 0.495 respectively were above standard deviation of 0.000. Lastly, influence of place in reporting robbery theft of livestock had a "perfect consensus" due to standard deviation of 0.000 which was equal to standard deviation of 0.000.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

The study concludes that the incident location affects the reporting of property crimes to varying degrees depending on the type of crime. Overall, the location had minimal influence on the decision to report robbery, burglary, and housebreaking crimes to the police. In the case of robbery, most respondents indicated that the incident location did not affect their decision to report the crime. This finding supports the argument by Baumer et al. (2003) that the decision to report crimes may be more influenced by the nature of the crime rather than the specific location where it occurred. For burglary and housebreaking offenses, respondents were generally not influenced by the location, reflecting Goudriaan's (2006) assertion that incident location does not always play a critical role in reporting decisions.

However, for theft crimes, especially the theft of farming tools and building construction tools, a small extent of influence was noted regarding the location of the crime. This finding partially agrees with Bunei et al. (2012), who observed that higher-value items are more likely to be reported, suggesting that the economic value of the stolen items may interact with location factors to influence reporting behavior.

These findings suggest that while the incident location may have some impact on the reporting of certain types of property crimes, particularly theft involving tools, it generally does not significantly influence victims' decisions to report other types of property crimes, such as burglary, housebreaking, and robbery. Factors such as the nature of the crime, the perceived severity, and the victim-offender relationship may play more crucial roles in determining whether a crime is reported to the police (Felson et al., 2002; Goudriaan, 2006).

Furthermore, the findings highlight the complexity of crime reporting behaviors and suggest that interventions aimed at increasing crime reporting in Gilgil Ward should consider multiple factors beyond the incident location. Enhancing trust in the police, increasing police visibility, and addressing socio-economic barriers could be more effective strategies to encourage the reporting of property crimes (Kempen, 2018; Chebii, 2019).

Recommendations

The study sought to examine the influence of incidents location on reporting property crimes to the police in Gilgil Ward. Tthe study recommends that more police posts be established in Gilgil Ward through the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government to improve crime reporting, as some respondents indicated that the proximity to the police station influenced their decision to report property crime. This can help improve the reporting rates of property crimes, particularly for residents who are currently far from existing police stations and may be deterred from reporting due to distance. To overcome the challenge of distance and

proximity to police stations, mobile police units should be introduced in areas where crime rates are high or where residents are located far from fixed police stations. This can provide more immediate access to police services and potentially increase the likelihood of crime reporting.

REFERENCES

Baumer, E. P., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2003). Reporting crime to the police: What the NCVS reveals about willingness to report property crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 19*(1), 79-104.

Cheng, K. K., & Smyth, R. (2015). Crime and punishment: A social norms perspective. *European Economic Review, 75*, 1-17.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.).* Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., Hoskin, A. W., & Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to the police. *Criminology, 40*(3), 617-648.

Goudriaan, H. (2006). *Reporting crime: Effects of social context on the decision of victims to notify the police*. Nijmegen, Netherlands: Radboud University Press.

Hautala, D., Sittner, K., & Whitbeck, L. (2015). Victim–offender relationship and crime reporting among American Indian adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(1), 89-114.

Kempen, E. L. (2018). Property crime in South Africa: Victim reporting behavior and correlates. *Victims & Offenders, 13*(1), 1-20.

Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS). (2019). *2019 Kenya population and housing census*. Nairobi: KNBS.

Sidebottom, A. (2015). Burglary victimization: Does place make a difference? *British Journal of Criminology, 55*(2), 274-290.

Stokbaek, M., Langballe, A., & Thoresen, S. (2021). Reporting crime: A study of delay and non-reporting. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention, 22*(1), 34-52.

Xie, M., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2012). Racial context and crime reporting: A multilevel analysis of contact and cooperation with police. *Justice Quarterly, 29*(3), 391-422.