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ABSTRACT

The increase in property crime has been the main issue affecting the nation’s security and economic growth. The rise in property crimes is sometimes associated with the reluctance of victims to report a crime. Hence, encouraging criminals to continue with criminal activities. In Gilgil Ward, property crimes have topped the list of crimes in the area. However, a low percentage of the reported crimes are property crimes. It is unclear why victims are not reporting property crimes, yet crimes are supposed to be reported to the police for action. Hence, the study aimed at establishing the influence of trust for the police in Gilgil Ward on reporting of property crime by victims in Gilgil Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya. The study used a mixed-method research design. The researcher used questionnaires and interview schedules as research instruments for the research study. The target population were the property crime victims, who had reported a crime to the police. The research study sample size was ninety-six (96). Stratified random sampling, purposive sampling, and snowballing sampling was used when selecting the respondents. Descriptive statistics was used in the data analysis. Descriptive statistics entailed the use of frequency distribution tables and percentages to summarize data on closed-ended items in the questionnaires. Data obtained from open-ended items in the questionnaire was categorized according to themes relevant to the study and was thematically analyzed. Findings from the study indicate that the level of trust for the police was at a “low level” with a mean of 1.19. However, majority of the respondents; 71.4%, 73.1%, 71.0%, and 75.3% indicated they were not influenced by trust in their decision to report property crime to the police, for robbery, burglary, housebreaking, and theft crimes respectively. This study recommends that, residents of Gilgil Ward should be enlightened on the role/importance of reporting property crime to the police so as to motivate proper policing. Also, the study recommends that, regular in-service training that covers both soft skills and technical skills, to be enforced to improve the police efficiency thus, increasing the level of trust for the police. Besides, the study recommends regular patrols to be conducted in Gilgil Ward to deter and/or arrest criminals.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Police are the first legal authority to respond to crime in any social setting (Tyler et al., 2014), adding to their roles include prevention and controlling of crime (Lum & Nagin, 2017). In most cases, they rely on the public to report crime happenings, and they will be present as witnesses at a crime scene in a few instances. Therefore, criminology scholars have regarded reporting of crime as a significant role in the Criminal Justice System (CJS) (Kroovand et al., 2019; Xie & Lynch, 2017). Police data is useful for compiling crime statistics for it represents an official record of crime since all police collect information about crime in their respective territories (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 2004).

Few empirical facts about reporting of crime by the victims have looked at the victim’s attitude and experience with the police (Xie et al., 2006; Yoon, 2015), which are the macro factors causing an effect on reporting of crime, hence becoming the current interest of researcher’s (Schnebly, 2008; Warner, 2007). Thus indicating that CJS should play a huge role in proving to the public that they are valid, competent, and accountable (Kirk & Papachristos, 2011; Yoon, 2015), to build a strong relationship between the police and the public that could have a positive effect on reporting of crime. However, there is scanty empirical evidence supporting this, so it is a crucial factor to study. Victimization surveys focusing on property crime
have been under-studied, most of which concentrate on specific violent crimes (Cook & Fox, 2011). Also, there is scanty crime reporting literature in developing countries (Sidebottom, 2015). Hence, the current study will focus on property crime in terms of crime reporting.

Crime detection has become a significant concern, resulting in a small number of reported crimes. The probability of crime reporting being 50% or less (Chaudhary et al., 2019; Yoon, 2015). Globally, the Netherlands reporting rate is at 35% (Centraal Bureau Voor de Statistiek, 2011). Besides, in 2017, 10% of the Dutch were victims of one form of property crime, and more than 5% of vandalism (Ministerie van Justitie en Veiligheid, 2017). Moreover, 24% of traditional crimes also were reported to the police. The British reporting rate is 38% of their victimizations (Home Office, 2011). Moreover, according to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), in 2010, about 39.3% of property crimes also were reported in the United States (Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), 2011). Besides, the Office of National Security (ONS) found out that there was no change in the level of crime in recent years (ONS, 2019). However, there was an increase in 11% and a 3% increase in reported cases of robbery and car theft, respectively, and a 4% decrease in reported burglary cases. ONS (2019) indicated that the rise or fall of police-recorded crimes does not necessarily mean that the actual crime levels in society have changed.

National Bureau of Statistics of Federal Republic of Nigeria report (2012), as cited in Musa (2016), stated that a total of 172,396 crime cases were reported to the police in 2006 as compared to 108,245 crime cases reported in 2012. These findings indicate an alarming decline in reporting of crime, given the fact that the figures from the CLEEN foundation (2012), as cited in Musa (2016), suggested that the actual victimization constitutes one in every three of the population. Also, Eze et al. (2019) found that there was a low level of crime reporting in Gwagwalada. Eze et al. (2019) suggested that reporting of crime will reduce criminal activities. However, there are few pieces of literature on crime reporting practices in developing countries hence, making it an issue that should be put into consideration by future researchers (Estienne & Morabito, 2016).

Crime reporting is a significant factor that has a great impact on every society. Crime reporting is a civic duty that is useful in controlling crime rates (Eze et al., 2019; Yoon, 2015) and reducing the risk of repeat victimization (Xie & Lynch, 2017). Crime is known to be financially costly (Kinoti, 2016). However, 100% reporting rates may not be the best way to combating crimes, but it may benefit the police and other CJ practitioners in a big way (Yoon, 2015). Besides, failure to address criminal activities can lead to insecurity within the neighborhood (Rinehart & Weisburd, 2019). Inadequate crime reporting is one of the factors contributing to high crime rates and the low arrest of criminals (Kirk & Matsuda, 2011; Kirk & Papachristos, 2011). Adebayo (2013) considers crime as dysfunction that risks social instability, and so a lasting solution should be sort. Also, according to Dirlik and Bulck (2014), as cited in Musa (2016), providing information on the crime to the police can help achieve community safety. Crime analysts study criminal activity and police function to aid in resource allocation and evaluation of programs (Kringen et al., 2017). Besides, accurate reporting of crime can assist in measuring crime rates, crime trends, the cost of crime, and governments can build better strategies that will impact a positive effect in the battle against crimes (ABS, 2004). Therefore, this means that the official crime reporting data can influence the distribution of CJ personnel like the police in fighting crime. Thus, a low rate of victim reporting will facilitate more crimes, and the police officers will become ineffective, for example, when deploying a few of the police officers in a crime hotspot area. Therefore, it would be wise to use other sources dealing with crime reporting when deploying police officers since official crime statistics might be misleading (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010; Yoon, 2015).

The legitimacy of the legal system can help in increasing reporting of crime without having the extra cost of giving tangible benefits to those who report a crime (Yoon, 2015; Pickering & Klinger, 2016). People who live in areas where they see the CJ as illegitimate and irresponsible may tend to avoid helping the police in identifying criminals (Anna et al., 2019; Maina, 2018; Yoon, 2015). Moreover, people learn about police behaviors on the media, and police are unlucky since the media portrays them as silly and incompetent, harsh and commanding, and dirty cops (Surrette, 2015). The stories in the media are a reference to a few cases, so it would be an injustice to conclude that police are incompetent. Negative media portrayal of illegitimate police acts and the negative experiences victims face when reporting a crime may influence victims of crime to think the police investigators will not take them seriously. In that case, victims may end up putting themselves at risk that the police will not be able to protect them, they may opt to confront the offenders by themselves (Anna et al., 2019; Warner, 2007; Yoon, 2015), and this might end up being more violent.

In Kenya, the police are employees of the government, and their main task is to implement the laws of Kenya. Police responsibilities include the arrest of criminals, conducting an investigation, and provision of security to the public. Initially, the police department was a force, later after the 2007/2008 post-election unrest, there were reforms done, and it became a service that was then strengthened by the promulgation of the new constitution in 2010 (Transparency International Kenya, 2016). Crime incidents have been increasing, as of 2018, the total number of reported crime cases was at 88,268 which was a 14% increase.
from 2016, and it’s projected to rise in 2020 (National Police Service (NPS), 2018). However, according to Transparency International Kenya (TIK) (2016) and Maina (2018), the public are not happy with police services. TIK (2016) found out that 53% of the respondents in Nairobi and Kisumu were dissatisfied with how the police were dealing with their cases, and they opted for other alternatives rather than reporting crime. According to the National Crime Research Center, NCRC, (2017), there were low correlations of most of the crimes whose figures were comparing the crime victims’ surveys and crimes reported to the police. Also, there is inadequate up to date crime mapping data in Kenya (NCRC, 2017). Hence, to mitigate this issue of the effect of crime reporting, it will be thoughtful to seek information from respondents who are most affected (Hobbs & Mann, 2015). In this case, victims of crime are the ones who are supposed to report a crime to the police.

Rift valley region posed the highest crime reporting in Kenya with 19,802 cases (NPS, 2018), and Nakuru County has experienced rising levels of crimes (Mikutu et al., 2016; NPS, 2018). Nakuru County was ranked as the top crime hotspot in Rift valley with 4,329 crime cases making it the third county with many reported crimes in Kenya, and stealing is the most prevalent crime with 935 reported cases (NPS, 2018). Moreover, robbery with violence, housebreaking, and burglary are also common crimes in Nakuru County (NCRC, 2017; NPS, 2018). The presumption is that most crimes are not reported to the police, hence with the high cases reported in Nakuru County, there is a high probability that it is a result of many unreported crimes' thus breeding criminality.

Gilgil Ward is considered an urban setting (RoK, 2013). Researchers have found a correlation between urban areas and high crime rates (Boggs, 2005; Brennan-Galvin, 2002; Sijuwade, 2014). Criminality in urban areas is motivated by population density, greater anonymity, class, and ethnic heterogeneity, reduced family functions, and social mobility (Sijuwade, 2014). Individuals who reside in Gilgil are diverse based on tribe, religion, and social status hence making it a suitable area to conduct the study. The most commonly convicted crimes in Gilgil Ward is property crime (Gilgil Police Station, GPS, 2018). However, convicted cases related to breakings, housebreaking, and burglary, have had a significant drop by 57% as per the comparison between 2016 and 2018 (GPS, 2018). Also, the monthly approximation is that 20% of the reported crimes are property crimes (GPS, 2020). Besides, Gilgil has received attention from the media on crimes related to property crime examples including, robbery with violence (Asiba, 2018) and unlawful acquisition of land (Ogamba, 2020), and being among the Wards in Nakuru County makes it vulnerable to more property crime happenings. Also, it isn’t clear whether the high numbers of convicted property crimes is as a result of low or high reporting rate at the police station hence making it necessary to carry out the study.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. 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 behavior (reporting of property crime to the police) among the victims in Gilgil Ward.

B. 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; Ogenga, 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. Besides, there is no research study on the factors affecting reporting of property
crime to the police by victims in Gilgil Ward, hence making Gilgil Ward a unique area that needs to be studied.

C. 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:

\[ \text{n}^0 = \frac{(z^2 \times p q) + e^2}{e^2} \]

\[ \text{n}^0 = \frac{((1.96)^2) (0.5) (1-0.5)} {0.1} \]

\[ \text{n}^0 = 96 \]

Where \(n^0\) 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).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study sought to determine the influence of trust for the police on reporting property crime to the police in Gilgil Ward. First, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of trust for the police. Second, they were asked to indicate their extent of agreement to the statements measuring their trust for the police; integrity, effectiveness, reliability, and fairness. Lastly, respondents were asked to indicate the extent at which trust for the police influenced their decision in reporting property crime (Robbery, burglary, housebreaking, theft) to the police. Level of trust for the police was measured using a 4 point scale, where; 0=not at all, 1=low level, 2=moderate level, and 3=high level. Also, extent of agreement to the statement measuring their trust for the police; integrity, effectiveness, reliability, and fairness was measured using a 4 point scale, where; 0=strongly agree, 1=agree, 3=disagree, and 4=strongly disagree. Finally, the extent at which trust for the police influenced their decision in reporting property crime to the police was measured using a 4 point scale, where; 0=not at all, 1=small extent, 2=moderate extent, and 3=large extent. Besides, key informants were interviewed concerning the research title to better understand the unit of analysis. The findings are as presented below:

A. Level of Trust for the Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>HL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2021)

Table I shows, respondents’ indicated their level of trust for the police as; - not at all 25.9%, had a low level 35.8%, moderate level 32.1%, and high level 6.2%. This indicates that majority of the respondents’ level of trust for the police ranged between not at all and low level with a total percentage of 61.7%. The findings of this study showed a lower percentage of victims, which was 25.9% of the respondents, who never had trust for the police compared to the study by Bunei et al. (2012) where 60% of the victims had no trust for the police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Respondents on average tended to be</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>St. Dev Responses distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what level do you trust the police in Gilgil Ward?</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2021)

The means and standard deviations of general trust for the police was determined through use of descriptors Not at All (NA), Low Level (LL), Moderate Level (ML), and High Level (HL) represented as 0,1,2, and 3 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, and 2.5<\(\mu\)<3 where \(\mu\) represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to not at all, low level, moderate level, and high level 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
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moderately distributed, and there was no consensus on the given metric respectively. As illustrated in the Table II, the respondents tended to be at “low level” in relation to the trust metric. In the context of the standard deviations, the trust metric had its’ responses distributed at “moderate” consensus due to standard deviation of 0.896 which was equal to or above standard deviation of 0.5.

This answers the recommendation by Baumer (2012), who suggested that future studies should look at the level of trust among individuals in the police. The findings of this study were similar to the study by Hough et al. (2013), which indicated very low levels of trust in the police in Ukraine, the Russian Federation, and Israel.

B. General Trust for the Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that the police at an emergency they might help me (effectiveness)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that the police are helpful to victims of property crime (fairness)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgil police officers are reliable (confidence)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgil police officers are trustworthy when crime is reported to them (confidence)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgil police officers are fair to every person who report property crime incidents despite the different social status (fairness)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgil police officers don’t ask for money so as to provide services to the residents who seek help (integrity)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe Gilgil Police officers are well trained to conduct their duties (confidence, effectiveness)</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgil Police officers are doing their best to fight against property crime (confidence, effectiveness)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe Gilgil police officers take into account the views of the victims of property crime (fairness)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police respond fast when property crime is reported to them by victims (effectiveness)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2021)

The measure for the determinants of trust for the police was determined using ten items as shown in the Table III. I am confident that calling the police at an emergency they might help me had a majority of the respondents response at; - strongly agree 8.6%, agree 24.7%, and disagree 49.4%. In respect to I am confident that the police are helpful to victims of property crime, majority of the respondents’ response was at; - strongly agree 1.2%, agree 54.3%, and disagree 43.2%. Gilgil police officers are well trained to conduct their duties had a majority of the respondents’ response at; agree 67.9%, and disagree 21.0%. Gilgil Police officers are doing their best to fight against property crime had a majority of the respondents’ response at; agree 69.7% and disagree 21.0%. Gilgil Police officers are doing their best to fight against property crime had a majority of the respondents’ response at; agree 49.4% and disagree 43.2%. I believe Gilgil police officers take into account the views of the victims of property crime had a majority of the respondents’ response at; agree 50.6% and disagree 42.0%. Police respond fast when property crime is reported to them by victims had a majority of the respondents’ response at; agree 51.9% and disagree 42.0%.

The means and standard deviations of trust for the police was determined through use of descriptors Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD) represented as 1,2,3,4, and 5 respectively in the SPSS input spread sheet. The interpretation of the scores 0<μ<1.5, 1.5<μ<2.5, 2.5<μ<3.5, 3.5<μ<4.5, and 4.5<μ<5 where μ represents the mean that the respondents on average tended to strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree respectively in relation to the given metric.

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores 0<σX<0.5, 0.5<σX<1, and σX>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 IV, the respondents tended to “disagree” in relation to the trust metric except: - I am confident that the police are helpful to victims of crime, Gilgil police officers are trustworthy when crime is reported to them, Gilgil police officers are fair to every person who report property crime incidents despite the different
social status, and police are well trained to conduct their duties, where respondents tended to “agree”. In the context of the standard deviations, all the trust metrics had their responses moderately distributed due to standard deviation which were equal to or above a standard deviation of 0.5.

### C. Influence of Trust on Reporting of Property Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>NA F</th>
<th>SE F</th>
<th>ME F</th>
<th>LE F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Robbery crime/s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Burglary crime/s</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Housebreaking crime/s</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Theft crime/s</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2021)

The influence of trust on reporting property crime to the police was determined using four items as shown in the Table V. Reporting Robbery crime/s had a majority of the respondents’ response at: Not at all 71.4% and small extent 21.4%. Reporting burglary crime/s had a majority of the respondents’ response at: Not at all 73.1% and small extent 19.2%. Reporting housebreaking crime/s had a majority of the respondents’ response at: Not at all 71.0% and small extent 16.1%. Reporting theft crime/s had a majority of the respondents’ response at: Not at all 75.3% and small extent 16.0%. This indicates that majority of the respondents were not influenced at all by trust for the police in reporting property crime. However, findings indicated that some respondents were influenced by the trust in their decision to report property crimes to the police.

Key informant interviews confirmed that trust in the police influences reporting property crime to the police to some extent. Some victims may avoid reporting property crime to the police if they believe the police are; corrupt, unable to find and arrest the offender, and if they believe reporting the crime to the police will cost them more money than they have lost.

Yes, trust for the police has an influence. You might hear victims say, they can’t take the case to the police since they believe the offender can use a “back-door” and go unpunished. Most of the victims have nearly no trust for the police (K.I-002)

Yes, it has an influence. Despite us encouraging the victim to report crimes to the police, you might find some victims refusing to report since they feel they won’t get help from the police. In this case, we try to inform the victim on the importance of reporting a property crime. We assure them we will follow up on the case even when it is under the police. Our role is to provide the police with intelligence.
concerning the crime that has happened. For example, for a case of livestock that has been stolen, once we are aware where the livestock is, we will inform the police and they will accompany us to the scene (K.I-003).

Yes trust for the police has an influence on reporting of property crime. If a victim doesn’t have trust for the police effectiveness then in most cases they might avoid reporting those crimes since they view it as a waste of time (K.I-004).

Yes. For example, when the victim is aware of the person who stole a property from them, most of the victims opt for alternative dispute resolution methods so as to get their property back. They believe that reporting a crime to the police won’t bare any fruit since it has cumbersome procedures which eventually don’t favour them. This shows that victim don’t have confidence with the police handling their cases. Hence, they opt to inform their area elder or the chief to intervene (K.I-005).

According to one of the key informants, trust influences property crime reporting to the police to a small extent. Victims may also choose to report the case to the police despite their negative attitude toward the police. The value of the stolen property appeared to have an advantage when it came to reporting property crime to the police.

Yes, to a small extent it does has an influence in reporting. However, there are two scenarios; if the victim has lost a property of less worth and they don’t trust if the police will help, they will choose not to report the crime, on the other side, if the item is of high worth the victim will choose to report the crime with the hope that, by good luck one day the offender will be found and their property will be returned (K.I-001).

## TABLE VI: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE EXTENT AT WHICH TRUST FOR THE POLICE INFLUENCED THE DECISION IN REPORTING PROPERTY CRIME TO THE POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Respondents on average tended to be</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>St. Dev Responses distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Robbery/s</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Burglary crime/s</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Housebreaking crime/s</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Theft crime/s</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2021)

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

On the other hand, the standard deviation interpretation with the scores 0<σX<0.5, 0.5<σX<1, and σX>=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 “not at all” in relation to the trust metrics. In the context of the standard deviations, all the trust metrics had their responses distributed at moderate consensus due to standard deviation of 0.737, 0.629, 0.810, and 0.713 for reporting; robbery, burglary, housebreaking, and theft respectively which were equal to or above standard deviation of 0.5.

Anna et al.’s (2019) study findings showed that trust may not be the primary variable motivating individuals to report a crime. The results of this study to some point support this statement. The study found that the level of trust for the police by victims in the Gilgil ward had a mean of 1.19 which indicated a “low level” of trust for the police. However, when the victims of property were asked about the extent to which their trust for the police influenced their decision to report property crimes to the police, the findings indicated their trust for their police never motivated them in their decision to report property crimes to the police. This was supported by the findings which indicated a mean of; 0.39, 0.35, 0.45, and 0.36 for; robbery victimization, burglary victimization, housebreaking victimization, and theft victimization respectively suggesting that on average the extent to which trust for the police influenced respondents’ decision to report property crime was at “not at all”.
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Summary

The study found that respondents had a low level of trust in the police, with a mean of 1.19. Respondents had differing views on the determinants of trust for the police officers, such as: - reliability, confidence, effectiveness, fairness, and integrity. The respondents were given statements and asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statements by agreeing or disagreeing based on their interactions with the police officers. Most of the items revealed that respondents tended to disagree based on their opinion of the statements provided. For example, respondents tended to disagree in the following cases: - I am confident that calling the police officers in an emergency will help me, Gilgil police officers are reliable, Gilgil police officers do not ask for money to provide services to residents who seek help. Police officers are doing their best to combat property crime, I believe Gilgil police officers consider the views of property crime victims, and Police officers respond quickly when property crime occurs due to a mean of 2.75, 2.57, 2.68, 2.54, 2.52, and 2.54 respectively.

On the other hand, some respondents tended to agree based on their opinion of the statements provided. Respondents tended to agree in the following cases: - I am confident that the police officers are helpful to victims of crime. Gilgil police officers are trustworthy when a crime is reported to them. Gilgil police officers are fair to everyone who reports property crime incidents regardless of social status, and Police are well trained to conduct their duties, with a mean of 2.44, 2.48, 2.41, and 2.14 respectively.

Finally, the researcher tested the extent to which trust in the police influenced the decision of the respondent in reporting property crime. The majority of the respondents indicated that trust for the police “never influenced them at all” in the decision to report property crime, with a mean of; 0.39, 0.35, 0.45, and 0.36 for; robbery victimization, burglary victimization, housebreaking victimization, and theft victimization respectively.

B. Conclusion

The level of trust in the police was at a low level. However, the majority of the respondents indicated they were not influenced by trust for the police in their decision to report property crime to the police.

C. Recommendations

The study sought to determine the influence of trust for the police on reporting property crimes to the police in Gilgil Ward. Firstly, the study established that there was a low level of trust in the police by the respondents. Secondly, the study also noted that few respondents were influenced by trust in the police on reporting property crimes to the police. This can be addressed by improving Gilgil Ward’s police efficiency. Regular in-service training, which includes both; soft and technical skills training, can help police officers become more efficient. When police officers are adequately trained, the public’s trust in them increases, as does their efficacy, competency, reliability, and fairness. Also, suitable resources, such as cars, should be provided to police personnel to aid in the effective application of the law and provide a faster reaction to criminality. Besides, awareness of the public on the importance of reporting property crimes to the police will be an added advantage.
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