Public Policy and Administration Research
ISSN 2224-5731(Paper) ISSN 2225-0972(Online)
Vol.14, No.3, 2024

Factors Affecting the Likelihood of Reporting Property Crime to the Police in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya

Erick M. Mwangi

Department of Peace, Security, and Social Studies, Egerton University

Abstract
Crime underreporting significantly hampers effective crime management and justice administration, particularly in developing regions. This study explores the factors influencing the likelihood of reporting property crimes to the police in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya, utilizing a mixed-method research design. The study integrates quantitative and qualitative approaches to assess how variables such as incident location, the relationship between victims and offenders, and crime severity impact reporting behaviours. Data from 96 respondents revealed that the relationship between the victim and the offender greatly affects reporting rates, with 42.9% of respondents indicating they would not report robbery if the offender was known to them, and 73.1% reporting "not at all" for burglary under similar circumstances. Crimes involving strangers were more likely to be reported, with 50.6% indicating they were "likely" to report such incidents. In contrast, incidents involving acquaintances were less frequently reported. Additionally, crime location was a significant factor; 78.6% of respondents indicated "not at all" for reporting robberies in familiar locations. Recommendations include implementing community policing programs, raising public awareness about the importance of reporting crimes, improving police training, developing alternative reporting channels, offering victim support services, and continuously monitoring reporting trends to enhance overall crime reporting practices and community safety in Gilgil Ward.
Keywords: Crime Reporting, Property Crime, Victim behaviour
DOI: 10.7176/PPAR/14-3-03
Publication date: September 30th 2024

I. INTRODUCTION

Crime underreporting represents a significant barrier to effective crime management and justice administration globally, especially in developing countries where criminal justice systems (CJS) are often underdeveloped or inefficient (Eze et al., 2019). This challenge is particularly acute in many African nations, including Kenya, where various socio-cultural, economic, and structural factors contribute to a noticeable gap between actual crime rates and reported crime statistics (Chaudhary et al., 2019; Yoon, 2015). The underreporting of property crimes, in particular, poses a serious problem, as it impedes the ability of law enforcement agencies to address and manage crime effectively, ultimately affecting community safety and trust in the justice system.

In Kenya's Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, the underreporting of property crimes is influenced by a complex interplay of factors. This study aims to explore these factors, focusing on elements such as trust in law enforcement, socio-economic conditions, and the nature and severity of crimes. Trust in law enforcement plays a crucial role; when victims perceive the police as corrupt, ineffective, or unresponsive, they are less likely to report crimes. Similarly, socio-economic conditions, including poverty and unemployment, can impact the likelihood of reporting crimes, as individuals facing economic hardships may view reporting as futile or fear further victimization. Understanding these factors is essential for developing strategies that enhance crime reporting rates and improve the overall safety and effectiveness of crime management in the region.

This study seeks to fill the gap in the literature by providing a detailed analysis of the factors affecting crime reporting behavior in Gilgil Ward. By examining how trust in law enforcement, socio-economic conditions, and the nature and severity of crimes influence victims' decisions to report property crimes, the research aims to offer actionable insights for policymakers and law enforcement agencies. Such insights are critical for designing targeted interventions that can improve crime reporting rates, strengthen community trust in the police, and ultimately contribute to a safer and more just society in Gilgil Ward and similar regions facing comparable challenges.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Crime reporting behavior is influenced by several interconnected factors, including trust in law enforcement, socio-economic conditions, the nature and severity of crimes, cultural and social norms, and the location of incidents. Each of these factors plays a crucial role in shaping the decision-making process of crime victims regarding whether or not to report crimes to the police.

Trust in law enforcement significantly affects crime reporting behavior. Studies have shown that when victims lack trust in the criminal justice system (CJS) or its officials, they are less likely to report crimes to the police (Eze et al., 2019). Distrust often arises from perceived corruption, inefficiency, or fears of retaliation and re-victimization by offenders (Chaudhary et al., 2019; Yoon, 2015). In Kenya, similar sentiments have been observed, with studies indicating that people are often reluctant to cooperate with police officers due to perceived ineffectiveness or fear of further victimization (Maina, 2018; Chebii, 2019). Goudriaan et al. (2004) highlight that the competency and perceived integrity of the police significantly influence the likelihood of reporting property crimes. In contexts where police are seen as competent and reliable, crime reporting rates tend to be higher. Conversely, when the police are perceived to be corrupt or ineffective, victims may choose not to report crimes, as seen in many parts of Africa (Musa, 2016). Improving trust in law enforcement through community engagement and transparency is therefore crucial for increasing crime reporting rates in Gilgil Ward.

Socio-economic conditions also play a critical role in determining the likelihood of reporting property crimes. Studies suggest that higher poverty levels, unemployment, and limited access to social services can contribute to lower crime reporting rates (Eze et al., 2019; Centraal Bureau Voor de Statistiek, 2011). For example, in South Africa, underreporting of property crimes remains a challenge, with only 48% of housebreaking incidents reported to the police despite a high incidence rate (Kempen, 2019). The socio-economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, such as increased unemployment and reduced neighborhood patrols, has also been found to influence crime reporting rates in Kenya (GPS, 2020). In the Uasin Gishu District of Kenya, the reporting rate for farm theft was found to be 44%, with more severe crimes like livestock theft reported more frequently (over 80%) than petty crimes like small equipment theft (less than 30%) (Bunei et al., 2012). This indicates that socio-economic conditions, particularly the economic value of the stolen property, directly impact the likelihood of reporting.

The nature and severity of the crime are significant determinants of whether victims choose to report property crimes. Crimes perceived as more severe, such as motor vehicle theft, are generally reported more frequently than less severe crimes like petty theft or larceny (BJS, 2007; Goudriaan, 2006). Victims of more severe crimes may be motivated to report due to the potential recovery of stolen property or the desire for justice (Chebii, 2019). However, discrepancies exist in crime reporting across different demographics. For instance, older victims are more likely to report crimes than younger individuals, and women are more likely to report crimes than men, except when the offender is an acquaintance (Goudriaan, 2006; Cheng & Smyth, 2015; Henson et al., 2013; Steinmetz & Austin, 2014). Understanding these dynamics is essential, particularly in Gilgil Ward, where property crimes are prevalent.

Cultural and social norms also significantly influence the likelihood of reporting property crimes. In many African societies, cultural beliefs and norms shape crime reporting behaviors (Goudriaan et al., 2004; Musa, 2016). In some communities, reporting crimes may be seen as disrupting social harmony or exposing the community to external scrutiny, leading to underreporting. For example, in some Kenyan communities, victims may choose not to report crimes due to cultural norms that discourage airing grievances outside the community (Maina, 2018). The analysis of the costs and benefits of reporting a crime, influenced by cultural norms, may also affect the likelihood of crime reporting (Eze et al., 2019). If cultural norms consider a crime inappropriate for reporting, victims may choose not to report, regardless of the crime's severity (Goudriaan et al., 2004).

Incident location and proximity to police services further affect crime reporting rates. Research indicates that crimes occurring closer to police stations or in areas with high police visibility are more likely to be reported (Hart & Colavita, 2011). In Gilgil Ward, the distance to the nearest police station and the frequency of police patrols have been found to influence crime reporting rates (GPS, 2020). Enhancing the accessibility and visibility of police services may therefore increase the likelihood of reporting property crimes. According to Goudriaan (2006), crime reporting behavior is also influenced by the physical location of the incident, with crimes occurring in public spaces being more likely to be reported than those in private or less visible locations.

Technological and structural changes, such as community policing, mobile communication technology, and social media, have been shown to positively impact crime reporting rates (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010). In the Philippines, for example, community policing has led to increased crime reporting rates, with robbery offenses

being among the top three reported crimes in 2013 (Patalinghug, 2017). However, the effectiveness of such strategies varies across contexts, and in many parts of Africa, community policing has not achieved the desired outcomes due to implementation challenges (Hills, 2014; Musa, 2016).

Overall, the literature indicates that various factors, including trust in law enforcement, socio-economic conditions, the nature and severity of crimes, cultural and social norms, and the location of incidents, significantly affect the likelihood of reporting property crimes to the police. In Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya, these factors collectively influence the decision-making processes of crime victims. Understanding these dynamics is critical to developing targeted interventions to enhance crime reporting rates and improve overall community safety.

The literature suggests that multiple factors, including trust in law enforcement, socio-economic conditions, the nature and severity of crimes, cultural and social norms, and the location of incidents, significantly affect the likelihood of reporting property crimes to the police. In Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya, these factors collectively shape the decision-making processes of crime victims. Understanding these dynamics is critical to developing targeted interventions to enhance crime reporting rates and improve overall community safety.

III METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a mixed-method research design, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2012). The mixed-method approach was chosen because it provides a more comprehensive understanding of the factors affecting the likelihood of reporting property crimes to the police in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya. The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods ensures a thorough exploration of the research problem, as neither method alone is sufficient to fully capture the complexities of crime reporting behaviors (Creswell, 2012).

The study employed a concurrent embedded approach, where the primary method (quantitative) guided the overall research process, while the secondary method (qualitative) provided supplementary insights to enhance and support the findings (Creswell, 2009). The quantitative approach was used to collect and analyze data from a sample of the target population to identify patterns, relationships, and statistical significance in crime reporting behavior. Meanwhile, the qualitative approach was utilized to gather in-depth information from participants through interviews and discussions, providing contextual understanding and exploring the underlying reasons for the likelihood of reporting property crimes. By combining these methods, the study aimed to comprehensively understand the factors influencing the likelihood of reporting property crimes to the police by victims in Gilgil Ward, allowing for a more nuanced analysis of both measurable data and personal experiences.

Location of Study

The study was conducted in Gilgil Ward, located in Nakuru County, Kenya, a region characterized by a high prevalence of property crimes. Gilgil Ward is bordered by four other County Assembly Wards within Gilgil Sub-county: Murindat, Elementaita, Mbaruk/Emburru, and Malewa West. According to the 2019 census, the ward has a population of 68,012, including 34,800 males and 33,211 females (KNBS, 2019).

Despite the significant incidence of property crimes in Gilgil Ward, with property crimes being the most common type of crime (GPS, 2020), only about 20% of these crimes are reported to the police (GPS, 2020). This low reporting rate suggests a complex interplay of factors affecting the likelihood of reporting property crimes.

The study aims to investigate these factors, including the distance to the nearest police station, the nature of interactions between victims and the police, and other socio-economic and contextual variables. By examining why property crimes are underreported despite their high incidence, the research seeks to uncover the underlying reasons for the low reporting rates and provide insights into improving crime reporting practices in Gilgil Ward. Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing strategies to enhance reporting rates and address the challenges in property crime reporting in the region.

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 = (z2pq) ÷ e2

n0 = {(1.962) (0.5) (1-0.5)} ÷ 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

This study aimed to investigate the factors influencing the likelihood of reporting property crimes to the police by victims in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County. To achieve this, the research employed both quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and analysis. Respondents were first asked to specify how many times they had been victims of property crimes and whether they had reported these incidents to the police. Composite index helped in analyzing the association between these variables, providing insights into the relationship between victimization frequency and the likelihood of reporting.

Additionally, a frequency distribution table was used to compare the percentage frequency of reported versus unreported property crimes. This comparative analysis helped illustrate the extent of underreporting and provided a clear picture of reporting behaviors among the respondents. Further, to gauge the respondents' likelihood of reporting future property crimes, including robbery, burglary, housebreaking, or theft, descriptive statistics were employed. Participants were asked to indicate how likely they would be to report such crimes if they occurred in the future. This was measured using a five-point scale: 0 = not at all, 1 = less likely, 2 = likely, 3 = very likely, and 4 = most likely. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to analyze these responses. This approach offered a detailed understanding of the factors influencing crime reporting behavior and provided insights into how likely victims are to report different types of property crimes.

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

Table I: 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 victim and the offender in reporting robbery	42.9% 12	21.4% 6	25.0% 7	10.7% 3	0.0% 0
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting robbery	78.6% 22	17.9% 5	3.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting burglary	73.1% 19	23.1% 6	3.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting burglary	76.9% 20	15.4% 4	7.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting housebreaking	71.0% 22	22.6% 7	6.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting housebreaking	87.1% 27	9.7% 3	3.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of vehicle	33.3% 3	33.3% 3	22.2% 2	11.1% 1	0.0% 0
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of vehicle	66.7% 6	22.2% 2	11.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of electronic gadget	51.1% 23	24.4% 11	20.0% 9	2.2% 1	2.2% 1
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of electronic gadget	75.6% 34	22.2% 10	2.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of building construction tools	20.7% 6	24.1% 7	31.0% 9	6.9% 2	17.2% 5
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of building construction tools	55.2% 16	27.6% 8	10.3% 3	6.9% 2	0.0% 0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of farming tools	25.0% 6	20.8% 5	25.0% 6	12.5% 3	16.7 4
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of farming tools	66.7% 16	12.5% 3	12.5% 3	4.2% 1	4.2% 1
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting theft of livestock	50.0% 3	50.0% 3	0.0 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting theft of livestock	100% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Influence of relationship between the victim and the offender in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling out money	31.5% 17	35.2% 19	11.1% 6	11.1% 6	11.1% 6
Influence of place of crime occurrence in reporting cheating, conning, or swindling out money	66.7% 36	22.1% 12	11.1% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 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 I. 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 most 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 most 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 most 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 a majority of the respondents' response at; not at all 87.1% and small extent 9.7%.

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

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

	N	Mean	Respondentson 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 reportingvehicle theft	9	1.11	Small Extent	1.054	Widely
Influence of place in reporting vehicle theft	9	.44	Not at All	.726	Moderate
Influence of relationship in reporting electronic theft	45	.80	Small Extent	.991	Moderate
Influence of place in reporting electronic theft	45	.27	Not at all	.495	High Consensus
Influence of relationship in reportingtheft of building tools	29	1.76	Small Extent	1.354	Widely
Influence of place in reporting theftof building tools	29	.69	Small Extent	.930	Moderate
Influence of relationship in reporting theft of farming tools	24	1.75	Moderate	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 reporting conning	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 III, 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.

B. Likelihood to Report Property Crime

Table III: Likelihood to Report Property Crime to the Police

Statement	**NA**	**LL**	**L**	**VL**	**ML**
	F	**F**	**F**	**F**	**F**
	%	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**
Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of yourmoney by a stranger	3	14	41	20	3
	3.7%	17.3%	50.6%	24.7%	3.7%

Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of yourmoney by an acquaintance	9	20	37	12	3
	11.1%	24.7%	45.7%	14.8%	3.7%
Having a stranger break into your home at nightwhile you are away	0	6	13	41	21
	0.0%	7.4%	16.0%	50.6%	25.2%
Having a stranger break into your home at nightwhile you are there	0	4	14	40	23
	0.0%	4.9%	17.3%	49.4%	28.4%
Having an acquaintance break into your home atnight while you are there	5	8	21	36	11
	6.2%	9.9%	25.9%	44.4%	13.6%
Having stranger break into your home at daylightwhile you are away	1	1	11	53	15
	1.2%	1.2%	13.6%	65.4%	18.5%
Having stranger break into your home at daylightwhile you are there	12	15	21	31	2
	14.8%	18.5%	25.9%	38.3%	2.5%
Having an acquaintance break into your home atdaylight while you are there	11	18	36	11	5
	13.6%	22.2%	44.4%	13.6%	6.2%
Having your vehicle stolen by a stranger.	2	0	3	46	30
	2.5%	0.0%	3.7%	56.8%	37.0%
Having a vehicle stolen by an acquaintance.	0	1	2	45	33
	0.0%	1.2%	2.5%	55.6%	40.7%
Having a building construction tool stolen by astranger.	4	10	34	26	7
	4.9%	12.3%	42.0%	32.1%	8.6%
Having a building construction tool stolen by an acquaintance.	8	9	31	27	6
	9.9%	11.1%	38.3%	33.3.%	7.4%
Having a farming tool/s stolen by a stranger.	9	17	26	24	5
	11.1%	21.0%	32.1%	29.6%	6.2%
Having a farming tool/s stolen by an acquaintance.	7	10	27	28	9
	8.6%	12.3%	33.3%	34.6%	11.1%

Livestock stolen by a stranger	0	4	10	42	25
	0.0%	4.9%	12.3%	51.9%	30.9%
Livestock stolen by an acquaintance	0	3	9	52	17
	0.0%	3.7%	11.1%	64.2%	21.0%
Being robbed at your home	2	0	2	56	21
	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	69.1%	25.9%
Being robbed on the street	5	7	31	36	2
	6.2%	8.6%	38.3%	44.4%	2.5%

The likelihood to report a property crime to the police in case it happened in future was determined using eighteen items as shown in the Table III. Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money by a stranger had a majority of the respondents' response at; - less likely 17.3%, likely 50.6%, and very likely 24.7%. In respect to being cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money by an acquaintance, majority of the respondents' response was at;
- less likely 24.7%, likely 45.7%, and very likely 14.8%. On the other hand having a stranger break into your home at night while you are away had a majority of the respondents' response at; - likely 16.0%, very likely 50.6%, and most likely 25.2%.

Having a stranger break into your home at night while you are there had a majority of the respondents' response at; - likely 17.3%, very likely 49.4%, and most likely 28.4%. Having an acquaintance break into your home at night while you are there had a majority of the respondents' response at; - likely 25.9%, very likely 44.4%, and most likely 13.6%. Having stranger break into your home at daylight while you are away had a majority of the respondents' response at; - likely 13.6%, very likely 65.4%, and most likely 18.5%. Having stranger break into your home at daylight while you are there had a majority of the respondents' response at; less likely 18.5%, likely 25.9%, and very likely 38.3%.

Having an acquaintance break into your home at daylight while you are there had a majority of the respondents' response at; - not at all 13.6%, less likely 22.2%, and likely 44.4%. Having your vehicle stolen by a stranger had a majority of the respondents' response at; - very likely 9.9% and most likely 37.0%. Having a vehicle stolen by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; - very likely 55.6% and most likely 40.7%. Having a building construction tool stolen by a stranger had a majority of the respondents' response at; - likely 42.0% and very likely 32.1%. Having a building construction tool stolen by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; - likely 38.3% and very likely 33.3%.

Having a farming tool/s stolen by a stranger had a majority of the respondents' response at; less likely 21.0%, likely 32.1%, and very likely 29.6%. Having a farming tool/s stolen by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; likely 33.3% and very likely 34.6%. Livestock stolen by a stranger had a majority of the respondents' response at; very likely 51.9% and most likely 30.9%. Livestock stolen by an acquaintance had a majority of the respondents' response at; very likely 64.2% and most likely 21.0%. Being robbed at your home had a majority of the respondents' response at; very likely 69.1% and most likely 25.9%. Being robbed on the street had a majority of the respondents' response at; likely 38.3% and very likely44.4%.

Table IV: Means and Standard Deviation of Likelihood to Report Property Crime tothe Police

Statement	N	Mean	Respondentson average tended to be	Std. Deviation	St. Dev Responses Distributed
Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money by a stranger	81	2.07	Likely	.848	Moderate
Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money by an acquaintance	81	1.75	Likely	.969	Moderate
Having a stranger break into your home at night while you are away	81	2.95	Very likely	.850	Moderate
Having a stranger break into yourhome at night while you are there	81	3.01	Very likely	.814	Moderate
Having an acquaintance break intoyour home at night while you are there	81	2.49	Likely	1.050	Widely
Having stranger break into your homeat daylight while you are away	81	2.99	Very likely	.698	Moderate
Having stranger break into your homeat daylight while you are there	81	1.95	Likely	1.128	Widely
Having an acquaintance break into your home at daylight while you are there	81	1.77	Likely	1.052	Widely
Having your vehicle stolen by astranger.	81	3.26	Very likely	.755	Moderate
Having a vehicle stolen by an acquaintance.	81	3.36	Very likely	.598	Moderate
Having a building construction toolstolen by a stranger.	81	2.27	Likely	.962	Moderate

Having a building construction toolstolen by an acquaintance.	81	2.17	Likely	1.058	Widely
Having a farming tool/s stolen by astranger.	81	1.99	Likely	1.101	Widely
Having a farming tool/s stolen by an acquaintance.	81	2.27	Likely	1.096	Widely
Livestock stolen by a stranger	81	3.09	Very likely	.794	Moderate
Livestock stolen by an acquaintance	81	3.02	very likely	.689	Moderate
Being robbed at your home	81	3.16	Very likely	.697	Moderate
Being robbed or mugged on the street	81	2.28	Likely	.898	Moderate
Valid N (list wise)	81				

The means and standard deviations of likelihood to report to the police was determined through use of descriptors; - Not at All (NA), Less Likely (LL), Likely (N), Very Likely (VL), and Most Likely (SD) 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, less likely, likely, very likely, and most likely 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 4.44, the respondents tended to be 'likely to report" in relation to the likelihood to report metrics except; -having a stranger break into your home at night while you are away, having a stranger break into your home at night while you are there, having stranger break into your home at daylight while you are away, having your vehicle stolen by a stranger, having a vehicle stolen by an acquaintance, livestock stolen by a stranger, livestock stolen by an acquaintance, and being robbed at your home.

In the context of the standard deviations, all the "likelihood to report" metrics had their responses moderately distributed except in relation to; -having an acquaintance break into your home at night while you are there, having stranger break into your home at daylight while you are there, having an acquaintance break into your home at daylight while you are there, having a building construction tool stolen by an acquaintance, having a farming tool/s stolen by a stranger, and having a farming tool/s stolen by an acquaintance, which had their responses widely distributed due to standard deviation of 1.050, 1.128, 1.052, 1.058, 1.101, and 1.096 respectively which were equal to or above a standard deviation of 1.000.

V. CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

The study concludes that the likelihood of reporting property crimes to the police is influenced by multiple factors, including the relationship between the victim and the offender, the location of the crime, and the nature of the crime. While some factors, such as the severity of the crime and the presence of a stranger as the offender, increase the likelihood of reporting, others like the relationship with the offender and the time of day have less impact. These findings are consistent with the literature indicating that victims weigh the cost and benefits before deciding to report (Goudriaan et al., 2004; Eze et al., 2019).

The high level of underreporting, particularly for crimes involving acquaintances and those occurring during the day, highlights a gap in reporting practices. This underreporting could be due to various reasons, including lack of trust in the police, fear of retaliation, or perceived ineffectiveness of law enforcement (Maina, 2018; Chebii, 2019). For example, studies by Yoon (2015) and Chaudhary et al. (2019) have demonstrated that victims who perceive the police as ineffective or corrupt are less likely to report crimes. Similarly, cultural norms and social factors can also play a role in influencing reporting behaviors, as suggested by Goudriaan et al. (2004).

Recommendations

The study recommends developing and implement community policing programs to build trust between the police and the community. These programs should focus on increasing visibility, engaging with residents, and addressing concerns about the police's responsiveness and effectiveness. Furthermore, there is need to conduct awareness campaigns to educate the public about the importance of reporting all types of property crimes. Emphasize the role of reporting in improving community safety and the effectiveness of law enforcement and provision regular training for police officers on handling property crime reports, especially those involving acquaintances or minor incidents. Training should include communication skills, conflict resolution, and sensitivity to victims' concerns. Besides there is need to develop and promote alternative reporting channels, such as online platforms or anonymous hotlines, to make it easier for victims to report crimes without fear of retaliation or stigmatization; offer comprehensive support services for victims of property crimes, including counselling, legal aid, and financial assistance. Support services can help mitigate the psychological and financial impact of crime, encouraging victims to report incidents and including continuously monitor and evaluate reporting trends to identify patterns and adjust strategies as needed. This will help in understanding changes in reporting behaviour and addressing emerging issues effectively.

REFERENCES

Baumer, E. P., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2010). Understanding crime reporting in the 21st century: The role of new technologies and social media. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 33*(1), 1-22.

Bunei, E., Omolo, J., & Kipkech, J. (2012). Reporting of property crimes in Uasin Gishu District, Kenya. *African Journal of Criminology, 10*(2), 113-125.

Centraal Bureau Voor de Statistiek. (2011). Socio-economic conditions and crime reporting in South Africa. *Statistical Yearbook, 54*, 45-62.

Chaudhary, V., Dutta, M., & Bhatia, S. (2019). Perceptions of corruption and their impact on crime reporting in developing countries. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 60*(3), 198-215.

Chebii, S. (2019). Public perceptions of law enforcement effectiveness in Kenya. *Kenya Journal of Criminology, 14*(1), 74-85.

Cheng, T., & Smyth, R. (2015). Demographic factors and crime reporting behavior: Evidence from a large-scale survey. *Crime & Delinquency, 61*(9), 1187-1209.

Eze, A. R., Chukwuma, O. U., & Obiora, A. M. (2019). Trust in law enforcement and its impact on crime reporting in Nigeria. *African Security Review, 28*(2), 167-182.

Goudriaan, H. (2006). Crime severity and reporting behavior: A comparative analysis. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, 14*(4), 367-382.

Goudriaan, H., Van der Poel, S., & Van Oortmerssen, A. (2004). Community policing and crime reporting: A review of recent studies. *Journal of Community Safety, 29*(2), 142-157.

Hart, T., & Colavita, R. (2011). The impact of police station proximity on crime reporting. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 33*(1), 45-61.

Henson, B., Moore, M., & Johnson, S. (2013). Age, gender, and crime reporting: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 41*(3), 210-223.

Hills, A. (2014). Challenges in implementing community policing in Africa. *African Journal of Policing, 19*(1), 36-49.

Kempen, J. (2019). Underreporting of property crimes in South Africa: An analysis of crime statistics. *South African Journal of Criminology, 31*(4), 114-128.

Maina, G. (2018). Perceptions of police effectiveness and reporting behaviors in Kenya. *East African Journal of Criminology, 23*(2), 75-89.

Musa, S. (2016). Corruption and its effect on crime reporting in African contexts. *African Journal of Law and Criminology, 12*(1), 25-40.

Patalinghug, E. (2017). The role of community policing in crime reporting: Evidence from the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Criminology, 12*(1), 55-70.

Steinmetz, K., & Austin, P. (2014). Gender differences in crime reporting: A review of recent literature. *Gender and Society, 28*(5), 743-761.

Yoon, H. (2015). Socio-cultural factors affecting crime reporting in developing countries. *Journal of Comparative Sociology, 56*(2), 205-223.