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ABSTRACT

In an attempt to aid policy formulation towards crime prevention, statistics on different types of crimes committed must be properly gathered and documented. In Ghana, crime statistics gathered from police records and victimization surveys indicate a discrepancy between the two forms of statistics. Using a sample of 16,445 and 203 respondents from the secondary and the primary data sources, respectively, the study sought to establish the level of significance of the “Dark Figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics, to identify respondent’s socio-demographic characteristics and socio-cultural factors that affects crime reporting and to ascertain the extent to which Black’s Behavior of Law Theory is confirmed in Ghana. Black’s theory in summary states that people on the higher social stratum are more likely to report crime to the police than those with lower social status.

This study employed quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis technique. This is so because the quantitative data provided information on characteristics of the respondents and their crime reporting behavior without considering to the reasons why these respondents acted the way they did. The qualitative aspect of the study delved into the reasons why individuals who have been victimized did not report their ordeal to the police. The quantitative (SPSS) data set which is a secondary data from the Round Six of the Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS) was analyzed considering the socio-demographic characteristics that affect the inaccuracy of crime statistics in Ghana. The socio-demographic characteristics that were considered were: gender, age difference and income levels, marital status and employment status including educational and literacy levels as was theorized by Donald Black.

The study established that the “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is significantly high such that the rate is more than 50 percent in all the three types of crimes selected for this study. The average percentage of Ghanaians who failed to report crime is as high as 85.4 percent from the GLSS-6 data set based on a nationally representative sample survey.
According to the data, the socio-cultural factors that influence people’s decision not to report crime include financial difficulties, police ineffectiveness/inefficiency, third party involvement, time wasting and victim – offender relationship, lack of evidence, police offender relationship, conflict prevention and crime not serious enough.

Black’s theory has been subjected to empirical testing from different contexts and spaces. None of the tests has so far rejected the theory in totality. This study has also established similar results. Some of the key propositions were found to be true and others proved otherwise. This includes stratification and crime reporting which has not been accepted or rejected wholly. Black’s assertions have both true and false propositions where the aspect that has been established to be true depends on the crime type. Further, the morphological propositions by Black using marital and employment status have both proven otherwise in this context.

The policy implication is that security agencies mandated to work and provide the needed peace, safety and security cannot work effectively and efficiently since their work/policies/measures are informed by wrong crime statistics. When people are not well protected from criminal offences, they will not be able to contribute to the development of their society. The study, therefore, recommends that there should be a deliberate effort by the state to reduce the „Dark Figure“ rate in Ghana’s crime statistics. The effort must include academic and public education on the need to report crime to the police taking into account the socio-demographic characteristics and the socio-cultural determinants of the inaccuracy of Ghana’s official crime statistics.
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CHAPTER ONE

STUDY BACKGROUND

1.0 Introduction:

Basic human survival requires that food, clothing and shelter needs are satisfied. In order for each and every one to survive, people struggle for the available but scarce resources mostly for themselves and their family. In the process, individuals may come into conflict with others to be able to achieve whatever they require for survival. This is typically the situation in the "State of Nature" as described by Hobbes (1949). According to Hobbes, "the State of Nature" refers to the human existence without social control or government. If human beings were left to themselves without government, Hobbes claims, life would be "solitary, nasty, brutish, and short." This means that human beings are essentially selfish and without social control, they would hurt and kill each other without hesitation. As a result, society saw the need to promote order for peaceful coexistence through measures of social control in order to avoid what has been described by Hobbes. Social control as classically defined by Roucek “is a collective term for those processes planned or unplanned by which individuals are taught, persuaded or coerced to conform to the usages and life values of groups” (Roucek 1947 cited in Abotchie 2012: 8). It is expected that once society goes through these defined processes, the majority of the people will conform to these social control mechanisms for peaceful coexistence with limited threat to life and the security of property. However, this does not happen due to the existence of crime and deviance in societies all over the world.

Communities all over the world have created the criminal justice system in order to be able to curb the level of crime in society. According to the International Classification of
Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) though harm and wrongfulness can be associated with crime, they do not provide a general definition for crime. Commonly across countries, crimes consists of behaviors which are known to be criminal offenses and are punishable by law following a country specific legal system which generally operates with a criminal code, penal code etc. “As a result, crime is considered by the ICCS to be the punishable contravention or violation of the limits on human behavior as imposed by national criminal legislation. Each criminal offence has a perpetrator thus person, corporation or institution which is liable for the criminal behavior in question” (UNODC. 2015). In Ghana, according to the criminal code (1960) (Act 29) "crime" means any act punishable by death or imprisonment or fine”. “The legal definition of crime refers to acts prohibited, prosecuted, and punished by criminal law” (Michael and Adler 1933:5). Others attempted to augment this legal definition and defined crime as the most serious harms or acts of norm violation that shock the common conscience, such that no serious crime has occurred where moral outrage is lacking (Durkheim 1933; Roshier 1989) (Henry and Lenier 1998:612).

The criminal is an offender who has been arrested, arraigned, indicted or prosecuted and held beyond all reasonable doubt of a particular offense (Tappan 1947). According to Tappan (1947:100), “crime is itself simply the breach of the legal norm, a violation within this particular category of social control; the criminal is, of course, the individual who has committed such acts of breach”. United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) declaration of basic principles of justice for victims of crime and abuse of power in 1985 defined "Victims" “as persons who, individually or collectively, have suffered harm, including physical or mental injury, emotional suffering, economic loss or substantial impairment of their fundamental rights, through acts or omissions that are in violation of criminal laws operative within Member States, including those laws proscribing criminal abuse of power” (UNGA
Resolution 1985). The resolution also professes that “A person may be considered a victim, under this Declaration, regardless of whether the perpetrator is identified, apprehended, prosecuted or convicted and regardless of the familial relationship between the perpetrator and the victim”. Whenever crime victims report their ordeal, the police record the crime and that puts the said crime into the uniform crime records. The “dark figure” comes into existence when crime victims fail to report their ordeal to the police.

According to Reiss (1971), 95 percent of the crime statistics presented by the police is as a result of citizens’ reportage, and yet the majority of crime victims do not report their ordeal to the police. Fisher and Cullen (1999) confirmed that in the US where 86.7 percent of rape cases, 85.7 percent sexual assaults and 97.7 percent of sexual contacts that were not desired are not reported to the appropriate security agency, an indication that uniform crime records are defective.

An important part of the work of security personnel globally is the collection, compilation and reporting of crime statistics. According to Mannheim, “Crime statistics may be defined as classified and tabulated facts relating to crimes compiled either officially or by private investigators” (Mannheim 1965 cited in Abotchie 2008: 11). The status and availability of crime statistics is very crucial for the work of crime prevention and management agencies in every society. It also helps to improve policy formulation for various social control mechanisms. The two major ways of gathering crime statistics as described by Mannheim (1965) include data gathered from reported crime to the police referred to as the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) or otherwise known as official records and also through a household victimization survey known as the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) which is a private Investigation. The UCR provides classified and tabulated facts about the types of crime committed and reported to the security agencies, especially, the
police while the NCVS brings to the fore the actual occurrences of crime in households and to individual members of households whether the said crime was reported or not. The victimization survey therefore establishes the difference between the occurrences of crime and reported crime otherwise known as the “Dark figure”. As long as the dark figure exists, it renders crime statistics inaccurate, meaning not all victims report crime to the police.

The „Dark Figure“ is crime that is neither reported nor recorded by law enforcement agencies. The „Dark Figure“ includes criminal incidence/occurrences that meet the definition of recordable crime that are not recorded in official crime statistics. The term was first used by a Belgian Mathematician and sociologist Adolph Quetelet in 1832.

A study by Marenin (1997) identified that in 1992, the United Nations and the Justice Ministry of the Netherlands conducted victimization surveys across 12 developing countries. These were Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Tunisia, Tanzania, Uganda, and South Africa (Zvekic and del Frate, 1993: 52). Respondents from these countries of a sample size that ranged from 150 for Tunisia to 3,750 for Indonesia were asked about their victimization and reporting for thirteen different types of crime. The results showed 31 percent to 88 percent of reporting burglary in Manila and South Africa, respectively, “from 4 percent (Jakarta) to 82 percent (Dar Es Salaam) for bicycle theft; from 1 percent (Bombay) to 39 percent (Jakarta, Tunis) for personal theft; from 12 percent (Rio de Janeiro) to 70 percent (Tunis) for assault or threat of assault; from 3 percent (Jakarta, Cairo) to 43 percent (Buenos Aires) and 50 percent (South Africa) for sexual incidents experienced by women.” (Zvekic and del Frate, 1993:79–83). This is an indicative of the rates of crime reporting that occurs in developing countries across the world.

In Ghana, as in other countries, crime statistics gathered from official records and victimization surveys indicate a discrepancy between the two forms of statistics. As indicated
in Table 1 (below), the three most reported crimes in Ghana, according to the police criminal offences record are threats, assault and stealing. The issuing of false cheques, abortion and counterfeiting are the lowest crimes reported to the police among the selected crimes from the police report. The reported crime records have aided in the selection of the types of crime to be considered in this study which include theft (stealing, burglary and robbery), sexual crime (rape, defilement and incest) and violent crime (attack, assault and threat).

| Table 1: Selected Criminal Offences Recorded in Ghana (2005 To 2010) |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Offences        | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  | 2005 - 2010 |
| Assault         | 70,367| 77,942| 85,412| 82,324| 82,557| 77,392| 475,994     |
| Stealing        | 48,551| 53,054| 59,573| 58,997| 56,563| 55,414| 332,152     |
| Threatening     | 16,802| 21,300| 23,470| 23,228| 22,685| 22,743| 130,228     |
| Other offences  | 18,560| 20,530| 20,649| 20,905| 22,247| 22,200| 125,091     |
| Fraud           | 9,855 | 12,826| 14267 | 14490 | 16,676| 16,086| 84,200      |
| Causing damage  | 6,628 | 8,920 | 10,130| 9,791 | 10,045| 9,326 | 54,840      |
| Causing harm    | 2117  | 3777  | 3,061 | 3,317 | 2,997 | 3154 | 18423       |
| Defilement      | 1106  | 1704  | 1730  | 1476  | 1336  | 1468 | 8820        |
| Robbery         | 1290  | 1914  | 1383  | 1407  | 1363  | 1256 | 8613        |
| Unlawful entry  | 1089  | 1230  | 1306  | 1573  | 1356  | 1225 | 7779        |
| Rape            | 318   | 541   | 551   | 443   | 407   | 417  | 2677        |
| False cheque    | 121   | 268   | 379   | 487   | 604   | 630  | 2489        |
| Abortion        | 185   | 235   | 265   | 208   | 187   | 217  | 1297        |
| Counterfeiting  | 28    | 86    | 195   | 324   | 215   | 254  | 1102        |
| **Total**       | **177,017** | **204,327** | **222,371** | **218,970** | **219,238** | **211,782** | **1,253,705** |


Ghana”s victimization surveys, however, show something quite different. The average crime reporting rate from Ghana”s first victimization survey in 2009 and the Ghana Living Standards Survey Round Six (GLSS 6) (2014) are 20.6 and 14.6 percent, respectively. Table 2 (below) shows the details of GLSS 6 crime reporting rate by the three types of crime
selected for this study. The average crime reported rate of 14.6 percent that has been established by the GLSS indicates that the criminal offence record presented by the police is not exhaustive of all crimes that occur all over the country. This means that with an average crime reporting rate of 14.6 percent for theft, violent and sexual crimes, there is a possibility of an established gap (that is 85.4 percent) of such crimes that have occurred but did not get into the criminal offence records. The Table again indicates that there is 92% “dark figure” rate for theft and sexual offenses and 72.3% for violent crime. This gap (Dark Figure) can be described as a gap that renders Ghana’s crime statistics inaccurate and this could make policy decisions less efficient in crime prediction for better crime prevention strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of crime</th>
<th>% reported to the police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attack, Assault or Threat</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSS; GLSS Main Report 2014*

1.1 Problem Statement:

It is acknowledged globally that there is a gap known as the “dark figure” in crime statistics that exists between the actual crime occurrence and reportage. Many criminologists have attempted to provide explanations for this discrepancy. This study also seeks to explain this discrepancy in the context of Ghana and to add to the body of knowledge that already exists in the academic discourse on the “dark figure” in crime statistics. Notable among criminologists who have provided an explanation in this regard is Donald Black who developed the Behavior of Law Theory. In this theory, Black (1976) asserted that socio-demographic attributes such as stratification, morphology, culture, social control and
organization are directly related to the quantity of law otherwise known as crime reporting records. Black proposed that individuals on the lower social structure of the five social life attributes he developed are less likely to report crime to the police than those on the upper social structure. With reference to stratification he used age, sex and income levels of individuals; with morphology he used employment and marital status. Culture was related to education (the level of academic qualification obtained) and literacy (ability to read and write English and or any local language) levels and social control and organization relates to the residential status of individuals.

Black’s assertion has been tested in some parts of the world such as Taiwan, Australia and America and has been ascertained to possess both true and false propositions. According to Kuo et al. (2012), these findings are yet to be verified to create deeper understanding and therefore require further empirical examination. The required examination does not preclude Ghana and or Africa to help fill the gap in literature and add to knowledge regarding the applicability of this theory to the Ghanaian and by extension, the African context. Understanding the Ghanaian socio-cultural factors that contribute to the dark figure is important so as to resolve these issues and hence minimize the dark figure.

Tankebe (2009) in the study titled “Public Cooperation with the Police in Ghana: Does Procedural Fairness Matter” and the study by Boakye (2009) titled “Attitudes toward Rape and Victims of Rapes, a Test of the Feminist Theory in Ghana” both brought to the fore some socio-cultural reasons for not reporting some types of crimes to the police. The study by Tankebe dwells of procedural fairness by the police without looking at other external socio-cultural factors while Boakye also looked at the factors in relation to rape and victims of rape. Tankebe (2009) confirmed that for individuals to cooperate more with the police depends on effectiveness of the work they do. (Tankebe 2009: 1278) Then Boakye concludes
that acceptance of rape myths in Ghana leads to the trivialization and ignoring of the different types of rape in the society, such as the belief that marital rape is not possible (Boakye, 2009).

Both studies relate to the socio-cultural determinants of the inaccuracy of official crime statistics in Ghana, but failed to consider both the internal and the external factors and with other crime types as this study set forth to investigate. Boakye also considered only rape unlike the current study which considered other crimes such as theft, violent and other sexual offences and the socio-cultural factors that inhibit crime reporting. The study, therefore, intends to add to existing knowledge on the socio-cultural factors the inhibit crime reporting of four broad types of crimes such as theft, violence crime, deception and sexual offenses.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to explore the nature and effects of the socio-demographic and socio-cultural characteristics/factors that bring about the “dark figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics. The specific objectives are:

1. To identify the specific nature of the respondent’s socio-demographic characteristics that affects their crime reporting behavior and use these characteristics to test the extent to which Black’s Behavior of Law Theory is applicable in Ghana.

2. To identify the specific nature of the socio-cultural factors that affects the accuracy of crime statistics in Ghana.
1.3 **Research Questions**

The research questions for this study are

- What is the “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana?
- What are the respondent’s socio-demographic characteristics that affect their ability to report crime?
- To what extent do the variables in Black’s Behavior of Law Theory apply to Ghana?
- What are the socio-cultural factors that affect the accuracy of official crime statistics in Ghana?

1.4 **Hypotheses**

$H_0$: There is no “dark figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics

$H_1$: There is “dark figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics

$H_0$: Age has no relationship with crime reporting

$H_1$: Adults are more likely to report crime than the young people

$H_0$: Sex has no relationship with crime reporting

$H_1$: Males are more likely to report crime than female

$H_0$: Income has no relationship with crime reporting

$H_1$: People with higher income are more likely to report crime than the less well off

$H_0$: Marital status has no relationship with crime reporting

$H_1$: The married are more likely to report crime than the unmarried

$H_0$: Employment status has no relationship with crime reporting

$H_1$: The employed are more likely to report crime than the unemployed
\(H_0: H_0: \) Education has no relationship with crime reporting

\(H_1: \) The Educated are more likely to report crime than the less educated

\(H_0: \) Literacy has no relationship with crime reporting

\(H_1: \) Literates may report crime more than the not literate

1.5 Study Rationale

The study of the socio-demographic and socio-cultural determinants of the inaccuracy of official crime statistics in Ghana is significant to increase the body of knowledge on the “dark figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics. The provision of information on the subject matter will add knowledge to the academic discourse by testing to prove or disprove Black’s Behavior of Law Theory. This study will also add to the body of knowledge concerning the socio-cultural factors that influence people’s decision not to report crimes they experience to the police. The information that would be obtained from the study will inform policy makers of peace and security to design the appropriate policy that will improve the purpose for social control. The formulation and implementation of appropriate policy for peace and security would aid conformity and hence reduce the acts of crime. The reduction in crime rate will provide a peaceful environment for the advancement of daily social and economic activities which will eventually bring about development.

1.6 Operationalization of Variables

- Age difference:

The ages of the respondents for the purpose of this study have been categorized into two main groups thus the young and adults. The young in this case refers to all respondents aged from 18 to 35 and adult represents all respondents who are 36 years and above.
• **Income Levels:**

Respondent’s earnings have been categorized such that high and low income earners can be differentiated. The low income earners were identified as respondents whose yearly income ranged from GH₵ 1.00 to GH₵ 999.00 Ghana cedis. The medium income earners get between GH₵ 1,000.00 to GH₵ 4,999.00 annually while the high income earning category is made up respondents who earned GH₵ 5,000.00 or more.

• **Marital status:**

For the purpose of this study, all respondents who are either married or cohabiting were classified as married. All the other respondents for instance those who have never married, divorced and widows were all classified as single.

• **Employment status:**

Employment status simply describes and differentiates the employed and the unemployed.

• **Educational level:**

Educational levels describes the educational attainment of the respondents and categorization as follows; Tertiary level, post-secondary qualification, secondary, technical and vocational levels, junior secondary and middle education and finally those who never attained any educational qualification.

• **Literacy:**

Literacy in this study is used to describe and categorize respondents who may or may not be able to read and or write. Literate respondents are those who are able to read while the not literate respondents are those respondents who cannot read.
1.7 Thesis Organization

To be able to read and understand the issues discussed in this thesis, the researcher has organized the write up in five chapters.

The first chapter presents an introduction based on the following headings; study background, problem statement, objectives, research questions, hypotheses, study rationale, definition of concepts and the thesis organization.

In the second chapter, a significant number of relevant scholarly studies and the theoretical perspective that provide more knowledge on the study area have been analyzed to help shape the work presentation. Additional empirical literature relating to the socio-demographic and the socio-cultural determinants, crime statistics and behavior of law is also discussed.

The third chapter discusses in details the research method used in the conduct of the study which include the research design, justification of study area, the sample size, sampling of respondents and data collection methods. The ethical considerations and the limitations of the study are also discussed.

In the fourth chapter, the findings emanating from the secondary (GLSS6) field data set are presented. This is done by quantitatively outlining and presenting the common themes and concepts that are the outcomes of the reports and experiences of Ghanaians with the criminal justice system. The secondary quantitative data collected in the GLSS – 6 has been analyzed. The “demographic characteristics of the respondents” has been cross tabulated with their crime reporting behavior in all the three types of crime considered in this study; theft, sexual and violent crime. The results have been used to test hypothesis that will either accept or reject Black’s Behavior of Law Theory.
The fifth chapter discussed the findings from the primary field data which were Focus Group Discussions (FGD) conducted in three (3) communities from three (3) regions (Ashanti, Greater Accra and Eastern Regions). This is done by qualitatively outlining and presenting the common themes and concepts that are the outcomes of the discussions as a results of participants experiences of with the criminal justice system. The demographic characteristics of the participants have been presented with their socio-cultural reasons for not reporting crimes to the police. There were four (4) main types of crimes identified during the FGD’s and these are theft, violence crime, deception and sexual abuse. The results have been used to identify the socio-cultural determinants of the inaccuracy of official crime statistics in Ghana.

Following from the objectives and the hypotheses of the study, the final chapter six synchronizes the overall findings of the study and its implications for previous and subsequent studies. Deductions, impact and major topics that may arise from the study and discussions for policy recommendations have also been provided where necessary.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

2.0 Theoretical Perspective: Black’s Behavior of Law Theory

According to Wacker (1998:363) “theories carefully outline the precise definitions in a specific domain to explain why and how the relationships are logically tied so that the theory gives specific predictions.” The four components of theory that academics often identified by academics include definition of terms or variables, a domain where the theory applies, a set of relationship of variables and specific predictions claimed that are factual (Hunt, 1991; Reynolds, 1971; Wacker 1998). The identified theory found to best fit this study is Donald Black’s Behavior of Law Theory which basically explains the different characteristics of individuals and how these human attributes contribute to the behavior of the criminally victimized. The propositions made by Black in this regard have been explained in the subsequent paragraphs.

Black (1976:3) defined law as dynamic behavior which can be measured as the number and scope of prohibitions, obligations and other standards to which people are subject and it is quantified as “more or less. “Filing a complaint with a police officer, for example, is more lawful than avoiding reporting to the police and so reporting a crime to the police equates to more law than the absence of reporting” (Kuo et al. 2012:53). Black (1976) proposed that the quantity of the law varied according to five aspects of social life: stratification, morphology, culture, social control and organization”. This means that crime victims reporting or not reporting their ordeal to the police depends on their social status according to these five social life attributes. This study considered the first three aspects of
social life described by Black and how the quantity of law varies in relation to these factors in the Ghanaian context.

Stratification, according to Black “is an uneven distribution of material conditions of existence, such as food and shelter and the means by which these are produced, such as land, raw materials, tools, domestic animals and slaves” (Black, 1976: 11). He theorizes that “Law varies directly with stratification” (Black, 1976: 13). This means that people with less wealth are less likely than those economically endowed to use the legal system. Gender, age and income are associated with the concept of stratification in the Ghanaian context such that females, the young and low income earners are less likely to report crime to the police than males, the adult and the rich.

He defined morphology as “the horizontal aspect of social life, the distribution of people in relation to one another including their division of labor, networks of interaction, intimacy and integration” (Black, 1976: 37). As Black’s theory indicates, “Law varies curvilinear with morphology” (Black, 1976: 39). He explained that an individual’s level of integration into social life influences the individual’s use of legal resources. According to Kuo et al. (2012), Black “assumed that more socially integrated people may report crime more than those who are less socially integrated. Thus, an employee or married person, for instance, is more integrated into the social mainstream than an unemployed or a single person”.

Black also defined culture to be “the symbolic aspect of social life, including expressions of what is true, good and beautiful” (Black, 1976: 61). The theory on culture by Black states that where culture is sparse, so is law; where it is rich, law flourishes. The more culture the more law meaning “Law varied directly with culture” Black (1976: 63).
According to Kuo et al. (2012), Black “used education as an indicator of culture and posited that educated and literate people may report crime more than the less educated and non-literate.

2.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics and Crime Reporting:

The causes of crime statistics inaccuracies reviewed from existing literature related to different parts of the world other than Africa have been presented in this section of the thesis. The main themes that have been considered in the literature review are Black’s propositions of the five aspects of social life in the Behavior of Law Theory and how they influence crime reporting. The socio-cultural factors that contribute to the inaccuracy of official crime statistics according to works by scholars and relating to other parts of the world other than Africa will also be discussed.

2.1.1 Stratification and Crime Reporting:

A study of the Behavior of Law by Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) in the United States of America found that reporting crime to the police did not vary directly with the victim's rank. Black posits that reporting crime should be greater for victimizations among the wealthy than among the less wealthy, and should vary directly with real income. However, these stratification variables were not supported by the test from Gottfredson and Hindelang. The Australian data used by Braithwaite and Biles (1980) also showed no association between household income and reporting crime to the police. This is true for seven out of the eight offense types when totals are disaggregated by offense. The notable exceptions are the categories of fraud, forgery and false pretenses which show a markedly higher rate of reporting to the police among high-income victims. Avakame et al. (1999) affirmed these results that the poor may report crime to the police more, contrary to Black’s
stratification proposition but when the wealthy are victimized it results more in arrests of the victim.

Kuo et al. (2012) tested this theory in Taiwan and concluded that the poor may report a few more times to the police about assaultive victimizations than the wealthy. The younger larceny victims did not report their victimization to the police as much as the victims who are older. The “significant variables, the only social-structural variable running counter to the hypothesis in the full model was gender for robbery reporting, in which females were nearly three times more likely to report than males” (Kuo, et al. 2012). Similarly, income levels of individuals negatively affect crime reporting (Pino & Meier, 1999).

Women and older victims have been found to be more likely to report crime and also families with higher household income, owner occupiers, those living in least disadvantaged neighborhoods and the employed are more likely to report crimes, as are those who have attained higher educational qualifications as established by (Baumer 2002; Carcach 1997; Conaway and Lohr 1994; Goudriaan et al. 2006; Hart and Rennison 2003; MacDonald 2002; Skogan 1994; Zhang et al. 2007).

The study contributes to academic knowledge on the reporting of criminal acts to the appropriate authority in developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. “Both the robbery and assault models confirmed similarities in crime reporting practices between developed and developing countries” (Estienne & Morabito 2015:137). Again, just as in the developed world, characteristics of the victim also contributes in one way or the other to crime reporting. National – level income inequality does influence the decision to report crime but differs across offence types. The study used International Crime Victimization Surveys (ICVS) undertaken in the different categories of countries to tease out the correlates
of crime reporting in comparison with underdeveloped and developed world.

2.1.2 Morphology and Crime Reporting:

Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) again tested the propositions relating to morphology that leads to the expectation that law will be used increasingly as relational distance increases. The proposition that law varies directly with integration implies that reporting to the police will be greater for employed and married persons than for unemployed and unmarried persons. For these morphological expectations, support is found only for the hypothesis that married persons would have a higher rate of reporting to the police than do unmarried persons. The results by Avakame et al. (1999) also suggest that Blacks “proposition is correct: married people are more likely to call the police and their assailants are more likely to be arrested. By contrast, however, unemployed people are more likely than the employed to call the police according to these data, and their assailants are more likely to be arrested” (Avakame et al. 1999:779). The support for Black's theory on the marital status question according to Braithwaite and Biles (1980) was not replicated with the Australian data. Apart from a tendency for separated or divorced respondents to report more victimization to the police, there was little variation according to marital status. The one exception by offense was with assault. Respondents, who had never been married, reported assault victimizations to the police at only half the rate of both those who were married and those who were separated. Divorced people working part-time were more likely to report offenses than the unemployed, and people working full time, more likely to do so than both people in part-time employment and the unemployed. This has been confirmed by Kuo et al. (2012) that unmarried victims may report less to the police their “assaultive victimizations than affluent and married victims, which, from Black’s perspective, would be due to their lower social status” (Kuo, et al. 2012:66).
2.1.3 Culture and Crime Reporting:

Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) also tested educational level as the indicator of individual and neighborhood culture to test the proposition that law varies directly with culture. There is weak support for this proposition on the individual's educational level and crime reporting contrary to the theory. Avakame et al. (1999:780) also concluded that “more highly educated people are less likely to call the police, but their assailants are more likely to be arrested”. This trend receives strong confirmation in the Australian data by Braithwaite and Biles (1980), and there were no individual offense types which provided significant exceptions to the aggregate trend.

On the contrary, the Taiwan study by Kuo et al. (2012), showed otherwise. Kuo et al. (2012), used robbery and larceny victims and concluded that those with lower educational attainment may report the offense to the police less than the victims with higher educational attainment, because educated people tended to be „litigious”, engaging formal social control rather than seeking informal remedies” (Black, 1976: 64). Similarly, educated women were found to be less likely to report rape in the US. (Lizotte, 1985).

2.1.4 Organization and Crime Reporting:

According to Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979), Black proposes that law varies directly with organization and hence the finding that business establishments have a higher rate of reporting to the police than do individuals is consistent with Black's organizational hypothesis. On the other hand, his theoretical predictions regarding variations in rates of reporting to the police according to whether the victim and the offender have greater or lesser organization are not consistently supported. The organization of the victim is associated with greater reporting to the police but, contrary to theoretical expectations, the organization of
offenders does not reduce reporting to the police. As concluded by Braithwaite and Biles (1980) more organized victims are more likely to use the law than less organized victims. Data are not available from the Australian victim’s survey on number of victims. However, data are available on the number of offenders. Contrary to Black's prediction, the Australian data show a strong tendency for recourse to the criminal justice system to increase as the number of offenders” increases. This contrasts with only a very slight tendency in the same direction in Gottfredson and Hindelang's data.

2.1.5 Social Control and Crime Reporting:

Finally, the conclusion by Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) that law varies inversely with other forms of social control was operationalized by examining rates of reporting by the extent of urbanization, time of occurrence, and place of occurrence. Rates of reporting were found to be homogeneous across levels of urbanization, but were found to vary somewhat across time and place of occurrence. Although the data relating to time of occurrence for victimizations of low seriousness are consistent with Black's theoretical predictions, those relating to extent of urbanization are not, and those relating to place of occurrence offer only partial support. In the context of reporting victimizations to the police, this implies that reporting will be greater for larger communities than for smaller communities and for more densely populated areas than for less densely populated areas. According to Braithwaite and Biles (1980) in Australia, the data do not support the prediction that reporting to the police will be greater in larger cities. Assault was the only individual offense type which showed a trend in support of the prediction. Assault was twice more likely to be reported to the police in cities over a million than in cities and towns under 50,000. Avakame et al (1999) also concluded in the affirmative that urban residents may report crime to the police more, but victimizations of “suburbanites are more likely to result in arrests; nocturnal victims are more
likely to call police, but their assailants are less likely to be arrested” (Avakame et al 1999:782). This result was affirmed by Kuo et al (2012), that “reporting was more likely for crimes that occurred at night than during the day, which Black (1976) rationalized as a consequence of informal social control being dormant when people were asleep” (Kuo et al 2012:52). They again concluded that “larceny crimes taking place in public places were reported to the police more than those that occurred in private places because more formal social control was exercised in the public than the private sector” (Kuo et al 2012:66).

2.2 Socio-cultural Determinants and Crime Reporting:

Reporting Crime to the Police by Tarling and Morris (2010) examines how crime reporting has changed over time and the reasons for reporting or not reporting crime to the police among the British. To report or not is a complex decision which the victim will weigh the costs and benefits. Crime severity was found to be very influential in victims’ decisions to report or not to report crime to the police. The study established that property crime is less likely to be reported whereas violent crime is more likely to be reported. The study again reveals that the importance attached to the costs and benefits in each case will vary according to personal characteristics and experiences of the victim as Donald Black considers theoretically. In the subsequent paragraphs, the socio-cultural reasons for reporting and not reporting crime to the police have been discussed.

2.2.1 Socio-cultural Reasons for Reporting Crime to the Police

According to Tarling and Morris (2010), individuals who are victimized see it as a duty to report crimes to bring about justice against a person who has disobeyed the law and gratification to victims who thinks that the offender has not profited from his or her crime. The victim and the public will be reassured that they are being afforded some protection and
that the offender is deterred from committing further crimes. People who suffered several incidents were less likely to report the last one. However, when Conaway and Lohr (1994) explored further the assertion that people who are victimized severally were less likely to report, it was found that police performance (positive outcome) encouraged victims to go back to the police. Skogan (1994) and MacDonald (2001) concluded from the BCS that victims who have received positive reporting results from the police were more likely to go back to the police with subsequent victimization.

In 2011, Kääriäinen and Sirén (2011) analyzed crime reporting based on three different theoretical dimensions. The literature based on the rational choice theory (according to Felson et al., 2002) established that victims of crime will mainly consider reporting victimization after their assessment of the cost and benefits and indicates that benefits are likely to outweigh the costs. These writers identified benefits to include police protection and or having the perpetrator brought to justice. Consideration of costs include the inconveniences incurred by the person making the report such as stigmatization of the victim, fear of revenge or the mere inconvenience caused by legal proceedings (Felson et al., 2002).

Similarly, the second dimension of literature assumes that “citizens” trust in the police and in the legal system as a whole increases their willingness to report crimes” (e.g. Bennett and Wiegand, 1994; Goudriaan et al., 2005; Silver and Miller, 2004). The conception regarding this assertion is that individuals consider it reasonable enough to call the police of their victimization if they believe that the police will effectively fight crime in the way that gives them gratification. The final theoretical dimension presented by Kääriäinen and Sirén suggests that, “willingness to report can also be seen from the perspective of social capital and, particularly, generalized trust. Social capital in the case serves as a resource for informal
control and support that may reduce citizens’ need to resort to official social control and this perspective was adopted by Hawdon and Ryan, 2009.”

Fisher et al. (2003) also conducted a study involving 233 postsecondary institutions in the United States on reporting sexual victimization to the police and others. The results represent national-level study of college women. Crime victims are most likely to report whenever they feel reporting will yield positive outcome (Dukes & Mattley, 1977; Laub, 1981). The study basically examined respondents’ characteristics and reasons for reporting or not reporting victimization to the police and found out the following: that their respondents do not contact the police and neither do they report to other authorities about most of their victimization. Only 2.8 percent of all victimizations and 3.2 percent of rape are reported to the school authorities. The reasons cited for not reporting such experiences includes lack of proof, avoidance of reprisal and not wanting families and other people to be aware of such incidence.

2.2.2 Socio-cultural Reasons for not Reporting Crime to the Police

Tarling and Morris (2010) cited some major reason for not reporting crime as reported by respondents. These included crime triviality\(^1\) and low police interest or inability to solve cases\(^2\). In some instances, the respondents regard the crime as private matter mainly due to the fear of affecting the relationship that exists between the victim and the criminal when the case gets to the police. According to the study, some respondents feels crime reporting is an admission of one’s own vulnerability or culpability in the crime and may lead to disapproval by one’s peers. These also include the fear of being partially blamed for the crime and the victims undertake cost–benefit analysis before deciding to report crime to the police. These cost–benefit analysis people do before reporting crime become more
complicated when the offender is known to the victim. In some instances, it may be family or work relationship where the victim may want to protect. This protection of the offender is carried out irrespective of further consequences to avoid family related conflicts and loss of the victim’s job. The assessment of the cost and the benefit of reporting a crime by victims is a major factor that inhibits crime reporting and has earlier on been mentioned in studies by (Smith 1989a; 1989b), and (Skogan 1994). Smith emphasized on domestic violence and rape as grossly underreported crime while Skogan concluded that victims fail to report their ordeal by regarding the crime as „private/personal/family matter whenever the offender is a family member, a current or an ex-partner, a household member.

Contrary to the conclusions by Tarling and Morris (2010), (Smith 1989a; 1989b), and (Skogan 1994), later findings by Hart and Rennison (2003) and Baumer (2002) showed no difference in reporting violence crime committed by either known or an unknown assailant. In 2002, Felson et al came back with a detailed exploration of victim–offender relationship using US National Crime Victimization Survey. The study challenged their own conclusions in 1999 with three major reasons that inhibit crime reporting when the offender and the victim are known to each other. The study cited the desire for privacy, the desire to protect the offender and for partners, the fear of reprisals. It, therefore, concludes that these cited socio-cultural factors indeed inhibit crime reporting and render crime statistics inaccurate.

Fisher et al. (1998) further confirmed that serious sexual crime such as rape were included in non-reported crimes to the police and established some reasons that account for such behavior by sexual crime victims. Victims who used drugs at the time they were abused sexually were less likely to report for the fear of not being trusted by the police. The data from the work of Fisher et al. show that 40 percent of the college women said they did not report their rape victimization because first they lacked proof, second they were afraid of
reprisals; third they did not want their families and other people to know about their victimization; fourth incidents were severity of crime in 8 of 10 cases and fifth victim-offender relationship. The findings also concluded that victims of sexual crime who failed to report to the police sometimes end up telling their social relations.

Tankebe (2009) in the study titled “Public Cooperation with the Police in Ghana: Does Procedural Fairness Matter”, established that Hickman and Simpson (2003) concluded that preferred outcomes in previous encounters with the police affects the behavior of domestic violence victims going back to make a report to the police meaning that comparatively, outcome and means used by the police differ and affect reporting behavior depending on the country in question. The percentage of respondents who reported of ever being victimized during a full calendar from Tankebe’s study in 2009 is 53 percent and is higher than what Adu-Mireku (2002) established to be 33.9 percent. Among the victimized respondents, 34.5 percent reported their ordeal to the police which confirms a conclusion reached by Reisig et al. in 2007 that police efficiency contributes to crime victims going to the police to make a complain. Tankebe (2009) also confirmed that for individuals to cooperate more with the police depends on effectiveness of the work they do. (Tankebe 2009: 1278) “In other words, the more people evaluated police current effectiveness positively, the greater their willingness to cooperate with the police”.

The conclusions reached by Tankebe (2009) are important for the Ghanaian society where crime reporting has been identified to be very low. “In such societies, the findings reported here support the need to build the capacity of the police to respond much more effectively to, or are perceived to be concerned with, collective public security needs” (Tankebe 2009: 1283). The thinking that democracy in Ghana will bring about improved policing is still a mirage (Tankebe, 2008a, 2009b). Alienation of the police by many
Ghanaians is characterized by attributes such as abuse, violence, intimidation and widespread corruption which characterized the service during the times of colonial and military rule and which the police service is not able to move away from even during this democratic dispensation (Tankebe 2009). The study again confirmed that crime has been on the increase since Ghana became a democracy in 1992 but unfortunately the police have not been able to adjust in the way that will increase citizen’s cooperation with the police, and this has brought about high sense of public insecurity.

This study relates in a way to the socio-cultural determinants of inaccurate official crime statistics in Ghana but Tankebe considered only the characteristics of the police that affect citizen’s cooperation and not factors external to the police that may influence police – citizen relationship. This study considered both the internal and the external factors dubbed “socio-cultural factors that inhibit police – citizen cooperation” which will at the long run affect the accuracy of crime statistics as reporting gets affected by this situation.

In a study by Boakye (2009) titled “Attitudes toward Rape and Victims of Rapes, a Test of the Feminist Theory in Ghana” (p. 1633), the author aimed to investigate the need for feminist theory of rape in understanding behavior put up against rape victims in Ghana. Boakye investigated the level of dominance of gender stereotype beliefs and rape myths among the Ghanaian population and concluded in the affirmative. “Male participants were consistently found to have higher levels of rape myth acceptance compared to female participants” (Boakye 2009: 1644). The study showed that male mostly do not take sexual crimes serious and do not also believe the offense is on the rise, as has been confirmed by other studies and affirmed in the case in Ghana. This contention may discourage victims of rape about their ordeal and sexual crime reportage (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Boakye, 2009). The acceptance of rape myths in Ghana leads to the trivialization and ignoring of the
different types of rape in the society, for example the belief that marital rape is not possible (Boakye, 2009).

The relationship between the current study and the work by Boakye is that rape myth acceptance can be seen as a socio-cultural factor that may act as a determinant of inaccurate official crime statistics in Ghana since it reduces the rape victim’s motivation to report her ordeal to the police. The victims have the perception that even if they do, the stereotypical nature of the offense will foster injustice on their part. This study only considered rape unlike the current study which considered other crimes such as theft, violent and other sexual offense and the socio-demographic and socio-cultural factors that inhibiting crime reporting.

2.3 Discussion of Literature:

The literature, as discussed above, brings to the fore the human behavior in relation to crime reporting based on socio-demographics characteristics or socio-cultural factors. This literature establishes the fact of the theory propounded by Donald Black (1976) and dubbed Black’s Behavior of Law Theory and concludes on some socio-cultural factors that inhibit crime reporting. Black’s theory postulates five different dimensions of social life which includes stratification, morphology, culture, organization and social control and how these social life attributes contribute to the reliability or not of crime statistics. Scholarly literature that discusses this theory is limited but not exclusive to Africa and Ghana. When tested in the US, Australia and Taiwan, the results obtained could not fully support or debase Black’s assertions of the different social dimensions and its contribution to the quantity of law. As long as the theory varies with time and space, it requires further investigations for Black’s hypothesis to be accepted especially on the African continent, or corrected or rejected continentally. This study has been able to identify the extent of the empirical research contributing the existing gaps in the theory to conclude on the acceptability, or the need for
the modification of Black’s Behavior of Law Theory. The theory requires intensive investigation in other parts of the world such as Africa.

The researcher therefore seeks to further develop this theory with empirical research by comparing his field data to data from the country-wide Ghana Living Standard Survey round six (GLSS 6) which includes a victimization survey component. The GLSS – 6 data set has all the information required to test most, if not all of the social dimensions that Black proposed. The primary qualitative data obtained from my personal fieldwork is analyzed to enrich the discussion and establish other socio-cultural factors that inhibit crime reporting in Ghana. Based on the articles reviewed, the theory has received divergent propositions by empirical testing from different contexts. None of the tests conducted based on the theory has so far rejected the theory in totality.

The stratification, morphology and cultural factors were partially supported by three of the articles Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979), Braithwaite and Biles (1980) and Avakame et al (1999). These factors were fully supported by Kuo, et al. (2012). The organizational aspect of the theory lacked data for its verification but the available information on that according to Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) and Braithwaite and Biles (1980) lacked support for Black’s proposition with regards to organization. Finally, the proposition on social control has mostly been proven to be valid by all four articles (Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979), Braithwaite, Biles (1980) and Avakame et al (1999) and Kuo, et al (2012)) but with few exceptions to this very proposition. It was also concluded by Kuo, et al (2012:51), “that the severity of infraction was positively related to crime reporting” and not just about the person’s status as per the social life dimensions. All evidence so far established to support or disproves Black’s Behavior of Law Theory does not include any extensive researches in any part of Africa. There is therefore the need to test this theory in Africa as
Almost all the articles reviewed concentrated on one problem, namely the inaccuracy of official crime statistics. The factors that affect crime statistics do not seem to emanate from the characteristics of individuals as proposed by Black but are also caused by some other socio-cultural factors as studied by Fisher et al, Tankebe, Boakye and many others. None of the authors whose works have been reviewed combined both Black’s propositions and other socio-cultural factors to provide comprehensive determinant of the factors that affect crime statistics. This study considers both divides to establish how Black’s propositions interplay with other socio-cultural factors to collectively inhibit crime reporting in Ghana. The reviewed literature suggests, though yet to be confirmed in this study, that individual characteristics otherwise known as the social life attributes by Black may contribute to crime reporting indirectly while the other socio-cultural factors have direct adverse effect on crime reporting.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

3.0 Introduction:

This chapter outlines the processes that were employed in the conduct of the study. The study area, sampling methods, instruments for data collection, data analysis, ethical consideration and limitations of the study are all discussed. The reasons that accounted for the choice of the techniques, methods and participants have also been explained clearly.

3.1 Study Types:

This study employed quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis technique. This is because the quantitative data provided information on the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their crime reporting behavior without the reasons why these respondents acted the way they did. The quantitative (SPSS) data set from the Round Six of the GLSS is analyzed considering the socio-demographic factors that affect inaccurate crime statistics in Ghana. The secondary data was a national survey to provide nationwide and sectorial information. The qualitative aspect of the study delved into the socio-cultural reasons why individuals who experienced crime failed to report their ordeal to the police. Three focus group discussions were organized in three regions specifically Greater Accra, Eastern and Ashanti regions to explore the socio-cultural factors that influence people’s decision not to report crime.

3.2 Scope

The data from the GLSS 6 that were analyzed as secondary data source was obtained from a representative sample for the entire country that covered all the ten regions of Ghana. Due to lack of time and resources, the primary data collection for the study purposively
concentrated on three of the regions. Specifically the Greater Accra, Eastern and Ashanti regions were selected based on the high victimization rates but low crime reporting and their higher population sizes. According to the latest population and housing census (2010), Ghana has a total population of 24,658,823 and the regions from which the primary data for this study were collected constitute about a half thus 46.33 percent of the country’s population.

3.3 Instruments:

One out of the four instruments that were used for the GLSS6 was considered for this study. There were two main household questionnaires that were used for collecting information from the households and individuals. For the purpose of this study, sections 1, 2, 4 and 13 of the household questionnaire were critically considered for the analysis. Section 1 collected information on socio-demographic characteristics, section 2 collected information on education, section 4 on employment and income and section 13 on governance, peace and security. The primary data collection was done using these sections of the questionnaire for the quantitative data and an FGD guide to extract qualitative information from victimized respondents. The household and the individual questionnaires used for the primary data collection identify participant for the FGD’s were almost entirely pre-coded.

The two types of questionnaires were used for the primary quantitative data collection the first questionnaire collected socio-demographic data about the household members and the second questionnaire which is the individual questionnaire, was administered to individual respondents who were 18 years and above. The household and the individual questionnaire sought basic demographic information such as educational levels, employment and income including crime victimization and reporting behavior of the individuals in the households. (Appendix A). The FGD guide focused on socio-cultural factors that affect
crime reporting. (Appendix B).

### 3.4 Sampling Procedure

The number of primary sampling units (PSUs) also called enumeration areas (EAs) and households that were sampled for the GLSS 6 are 1,200 and 18,000, respectively and a two-stage stratified sampling was adopted.

#### Table 3: Regional distribution of EAs and Households covered for GLSS6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>EAs</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Percentag e of EAs</th>
<th>Proportion Urban</th>
<th>Proportion Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Accra</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volta</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>1,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashanti</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brong Ahafo</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper East</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper West</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td>9,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Main Report 2014*

The first stage was the selection of 1,200 PSUs according to the population proportion of all the 10 regions (See Table 3 above). According to the GLSS – 6 (2014) report, “The EAs were further divided into urban thus localities with more than 5,000 people and rural localities of residence and a complete listing of households in the selected PSUs was undertaken to form the secondary sampling units (SSUs). At the second stage, 15 households from each PSU were selected systematically”. Field data collection period for the survey was 12 months and this sampling procedure was adopted for my primary data collection.
The primary data collection for this study followed a similar process but was limited to the three (3) purposively selected regions. The number of PSUs or EAs selected was three (3) from each region making a total of nine (9). Two hundred and twenty five (225) households were selected from all these 9 EA’s (25 households from each) which constitutes 1.25 percent of the GLSS 6 population. Twenty five (25) households located within the EA’s used for the GLSS 6 were selected using systematic random sampling and interviewed from the three (3) localities sampled in each of the 3 regions. Preference was not given to specific types of households. One (1) respondent was selected from each of the 225 households using the Kish grid which is a random sample table.

**Table 4: Regional distribution of EAs and Households covered by this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>EAs Urban</th>
<th>EAs Rural</th>
<th>EAs Total</th>
<th>Households Urban</th>
<th>Households Rural</th>
<th>Households Total</th>
<th>Percentage Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Accra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashanti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The households in each selected locality were numbered from 01 to 25. The last digit of the household number was matched to the total number of eligible respondents who were 18 years and above on the Kish grid. The serial number of the eligible respondent whose number matched with the selected number on the Kish Table was the persons selected to respond to the individual questions. (See Table 5: the Kish grid).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last digit of household number</th>
<th>Total number of eligible members in the household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 2 2 4 3 6 5 4 7 5 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 3 1 4 1 6 5 8 6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 1 2 5 2 7 6 9 7 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 1 3 1 7 1 8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 2 4 2 8 2 9 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 3 5 3 1 3 10 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 2 2 2 4 6 4 2 4 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 1 3 3 5 1 5 3 5 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 2 1 4 1 2 6 4 6 3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 3 7 5 7 4 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GLSS 6 Household Questionnaire

After the survey of the selected individuals, the respondents who have ever been victimized and failed to report identified after responding to those questions were organized into groups for FGD and were classified according to sex and age groups and other demographic characteristics. The FGD information obtained complemented the secondary data set to assess the socio-cultural factors as to why victims of crime do not report their
ordeal to the police. Three FGDs were organized, one in each region. There were at least 11 discussants in each of these FGD groups who were purposively selected based on their failure to report their victimization.

There was primary quantitative and qualitative data collection from nine (9) randomly selected localities across the three (3) purposively selected regions. These were regions that recorded high victimization but with low crime reporting rates according to the GPS report. The primary quantitative data collection aimed at identifying respondents who have been victimized but failed to report their ordeal to the police and not for the analysis of the primary quantitative data. Those identified to have experienced crime but failed to report were put into groups in the three selected localities (one from each region) for the Focus Group Discussion (FGD), using an FGD guide to ascertain from them the socio-cultural reasons why they would prefer to avoid reporting various types of crime to the police. Their responses were transcribed and used to ascertain the socio-cultural reasons why victims of crime in Ghana would not report crime to the police.

3.5 Demographic Variables:

As indicated in chapter two, various individual socio-demographic variables such as age, sex, income levels, marital status, employment status, education and literacy levels, are used to explain crime victims’ reporting behavior in other countries. These variables are therefore assessed to determine whether they were influential in crime reporting in the Ghanaian context. The socio-demographic variables considered in the study are those that relates to Donald Black’s social life attributes (stratification, morphology and culture) used against crime reporting. Black cataloged some demographic characteristics to the social life attributes he described such that, age, sex and income distributions relates to stratification,
marital and employment status relates to morphology while education and literacy levels are referred as culture. The aim is to help in understanding the importance of these characteristics on respondents’ crime reporting behavior in this context. The presentation of the demographic variables is done for both the secondary data set and the Primary data.

3.5.1 **Demographic Variables for the Secondary Data Set:**

Age, sex and income distribution of the respondents are the variable used by Black for the stratification assertions. The stratification is such that adults (35+), male and higher wage earners are classified as those who are most privileged to possess higher social status. The young (18 – 35), female and lower wage earners are classified as those less privileged and have lower social status. The income distribution of the respondents as presented has more than two categories, the purpose is to be able to test Black’s claim that as income increases, crime reporting rate of the respondents will also increase. These independent variables were therefore required to serve as the basic information to be cross tabulated with the dependent variable crime reporting. The cross tabulated information helped in the testing of Black’s stratification and crime reporting postulates where he theorized that those classified on the higher social status may report crime to the police more than those on the lower social status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Respondents’ Age and Sex Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age * Sex Cross tabulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 To 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSS; GLSS – 6 Data Set 2014*
A total of 16,445 individuals across the ten regions of Ghana responded to questions on the Governance, Peace and Security (GPS) module of the GLSS – 6 (Section 13). The female respondents (52.1 percent) were more than the male respondents (47.2 percent). The male respondents aged between 18 and 35 constituted 47.9 percent while the female respondents for the same age group formed 52.1 percent. The percentages of respondents aged 35 years plus were 46.6 percent and 53.4 percent for male and female, respectively. Further details can be found in Table 6 (above).

The income distribution of the respondents for the study has been presented in Figure 1. As shown in the Figure 1, almost half (47.8%) of them earn very low incomes; that is between 1 – 99 Ghana Cedis within the 12 months period of the survey. Fourteen percent earned between 100 and 999 Ghana Cedis while about one fourth of the respondents (24.8%) earn between 1,000 – 4,999 Ghana Cedis within the same period. High income earning respondents are between 8, 4.9 and 0.5 percent with income ranging from 5,000 – 9,999, 10,000 – 49,999 and 50,000 – 600,000 Ghana Cedis respectively.

**Figure 1: Respondents Annual Wage Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Annual Wage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 4,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSS; GLSS – 6 Data Set 2014*
Marital and employment status of the respondents are the variable used by Black for the morphological proposition. Black classified the married and the employed respondents on one side of the strata while the unmarried and unemployed are placed on the lower social rank. These independent variables were therefore required to serve as the basic information to be crossed-tabulated with the dependent variable (crime reporting). The cross-tabulated information helped in the testing of Black’s theory that those classified on the higher social status may report crime to the police more than those on the lower social status. The respondents’ marital status shows that about six out of every ten of the respondents are either married or in a consensual union while the remaining 4 have never married, widowed, divorced or separated according to the secondary data source. Figure 2 shows the sample of respondents distributed according to their marital status. The employment status of the respondents from the secondary data source has been presented in Figure 3 above. About 84 percent of the respondents are gainfully employed while the remaining 16 percent are not. According to the primary data source, 82.3 percent of the respondents are employed while the remaining 17.7 percent are not employed.

Education and literacy levels of the respondents are the variables used by Black for his claim on culture and crime reporting. Highly educated people and those who can read write were placed on one side of the strata while those with lower education and non-literates were classified as those on the lower social status. The educational levels of the respondents as presented have more than two categories unlike literacy. The reason is that, Black claims that as the educational qualification increases, crime reporting rate of the respondents will also increase and those who can read and write will also report crime more than those who cannot. These independent variables were therefore required to serve as the basic information to be cross tabulated with the dependent variable (crime reporting). The cross tabulated
information helped in the testing of Black’s cultural and crime reporting claim where he theorized that those classified on the higher social status may report crime to the police more than those on the lower social status.

**Figure 2: Highest Educational Qualification Respondents Attained**

![Chart showing educational qualification](chart.png)

Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014

The educational qualification of the respondents has been presented in Figures 2. About half of the respondents (51.3 percent) had no academic qualification meaning they either did not attend school at all or could not complete any level that will lead to the award of any certificate. The percentage of respondents that attained junior secondary or middle school certificate is 29.66 percent while 12.14 of the respondents attained secondary, vocational or technical educational qualification. Respondents with higher education, that is to say a certificate or diploma is 3.98 percent and those with first degree and above is 2.20 percent. A higher percentage of the respondents are not literate (58.4%), meaning they cannot read or write a sentence in any local or foreign language but the remaining (41.6%) are able to read or write a local language, foreign language or both.
3.5.2 Demographic Variables for the Primary Data:

The number of participants for all the three (3) FGD’s was thirty (36), eleven (11) people took part in the discussions in the Ashanti Region, twelve (12) were involved in the in the Eastern Region’s discussion and thirteen (13) people were engaged in the Greater Accra Region’s group. Nineteen (19) of the discussants were youth between the ages of 18 – 35 while the remaining seventeen (17) were adults aged 35+ years. There were eleven (11) females and twenty five (25) males involved in the discussions. The respondent’s yearly wage distribution showed that the majority of them (13) of them earned very low income (from 1 to 99 Ghana Cedis) within 12 months. Twelve (12) of the respondents earned between 1,000 – 4,999 Ghana Cedis within the same period while six (6) of them earned between 100 and 999 Ghana Cedis. High income earning respondents are five (5), three (3) earned 5,000 – 9,999 and 2 earned 10,000 – 49,999 Ghana Cedis. Fourteen (14) of the discussants are married or cohabiting while the remaining twenty two (22) were not in any union. Twenty nine (29) of the participants are working while seven (7) of them are still looking for work. Data on educational qualification and literacy level of the respondents revealed that eight (8) of the participants had no formal education while five (5) attended school but did not attain any academic qualification. The number of the FGD participants that attained junior high school (JHS) or middle school certificate was thirteen (13) while six (6) of them attained secondary, vocational or technical educational qualification. Group members with higher education thus certificate or diploma was two (2) and those with first degree and above were two (2). Eighteen (18) of the discussants can read and write while the remaining eighteen (18) cannot read nor write. Almost all the respondents for the FGD’s are Christians except three (3), one (1) from the Ashanti Region’s group and two (2) from the Greater Accra group who were Muslims. The three group discussions produced thirty six
(36) criminal cases that were not reported to the police. Theft cases discussed were fifteen (15), violence crimes were eleven (11), six (6) cases of deception, three (3) sexual offences and one (1) case of an economic abuse. The analysis focused of the first four crime cases identified.

3.6 Analyses:

A univariate analysis (frequencies, percentages) was conducted to give a general description of both primary and secondary data. The variables that were considered are marital status, age, employment status, sex, education, literacy levels and income levels. Bivariate analyses using cross tabulation were conducted with chi - square tests to show the association between predictor variables and the dependent variable. A multivariate regression analysis was also conducted in cases where the independent variable which is the categorical variable has more than two possible values. The chi – square critical value was compared with the chi – square obtained value and when the chi – square obtained was greater than the chi – square critical, then the null hypothesis was rejected, otherwise, the null hypothesis was accepted. After the decision rule of either failing to reject or rejecting the null hypothesis, the P – Value obtained from the test has also used to confirm the test results at a significance level of 0.05. The obtained P – Value if greater than 0.05, indicates that the observed results from the sample were inconsistent with the null hypothesis and vice versa. These verifications were done using the SPSS data software both to capture the secondary data and for the primary data capture.

The FGD data was transcribed after using an FGD guide to conduct focus group discussions. Coding was done to identify the main themes of socio-cultural determinants that affect crime reporting to complement the quantitative data. The identified themes were
analyzed considering specific quotes from the group discussions which talks to those themes and as a result, some specific socio-cultural determinants of the inaccurate official crime statistics were identified in that chapter.

3.7 Ethical Considerations:

Information about the study was provided to the respondents before obtaining their verbal and written consent for their participating in the study. The data collected have been treated with the needed care to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. Participation was also voluntary. Participants did not receive any direct incentive for participating in the research. The proposal was submitted to the Ethics Committee of Humanities prior to the study being conducted.

3.8 Limitations of the Study:

The inability to generalize the findings of the study to cover the entire country with a limited sample as compared to the GLSS – 6 data which were more representative constitutes one of the limitations of the study. Further, the presence of the researcher possibly affected the responses provided by the respondents as manifested in altering of normal behavior. The respondents were expected to provide honest responses and display genuine actions throughout this research study but that could not be guaranteed. Another limitation was the role of memory which might have affected respondents’ quality of information. A time frame of 5 year was placed to maximize the probability of remembering. Although this five-year time frame excluded a considerable number of people who had used the justice system, this was deemed reasonable to ensure respondent’s ability to recall the very details of their personal experiences with the justice system which was also difficult for the respondent’s to recall vividly.
The other challenge of the study had to do with the fact that many of the respondents did not speak English. Both the quantitative primary data collection instrument and the FGD guide had to be translated from English to a Ghanaian language (Akan or Ga-dangme). This process would have made transcription very difficult and would have affected the richness of the data but for the fact that I could speak both languages. I tactfully conducted the focus group discussions using these two Ghanaian languages and carefully recorded the responses in English and that helped to maintain the quality of data collected and analyzed.

3.9 Conclusion

The research methods discussed above was the guiding principles for the conduct of this study. It guided the conduct of the study, bringing together the secondary and the primary data to explore the major objectives of the study. Having used this approach, the data collected were analysed and are discussed in the next chapter. This is done with reference to the literature and the grounded theoretical framework of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES

4.0 Introduction:

In this chapter, the findings generated from the secondary data source (GLSS-6 with GPS module) which is mainly quantitative data required for the study are presented and analyzed. This is done by outlining and presenting the common themes and concepts that emerged from the reported experiences of respondents with crime and crime reporting, against their socio-demographic characteristics. In response to the objectives of the study, the analysis is followed by the experiences of the respondents with the police. The experiences of crime, crime reporting and the reasons for not reporting crimes are discussed in conjunction the findings of previous investigations.

Also, findings generated from the secondary (GLSS – 6) field data set are cross-tabulated and analyzed and hypotheses tested to verify Black’s Behavior of Law Theory. The hypotheses tested considered the relationship between respondent’s characteristics; crime victimization and reporting. The findings are discussed in line with existing literature. The explanations regarding the respondent’s characteristics, crime occurrences, victimization and reporting and other alternative avenues helped in understanding the broader context within which citizen’s deal with crime victimization experiences. The analyses are also based on three main propositions of Black’s Behavior of Law Theory which includes stratification, morphology and culture with a test of hypothesis in each case. There are seven different variables classified into three categories by Donald Black. These variables contribute to enhancing the behavior of law theory. In other words, the variables are used as predictors of crime reporting. The main reason behind Black’s assumption is that people on the higher
social rank may have some level of advantage over those on the lower social rank in their quest to assess the criminal justice system and this motivates those in these categories to report crime more than the less privileged. This aspect of the study tested hypotheses for all seven independent variables cross tabulated with the dependent variable (crime reporting) in the context of Ghana and analyzed the results to confirm or reject either wholly or partially Donald Black’s (1976) Behavior of Law Theory.

4.1 Respondents” Crime Victimization Status

Three major types of crime have been considered for this study which include theft, sexual and violent crime. All the independent characteristics of the respondents were cross-tabulated with respondents” crime reporting behavior. The victimized respondents are those whose crime reporting behavior was measured with their independent characteristics. The rates of victimized respondents were therefore required to serve as the basic information that was crossed tabulated with the independent variables. The cross tabulated information helped in the testing of Black”s Behavior of Law Theory.
Table 7: Respondents’ Crime Victimization Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did anyone steal or try to steal from you or other members of your household?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, myself</td>
<td>4588</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, a member of my household</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10541</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16445</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has anyone attacked, assaulted or threatened you or any member of your household?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, myself</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, a member of my household</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, a relative</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, someone I know</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, someone I don't know</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14389</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16445</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has anyone assaulted you sexually?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16067</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16445</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014

The study analyzes three major criminal offences for which respondents can become victims. The crimes are stealing which may be in the form of theft, burglary or robbery, sexual crime in the form of defilement, incest or rape and violent crime such as attack, assault or threat. The crime for which most respondents become victims is stealing where 27.9 percent of the respondents were victimized and 7.4 percent of the respondents other household members were also victimized. Respondents who experienced violent crime are 6.4 percent while sexual crime is the least experienced by only 2.3 percent of the respondents.
4.2 Victimized Respondents’ Crime Reporting Rate

The study, mainly focuses on reporting the degree of crimes to achieve greater accuracy of crime statistics requires that the majority, if not all people who become victims to crime, report their ordeal to the police. Having established the rate if victimization, there is also the need to test hypothesis to know the level of significance of the “dark figure” in Ghana’s official crime records. Table 8 below therefore presents information on the rate at which the respondents who were victimized criminally reported or failed to report to the police. It also presents a one-tailed test results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you or anyone report the theft/incident to the police</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5805</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T ) Obtained = 390.932</td>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 0.00 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you or anyone report the sexual crime to the police</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T ) Obtained = 112.662</td>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 0.00 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you or anyone report the violent incident to the police</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T ) Obtained = 112.129</td>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 0.00 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014
The first specific objective of this study is to measure the extent of the “Dark Figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics. The information provided in this section of the study from the secondary data set exhibits the extent of the “Dark Figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics. The “Dark Figure” rate as per the average of the three selected crimes for the study, violence, theft and sexual crime is as much as 83.5 percent \((91.2 + 92.0 + 67.3 ÷ 3 = 83.5)\) (see Table 8). This means that for every one hundred (100) crimes that occur in Ghana, only 16 of them are reported to the police.

Crime reporting frequencies as extracted from the GLSS – 6 data set shows very low reporting rate. As shown in Table 8, the number of respondents who experienced crime and decided not to report is very high; 92.0 percent, 91.2 percent and 67.3 percent did not report sexual, violent and stealing offences to the police, respectively. As indicated in the Table, for the mostly reported crime (violent offence), only 27.7 percent reported to the police. The crimes with the lowest reporting rates are stealing and sexual crime, both with a reporting rate of 8.0 percent.

### 4.3 Hypothesis Testing

The third objective of this study is to ascertain the extent to which Black’s Behavior of Law Theory can be confirmed or rejected in the context of Ghana. These can be done by testing the following hypotheses: (i) age difference have no relationship with crime reporting. (ii) sex difference has no relationship with crime reporting (iii) income differences has no relationship with crime reporting (iv) marital status has no relationship with crime reporting (v) employment status has no relationship with crime reporting (vi) educational level has no relationship with crime reporting (vii) literacy has no relationship with crime reporting. This are all null hypotheses which Donald Black formulated as alternatives hypotheses and hence the need to test and ascertain the level of variability or otherwise. The existence of the “dark
figure was tested first to establish the significance of the figure before proceeding to test for the relationship between the socio-demographic characteristics and crime reporting.

4.3.1 Hypothesis Testing for the “Dark Figure”

This is to test the claim by the researcher that the “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is significantly high (above 50%).

The Null Hypothesis (\(H_0\)) and the Alternative Hypothesis (\(H_1\))

\(H_0: \) The “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is less than 50%.

\[ H_0: P_u \leq 0.50 \]

\(H_1: \) The “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is more than 50%

\[ H_1: P_u > 0.50 \]

Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.

Sampling distribution = T distribution, at the alpha level of 0.05

Right tailed test: \( T (\text{critical}) = 6.314 \)

Test Statistic

One sample T test values presented for the three different types of crime in Table 8 above

Making a Decision

With alpha set at 0.05, one-tailed, the critical region begins at \( T (\text{critical}) = 6.314 \). Having obtained the following T values Theft 390.932, Sexual Crime 112.662 and Violent Crime 112.129 with \( P – values = 0.000 < 0.05 \), the null hypothesis for all the three types of crime is rejected.

Conclusion

This means that, at 95 percent confidence level, it can be concluded that the “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is significantly high such that the rate is more than 50% in all the three types of crimes selected for this study. This means that more than 50% of
Ghanaians who were victimized criminally in theft, sexual and violent crime did not report their victimization to the police. The implication is that the crime statistics obtained from the UCR otherwise known as the official crime records compiled by the Police Criminal Investigation Department (CID) as a result of crime reported to their outfit constitute less than half of all crimes that occur in the country. These crime statistics which have been proven empirically to be inaccurate is used by the criminal justice system in their bid to formulate policies that will bring about peace, safety and security to the people. Basing security policy formulation on inaccurate crime statistics will render the criminal justice system inefficient and ineffective.

### 4.3.2 Hypotheses Testing of Black”s Stratification and Crime Reporting

In Black’s theory, he stratified individuals by age, sex and income levels and asserted that older people are more likely to report crime than the young, males are more likely to report crime than females and finally the rich are more likely to report crime than the poor. These categorizations has been explained in pages 10 and 11 of the thesis report.
4.3.2.1 Age and Crime Reporting

The GLSS – 6 gathered data on stealing, violent and sexual crime. These three types of crime are being used for analysis in this study. The age variable has being categorized into two main groups thus the youth group from 18 to 35 years and the adult group 35+ years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Respondents’ Age Distribution and Crime Reporting Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age * Reported Crime to the Police Cross Tabulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Age Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pearson Chi-Square value = 1.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Age Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pearson Chi-Square value = 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Age Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pearson Chi-Square value = 7.159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014

The percentage of the youth that reported stealing (7.5 percent) is slightly higher than the adult respondents who also reported stealing to the police (7.1 percent). The result shows a similar trend for sexual crime with a difference of 0.3 percent (5.8 – 5.5 = 0.3) reporting rate for the young higher than the adult respondents. However, the result for violent crime in the form of attack, assault or threat is in the reverse with a difference of 4.96 percent (27.94 – 22.98 = 4.96). This means that for the three crimes considered for this study, violent crime is
the only type for which reportage seems to support Black’s proposition; while for theft and sexual crimes, the younger respondents reported crime slightly more than the older once contrary to Black’s claim.

**Testing for Age and Crime Reporting**

This is to test Donald Black’s claim that older people are more likely to report crime than younger people.

**The Null Hypothesis and the Alternative Hypothesis**

\[ H_0: \text{The two variables (Age groups and Crime reporting) are independent} \]

\[ H_1: \text{The two variables (Age groups and crime reporting) are dependent} \]

**Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.**

Sampling Distribution = Chi Square Distribution

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

Degrees of freedom = 1  \( X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \)

**Test Statistic:**

Pearson’s Chi – Square values and P – Values are presented for the three different types of crime in Table 9 on the previous page.

**Making a Decision**

At the alpha level of 0.05, the critical region begins at \( X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \), if Pearson’s Chi – square value for theft (1.187) and sexual crime (0.016) are less than the \( X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \) and the P – Values 0.552 and 0.889 also greater than 0.05 then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In the case in violent crime, Pearson’s Chi – square value = 7.159 is greater than \( X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \) and the P – Value = 0.028 also less than 0.05, means that the null hypothesis is rejected.
Conclusion

Since H₀ has been not been rejected, this implies that there is no relationship between age groups and crime reportage for theft and sexual but same cannot be said for violent crime where the test affirms Black’s proposition that adults are more likely to report crime than the young. Black’s proposition about age and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted or rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context. The theory can be said to be true but depending on the type of crime for instance, as shown in the case of violent crime.
4.3.2.2 Sex and Crime Reporting

Table 10 below shows male and female crime reporting rate and the hypothesis test result with the analyses presented below. Donald Black asserted that males are more likely to report crime than females.

Table 10: Respondents Sex Distribution and Crime Reporting Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square value = 19.513  \( P – Value = 0.00 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square value = 0.549  \( P – Value = 0.459 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square value = 2.227  \( P – Value = 0.328 \)

Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014

The percentage of the male respondents that reported stealing (8.8 percent) is higher than the female respondents who also reported stealing to the police (5.8 percent). The result shows a reverse trend for sexual crime with females reporting a higher rate by 2.0 percent \((6.4 – 4.4 = 2.0)\) than the male respondents. However, the result for violent crime in the form of attack, assault or threat is almost the same with no significant difference, (25.4
percent) male respondents reported violent crime while a similar percentage of the female respondents (25.2 percent) also reported violent crime to the police. This means that for the three crimes considered for this study, theft and sexual crime are the type of crimes that seem to be supporting Black’s proposition in respect to gender but Black’s assertion that males are more likely to report crime than females cannot be accepted regarding sex as a stratification variable for violent crime in the Ghanaian context.

Hypothesis Testing (Sex and Crime Reporting)

This is to test Donald Black’s claim that males may report crime more than females

Stating the Null Hypothesis and the Alternative Hypothesis

\[ H_0: \] The two variables (sex and crime reporting) are independent

\[ H_1: \] The two variables (sex and crime reporting) are dependent

Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.

Sampling Distribution = Chi Square Distribution

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

Degrees of freedom = 1 \[ X^2 (critical) = 3.841 \]

Test Statistic:

Pearson’s Chi – Square values and P – Values has been presented for all the three different types of crime in Table 13 above

Making a Decision

At the alpha of 0.05, the critical region begins at \[ X^2 (critical) = 3.841 \], if Pearson’s Chi – square value for sexual crime (0.549) and violent crime (2.227) are less than the \[ X^2 (critical) = 3.841 \] with P-values 0.459 and 0.328 greater than 0.05, then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In the case in theft, Pearson’s Chi – square value = 19.513 is greater than \[ X^2 (critical) = 3.841 \] and P–value=0.000 less than 0.05, means that the null hypothesis is
rejected.

**Conclusion**

Since $H_0$ has not been rejected, this implies that there is no relationship between sex and crime reportage in the case of violent and sexual crime but same cannot be said for theft. This affirms Blacks proposition that males are more likely to report crime than females. Black’s proposition about sex and crime reporting cannot be accepted or rejected wholly in the context of Ghana. Black’s propositions can be said to be true but it depends on the type of crime for instance as shown in the case of theft.
4.3.2.3 Income Levels and Crime Reporting

One of the propositions in Donald Black’s Behavior of Law Theory that this study investigated is the assumption that individuals who are endowed financially may report crime more than the less privileged. This claim was measured with three different types of crime; theft, sexual crime and violent crime.

Table 11: Respondent’s Income Distribution and Crime Reporting Rate

| Did you or Someone else Report Crime to the Police * Respondents Wages Cross Tabulation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| **Theft**                                   | **Sexual Crime**                               |
| **Crime**                                   |                                               |
| Reported                                    |                                               |
| 1 - 99                                      | 100 - 999                                     |
| 1000 - 999                                  | 5000 - 999                                    |
| 10,000 - 49,999                             | 50,000 - 600000                              |
| 50,000 - 600000                             |                                               |
| Reported                                    | 5.6                                           |
| 4.5                                         | 7.9                                           |
| 12.1                                        | 15.2                                          |
| 16.7                                        |                                               |
| Not Reported                                | 93.5                                          |
| 95.0                                        | 91.4                                          |
| 87.1                                        | 84.1                                          |
| 83.3                                        |                                               |
| don't know                                  | 0.9                                           |
| 0.5                                         | 0.7                                           |
| 0.8                                         | 0.7                                           |
| 0.0                                         |                                               |
| Total                                       | 100.0                                         |
| 100.0                                       | 100.0                                         |
| 100.0                                       | 100.0                                         |
| 100.0                                       | 100.0                                         |
| 100.0                                       |                                               |
| **Pearson Chi-Square value = 67.493**        | **P – Value = 0.000**                         |
| **Violent Crime**                           |                                               |
| **Crime**                                   |                                               |
| Reported                                    | 25.2                                          |
| 22.8                                        | 24.8                                          |
| 26.8                                        | 27.8                                          |
| 54.5                                        |                                               |
| Not Reported                                | 68.4                                          |
| 74.4                                        | 72.4                                          |
| 67.1                                        | 65.6                                          |
| 45.5                                        |                                               |
| don't know                                  | 6.5                                           |
| 2.8                                         | 2.8                                           |
| 6.1                                         | 6.7                                           |
| 0.0                                         |                                               |
| Total                                       | 100.0                                         |
| 100.0                                       | 100.0                                         |
| 100.0                                       | 100.0                                         |
| 100.0                                       |                                               |
| **Pearson Chi-Square value = 21.177**        | **P – Value = 0.020**                         |

**Source:** GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014

In the case of theft, respondents who earned 0 – 99, 100 – 999 and 1000 – 4999 reported less crime ranging from 10.0, 8.7 and 11.1 percent respectively. Respondents with relatively high income from 5000 – 9999, 10,000 – 49,999 and 50,000 – 600,000 Ghana Cedis result show that the crime reporting rate is quite high with such respondents ranging
from 19.4, 20.35 and 20.0 percent respectively. There are slight differences in reporting sexual crime with respect to income; the low income earning respondents report while none of the respondents in the higher income earning bracket reported sexual crime to the police. 

Violent crime reportage according to the Table shows a study increase as income increases from 22.8 percent reporting rate for respondents earning between 100 – 999 Ghana Cedis to 54.5 percent for the highest income earning respondents (50,000 – 600000 Ghana Cedis) except for respondents earning the lowest income reporting 25.2 percent of violent crime that they are victimized.

**Hypothesis Testing (Sex and Crime Reporting)**

This is to test Donald Black’s claim that people with higher income are more likely to report crime than those with low income.

**Step 1: Stating the Null Hypothesis and the Alternative Hypothesis**

\[ H_0: \text{The two variables income levels and crime reporting are independent} \]

\[ H_1: \text{The two variables income levels and crime reporting are dependent} \]

**Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.**

Sampling Distribution = Chi Square Distribution

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

Degrees of freedom = 5 \[ X^2 (\text{critical}) = 11.070 \]

**Test Statistic:**

Pearson’s Chi – Square values and P – Value has been presented for the three different types of crime in Table 14 above.

**Making a Decision**

At the alpha level of 0.05, the critical region begins at \[ X^2 (\text{critical}) = 11.070, \] if Pearson’s Chi – square value for sexual crime (0.549) is less than the \[ X^2 (\text{critical}) = 11.070 \]
and the P – value = 0.77 greater than 0.05, then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In the cases of theft and violent crime, Pearson’s Chi – square values = 67.493 and 21.177 respectively are greater than $X^2 (\text{critical}) = 11.070$ and the P – values 0.00 and 0.020 both less than 0.05, means that the null hypothesis can be rejected in the case of these two crime types.

**Conclusion**

Since Ho has been rejected, this implies that there is a relationship between income levels and crime reportage in the case of theft and violent crime which affirms Blacks proposition that the rich are more likely to report crime than the poor. The situation is different with sexual crime where there is no relationship with crime reportage and income levels. Black’s proposition about income and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted wholly in the context of Ghana but can be concluded to mean that it can be true depending on the type of crime for instance, as shown in the case of theft and violent crime.

**4.3.2.4 Conclusion on Stratification and Crime Reporting**

The literature on Black’s stratification and crime reporting postulate concluded both in the affirmative and in the negative. Stratification variables were not supported by the test from Gottfredson and Hindelang. The Australian data by Braithwaite and Biles (1980) also showed no association between household income and reporting crime to the police. The notable exception is the category of fraud, forgery, and false pretenses which show a markedly higher rate of reporting to the police among high-income victims. Avakame et al. (1999) affirmed these results even in a reverse where the poor reported crime to the police more than the wealthy ones. On the contrary, Kuo et al. (2012) concluded that the poor reported less crime to the “police about assaultive victimizations than affluent and married victims, which, from Black’s perspective”. The young people who were victimized
of larcenous crime did not report to the police as much as the adults, again confirming Black’s proposition. Kuo et al (2012), confirmed that, “The significant variables, the only social-structural variable running counter to the hypothesis in the full model was gender for robbery reporting, in which females were nearly three times more likely to report than males”.

This study in Ghana concluded similarly as the literature. There is limited evidence to support Black’s claim that young people report crime less than adults in the case of theft and sexual crime but concluded on the contrary for violent crime where the test affirms Black’s proposition that adults are more likely to report more than the young. There is little or no evidence to support Black’s claim that males report crime more than females in the case of violent and sexual crime but on the contrary, for theft which affirms Black’s proposition on sex and crime reporting. There is little or no evidence to support Black’s claim that the rich are more likely to report crime to the police more than poor in the case of sexual crime but on the contrary for theft and violent crime.

Black’s proposition about stratification and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted or rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context. The assertion can be concluded to mean that it is true but depending on the type of crime for instance as shown in Table 12. All three stratification variables age, sex and income were rejected by sexual crime, theft rejected only age and violent crime also rejected only sex as stratification variables against crime reporting. On the other hand, the stratification variables sex and income confirmed the propositions against theft and age and income also confirmed the propositions against violent crime.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratification Variables</th>
<th>Crime Types</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>Sexual Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors own presentation; 2016*
4.3.3 Morphology and Crime Reporting

Morphologically, Black (1976) stated the married people may report crime more than the unmarried and also that employed people may report crime more than the unemployed.

4.3.3.1 Marital Status and Crime Reporting

The variable marital status has also been categorized into two main groups: the married which include consensual union and fully married couple and the unmarried.

Table 13: Respondents Marital Status and Crime Reporting Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status * Reported Crime to the Police Cross Tabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square value = 4.089  P – Value = 0.129

Sexual Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime/Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square value = 1.435  P – Value = 0.231

Violent Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime/Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square value = 0.840  P – Value = 0.657

Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014

The percentage of the married respondents that reported stealing (7.8 percent) is slightly higher than the unmarried respondents (6.4 percent) who reported stealing to the police. The result shows a similar trend for violent crime in the form of attack, assault or
threat with 25.9 percent of the married respondents as against 24.1 of the unmarried reporting violent crime to the police. However, the result for sexual crime is the reverse where more of the unmarried (7.1 percent) reported sexual crime to the police as compared to 4.1 percent of the married. This means that for the three crimes considered for this study, violent crime and theft are the types of crime that seem to support Black”s proposition while sexual crime did not support the assertion in this regard.

Testing for Marital Status and Crime Reporting

This is to test Black”s claim that the married are more likely to report crime than the unmarried.

Stating the Null Hypothesis and the Alternative Hypothesis

\[ H_0: \text{The two variables (Married and Unmarried) are independent} \]

\[ H_1: \text{The two variables (Married and Unmarried) are dependent} \]

Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.

Sampling Distribution = Chi Square Distribution

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

Degrees of freedom = 1 \[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \]

Test Statistic:

Pearson”s Chi – Square values presented for the three different types of crime in Table 12 above

Making a Decision

With alpha set at 0.05, the critical region begins at \[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \], if Pearson”s Chi – square value for sexual crime (1.435) and violent crime (0.840) are less than the \[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \] and P–values of 0.231 and 0.657 then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In the case of theft, although Pearson”s Chi – square values = 4.089 is greater than
\[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \] but since the P-value = 0.129 is greater than 0.05, there is difference in marital status and theft reporting though but the difference is not significant enough to warrant the rejection of the null hypothesis.

**Conclusion**

Since \( H_0 \) has not been rejected, this implies that there is a no relationship between marital status and crime reportage. Donald Black”s claim that the married are more likely to report crime than the unmarried is not true for all three crime types, theft, violent and sexual crime in Ghana. Black”s proposition about marital status and crime reporting can therefore be rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context. There is no difference in crime reporting among the married and the unmarried in Ghana.
4.3.3.2 Employment Status and Crime Reporting

The employment status has been categorized into two main groups: the employed and the unemployed respondents.

**Table 14: Respondents Employment Status and Crime Reporting Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status * Reported Crime to the Police Cross Tabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Employment Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pearson Chi – Square value = 1.261*  
*p – Value = 0.532*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sexual Crime</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Employment Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pearson Chi-Square value = 0.881*  
*p – Value = 0.348*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Violent Crime</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Employment Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pearson Chi-Square value = 5.672*  
*p – Value = 0.059*

Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014

The percentage of the employed respondents that reported stealing (7.4 percent) is almost the same as the unemployed respondents (6.7 percent) who reported stealing to the police. The result for violent and sexual crime shows the not employed respondents reported crime more than the employed respondents. The unemployed who reported violent and sexual crimes are 28.2 and 7.5 percent respectively and for the employed, 24.0 and 4.9 percent in violent and sexual crime respectively. This means that none of the three crimes considered for this study, violent, theft and sexual crime seem to confirm Black’s proposition.
which is that employed people may report crime more than the not employed.

**Hypothesis Testing (Employment Status and Crime Reporting)**

This is to test Black’s claim that the employed are more likely to report crime than the not employed.

**Stating the Null Hypothesis and the Alternative Hypothesis**

\[ H_0: \text{The two variables (Employed and Not Employed) are independent} \]

\[ H_1: \text{The two variables (Employed and Not Employed) are dependent} \]

**Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.**

Sampling Distribution = Chi Square Distribution

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

Degrees of freedom = 1 \[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \]

**Test Statistic:**

Pearson’s Chi – Square values and P – values presented for the three different types of crime in Table 12 above

**Making a Decision**

With alpha set at 0.05, the critical region begins at \[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \], if Pearson’s Chi – square value for theft (1.261) and sexual crime (0.881) are less than the \[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \] and P – values = 0.532 and 0.348 all less than 0.05, then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In the case in violent crime, Pearson’s Chi – square values = 5.672 is greater than \[ X^2 \text{ (critical)} = 3.841 \] through but since the P – value = 0.059 is greater than 0.05 meaning that in this case also, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for violent crime.

**Conclusion**

Since Ho has not been rejected, this implies that there is a no relationship between age groups and crime reportage employment status. Donald Blacks claim that employed
people report crime more than the not employed is not supported for all the three crime types theft, sexual and violent crime in this context. Black’s proposition about employment status and crime reporting can therefore be rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context. There is no difference in crime reporting between the employed and the not employed in Ghana.

4.3.3.3 Conclusion on Morphology and Crime Reporting

The results by Avakame et al (1999) suggested that Blacks “proposition is correct: Married people are more likely to call the police and their assailants are more likely to be arrested. By contrast, however, unemployed people are more likely than the employed to call the police, according to these data, and their assailants are more likely to be arrested”. The support for Black's theory on the marital status question, according to Braithwaite and Biles (1980), was not replicated on the Australian data. Respondents, who had never been married, reported assault victimizations to the police at only half the rate of both those who were married and those who were separated. This has been confirmed by Kuo et al. (2012) who assert that unmarried and poor victims may report less of their assaultive victimizations to the police than wealthy and married victims, which confirm Black’s perspective.

Donald Black’s claim that the married are more likely to report crime than the unmarried has tested otherwise in the case of Ghana for all three crime types theft, violent and sexual crime used for this study. Black’s proposition about marital status and crime reporting can therefore be rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context. Black’s claim that employed people report crime more than the not employed in the case of Ghana has tested otherwise in all the three crime types theft and sexual and violent crime in this context. Black’s proposition about employment status and crime reporting can therefore be rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context. The morphological proposition by Black using marital and
employment status as his base have both proven otherwise in this context and can be rejected wholly. The literature in this regard only rejects that employment and accepts the marital status analogy partially.

Table 15: Morphology and Crime Reporting Propositions by Donald Black

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphology Variables</th>
<th>Crime Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors own presentation; 2016
4.3.4 Culture and Crime Reporting

Culturally, Black (1976) asserted that highly educated people may report crime more than less educated people same are literates will do against not literates.

4.3.4.1 Educational Qualification and Crime Reporting

Respondents’ level of educational qualification and crime reporting behavior has been presented in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification Attained</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Post Sec</td>
<td>SSS/TVET</td>
<td>JSS/Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pearson Chi-Square value = 81.289*  
*P – Value = 0.000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification Attained</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Post Sec</td>
<td>SSS/TVET</td>
<td>JSS/Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Crime</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pearson Chi-Square value = 3.387*  
*P – Value = 0.495*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification Attained</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Post Sec</td>
<td>SSS/TVET</td>
<td>JSS/Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pearson Chi-Square value = 13.272*  
*P – Value = 0.013*

*Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014*
The data shows an increasing trend in crime reporting as the respondents’ levels of education also increases. In the case of theft, only 5.5 percent of respondents without any educational qualification reported crime. This increased to 7.8 percent for respondents with at least JSS/JHS and or Middle school living certificates and increased again to 11.7 percent for those with secondary educational qualification. The trend increased to 15.0 percent for respondents with Teacher or Nursing training or post-secondary education and escalated further to 25.2 percent for respondents with tertiary educational qualification. The trend is not the same for violent crime but still followed a similar trend with the highest reporting rate of 32.6 percent for respondents with tertiary education qualification followed in this case by the secondary education respondents 31.2 percent before those with Teacher/Nursing or post-secondary. Uneducated respondents reported crime slightly higher 0.4 percent (24.6 - 24.2 = 0.4) more than respondents with JHS/JHS and or middle school living certificates. Sexual crime reporting data shows that respondents with higher education that is tertiary and post-secondary did not experience any sexual crime. Respondents with secondary education who experienced crime, 8.9 percent reported to the police while 7.5 percent of those without education also reported sexual crime to the police but only 4.1 percent of respondents with JSS/JHS and or Middle school living certificates reported sexual crime victimization to the police.

Testing for Education levels and Crime Reporting

This is to test Black’s claim that educated are more likely to report crime than the less educated.

Stating the Null Hypothesis and the Alternative Hypothesis

\[ H_0: \text{Educational level and crime reporting are independent} \]

\[ H_1: \text{Educational level and crime reporting are dependent} \]
Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.

Sampling Distribution = Chi Square Distribution

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

Degrees of freedom = 4 \[ \chi^2 \text{ (critical)} = 9.488 \]

Test Statistic:

Pearson’s Chi – Square values and P – values presented for the three different types of crime in Table 12 above

Making a Decision

With alpha set at 0.05, the critical region begins at \[ \chi^2 \text{ (critical)} = 9.488 \], if Pearson’s Chi – square value for sexual crime (3.387) is less than the \[ \chi^2 \text{ (critical)} = 9.488 \] and a P – value = 0.495 also greater than the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In the case in of theft and violent crime, Pearson’s Chi – square value = 81.289 and 13.272 are both greater than \[ \chi^2 \text{ (critical)} = 9.488 \] and the P – values = 0.000 and 0.013 are both less than 0.05, meaning there is difference in reporting theft and violent crime between the different educational qualification, the difference is significant enough to reject the null hypothesis.

Conclusion

Since H0 has been rejected, this implies that there is a relationship between educational levels and crime reportage in the case of theft and violent crime. Donald Black”s claim that educated people are more likely to report crime than the less educated is true in the case of theft and violent crime but same cannot be said of sexual crime which rejected Black”s claim in this context. Black”s proposition about educational status and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted or rejected wholly in the context of Ghana but can be concluded to mean that it can be true depending on the type of crime as shown in the case of
theft and violent crime. There is evidence in Table 18 which indicates increase in crime reporting rate as levels of education also increases in the case of theft and violent crime.

4.3.4.2 Literacy Levels and Crime Reporting

Individual’s literacy levels are assumed to have an influence on crime reporting. The literacy levels of the study respondents have been cross tabulated with their crime reporting behavior and presented in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17: Respondents Literacy Levels and Crime Reporting Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you or someone else report Crime * literacy Cross Tabulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Chi-Square value = 57.561</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Chi-Square value = 1.201</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Chi-Square value = 8.550</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014*

According to the Table, 10.4 percent of the literate respondents reported theft victimization while only 4.6 percent of the respondents who are not literate reported theft to
the police. Regarding sexual crime, only 4.8 percent of the literate respondents reported their ordeal to the police while 8.3 percent of the not literate respondents reported sexual crime victimization. Violent Crime has to do with assault, attack and threat. The percentage of the literate respondents who reported violent crime victimization is 28.7 which is higher than the 23.1 percent of the not literate respondents who reported same type of crime.

**Hypothesis Testing (Literacy Status and Crime Reporting)**

This is to test Black’s claim that the literate are more likely to report crime than the not literate.

**Stating the Null Hypothesis and the Alternative Hypothesis**

\[ H_0: \text{The two variables (Literacy level and Crime Reporting) are independent} \]

\[ H_1: \text{The two variables (Literacy level and Crime Reporting) are dependent} \]

**Selecting the Sampling Distribution and Establishing the Critical Region.**

Sampling Distribution = Chi Square Distribution

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

Degrees of freedom = 1 \[ X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \]

**Test Statistic:**

Pearson’s Chi – Square values and P – values presented for the three different types of crime in Table 12 above.

**Making a Decision**

With alpha set at 0.05, the critical region begins at \[ X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \], if Pearson’s Chi – square value for sexual crime (1.201) is less than the \[ X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \] and the P – Value = 0.273 which is greater than 0.05, then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In the case of theft and violent crime, Pearson’s Chi – square values = 57.562 and 8.550 respectively are greater than \[ X^2 (\text{critical}) = 3.841 \] and P – values = 0.000 and 0.014 both less than 0.05, means
that the null hypothesis can be rejected in the case of theft and violent crime.

**Conclusion**

Since Ho has not been rejected, this implies that there is no relationship between literacy and crime reportage in the case of sexual crime but same cannot be said of theft and violent crime, which confirms Black’s claim in this context. Black’s proposition about literacy status and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted or rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context but can be concluded to mean that it is true depending on the type of crime as shown in the case with theft and violent crime. The literate reported theft and violent crime significantly more than the not literate. There is evidence in Table 18 of higher crime reporting rates for the two types of crime supporting the theory.

**4.3.4.3 Conclusions on „Culture” and Crime Reporting**

A study by Kuo, et al. (2012) in Taiwan, “using robbery and larceny victims with lower educational attainment may report their offense to the police less than the victims with higher educational attainment”. Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) also tested educational level as the indicator of individual and neighborhood culture to test the proposition that law varies directly with culture. Neither the individual level nor the residential area level (urban or rural) coupled with the relationship between education and reporting to the police as substantial as required by Black's theory. Avakame et al. (1999), in an empirical assessment of Black's theory of behavior of law also concluded that more highly educated people may report crime to the police less contrary to Black’s Theory. This trend receives strong confirmation in the Australian data by Braithwaite and Biles (1980), and there were no individual offense types which provided significant exceptions to the aggregate trend.
Black’s claim that educated people are more likely to report crime than the less educated has tested positive in Ghana in the case of theft and violent crime but same cannot be said of sexual crime which rejected Black’s claim in this context. Black’s proposition about educational status and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted or rejected wholly in the context of Ghana but can be concluded to mean that it can be true depending on the type of crime as shown in the case of theft and violent crime. Theft and violent crime again confirm Black’s claim in this context by the levels of literacy of the individual but contrary in the case of sexual crime. Black’s proposition about literacy status and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted or rejected wholly in the context of Ghana but can be concluded to mean that it is true depending on the type of crime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18: Morphology and Crime Reporting Propositions by Donald Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance or Rejection of Black's Propositions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morphology Variables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors own presentation; 2016*

4.3 Conclusion:

Analyzing the quantitative data from the secondary source, all the demographic characteristics attributed to and required to test Blacks propositions of the Behavior of Law Theory have been obtained. These characteristics which Black described as social life attributes were cross-tabulated with crime reporting and the results were used to test the propositions in the theory that has been used to formulate hypotheses for this study.
Drawing from the qualitative data some factors can be identified to be socio-cultural factors that inhibit crime reporting and hence contribute to the inaccuracy of crime statistics in Ghana. These factors include unsatisfactory police service, lack of evidence for committed crimes, avoidance of ethnic conflict, financial constraints, religious reasons, avoidance of family disgrace (emotionally flavored crime) otherwise known as stigmatization, crime severity, lack of education, access to police service, chieftaincy involvement and community members perception and prejudice and more. These factors no doubt contribute to the inaccurate official crime statistics in Ghana and require a serious effort to curtail such acts in order to improve people’s understanding of crime reporting and its contribution to a peaceful, safe and secured community with reduced acts of crime.
CHAPTER 5

SOCIO-CULTURAL DETERMINANTS AND CRIME REPORTING

5.0 Introduction:

This chapter presents findings from focus group participants on the socio-cultural factors leading to/resulting in some people taking the decision not to report crimes they have experienced or witnessed to the police for the necessary action to be taken. The finding from the FGD”s complements that of the secondary quantitative data used in the previous chapter.

The literature, brings to the fore the socio-demographic and socio-cultural factors that affects crime reporting by elaborating on Black’s Behavior of Law Theory and other literature on socio-cultural factors that inhibit crime reporting. The qualitative data obtained from the fieldwork is analyzed to enrich the discussion and establish other socio-cultural factors that inhibit crime reporting in Ghana. The socio-cultural factors that affect crime statistics has also been elaborated by reviewing works from Fisher et al., Tankebe, Boakye and many others. The reviewed literature suggests that socio-demographic characteristics contribute to crime reporting indirectly while socio-cultural factors have direct adverse effect on crime reporting. This chapter discusses the crimes experienced and analysis the socio-cultural factors for not reporting as obtained from the qualitative data (FGD”s).

5.1 Crime Incidents

Participants in the FGD”s identified four main types of crime which were theft, violence crime, deception and sexual crimes that occurred but were not reported to the police. Participants for the FGD”s were not limited to only the three types of crimes considered in the quantitative data. This is to help explore on the socio-cultural factors for not reporting crimes to the police. The quantitative aspect of this study has been used to establish the
magnitudes of the three selected types of crimes (theft, violence and sexual) that are not reported to the police and respondents demographic characteristics was used to test Black’s Behavior of Law Theory. That aspect of the thesis was not used to explore the socio-cultural factors that influence people’s decision not to report crime to the police. This is necessary because, although crimes are reported all over the country, the Governance, Peace and Security (GPS) module of the Ghana Living Standard Survey round six (GLSS 6) (2014) brings to the fore the existence of the “Dark Figure” in Ghana’s crime statistics. This data suggests that an average of only 14.6 percent of theft, violence and sexual crimes are reported in Ghana, meaning that there is a “Dark Figure” of about 85.4 percent. One study objective is to explore the nature and effects of socio-cultural factors on the “dark figure” in crime statistics. The thesis provides information on the subject matter and adds knowledge to the academic discourse regarding factors that derive the existence of the „Dark Figure” and the applicability of Black’s Behavior of Law Theory in the context of Ghana. The chapter discusses the demographic characteristics of the FGD participants and analyses the FGD’s findings based on the four (4) main types of crime.

5.1.1 Theft Incidents Experienced by the FGD Participants

Of the fifteen (15) theft cases discussed, three (3) were from the Ashanti Region’s group, two (2) from the Eastern Region’s group and remaining ten (10) from the Greater Accra Region’s group discussions. In all the theft cases reported, the victims lost some personal belongings such as mobile phones, televisions, clothes, monies, jewelry and others in the process. There were some dynamics in the forms that the theft took place. Thirteen (13) of the acts were against property only and two (2) were acts against property involving violence or threat to a person. One of the acts against property involving violence or threat
against a person was an armed robbery case that was narrated by Quayetey as it happened to him and his family. Quayetey is a 46 year old male who holds a diploma and works as a politician in the Greater Accra Region. He is married and earns between 5,000.00 – 9,999.00 Ghana Cedis annually. Quayetey narrates his experience as follows:

About 5 years ago I was living in the same apartment with my mother. One midnight while we were fast asleep, we heard a noise from our main door as if it was being forced open by thieves. They succeeded in breaking into my mother’s room and gave warning shots. My mother shouted my name and just as I came out of my room to rescue her, they pointed a gun at me. Then one of them said “My friend, get inside, if you try anything I will shoot you.” I could not do anything because I realized they could hurt me if I tried it. So they started removing clothing and other valuables including money from my mother’s room. They were wearing masks and so you could not even see their faces. They were about six in number and all fully armed. They took away everything that they had access to and was easy to carry away….If this exercise can help the community through any NGO or government to provide a police station for the community, such crimes that require prompt attention could have been dealt with by the police and that would have helped in reducing such crimes. For instance, quite recently I went towards the sea shore and saw that there were some wee smoking gangs hiding around the area. I witnessed one of them stabbing someone near the sea but because of the absence of police in the community, such incidents that require prompt attention cannot be dealt with. The thieves whose buildings have been demolished around Agbogbloshie and Nima have all moved towards the sea shore making living in this area difficult as compared to previous times. Even if we could have security men patrolling the area at night through your study we will be very grateful. Thank you.

The other armed robbery incident was narrated by Boye who was also part of the Greater Accra group. Boye is a 34 year old fisherman who earns between 1,000.00 – 4,999.00 Ghana Cedis annually. He did not have formal education and was cohabiting with a lady with whom he had a child. This is how he described the robbery incident that he experienced with his team of fishermen:

I am a fisherman and I do my fishing in the Weija Lake. There are some Ewe living near the lake and they are fond of always accusing us wrongly. There is a lot of fish in the lake so even our fore fathers used to have their daily bread from the lake but these people behave as if they do not want any other person to fish in the lake with
them. Anytime we get a big catch in the lake, they attack us with arms and accuse us of using poison to kill the fishes, meanwhile they will eat and sell some of those fishes they claim we used poison in catching.

The thirteen (13) other cases which were acts against property only can also be categorized into two groups which includes burglary and theft in the absence of the victim which does not involve breaking in. The number of incidents reported as burglary was ten (10) while the remaining three (3) happened in the absence of the victim without necessarily breaking in. The non-burglary theft cases were reported in the Greater Accra and the Ashanti Region.

Koo is a 59 year old farmer, living in the Ashanti Region who earns between GHC 100.00 – 999.00 annually and a married man who has no formal education in the Ashanti Region. This is how he describes what happened to him:

A very good friend of mine stole my money but looking at the relationship, if I get him arrested people will complain about the fact that I have gotten my own friend to be arrested. He is my childhood friend. And when he was stealing the money my daughter saw him. When I asked him he admitted that he stole the money but had used it. I therefore had good grounds to have him arrested but for the fact that he is my friend I decided to let go.

Another theft from the Greater Accra Region was experienced by 23 year old Sowah, who is a driver’s mate. He explains his experience as follows:

I happen to have gained employment with a mobile phone sales shop. The shop owner sells mobile recharge cards and charges mobile phones for community members at a fee. One day after work, my employer asked me to sleep at the shop but I decided to rather go and sleep in my room and come the next morning. While sleeping in my room, someone came to call me to go and remove his phone for him but I told him the key is not with me. This person told me the shop was not locked and that he cannot enter the shop to take his phone himself and that is the reason why he came to call me. When I went to check, the shop’s lock had been broken and thieves had stolen some phones including two phones that belong to me and one for the customer who came to call me. We went to report at the police station but the
police did not attach any seriousness so we did not follow up the case, the case ended abruptly. I experienced another crime incident that I did not report to the police. I was sleeping one night in a mini bus that I worked in as driver’s mate. I slept in the bus because the driver could not come to call me from my house when it was time for us to start work. I was holding my mobile phone and money when I slept off and by the time I woke up, the phone and the money I was holding was not there. Considering how the incident happened, I was of the view that it was my own carelessness thus did not see the need to report.

The ten remaining cases of theft were all burglary and were reported across the three Regions where the FGDs were conducted. The Greater Accra group reported seven incidents of burglary while Eastern and Ashanti Regions reported 2 and 1 respectively. The most serious notable burglary case reported had been experienced by Clottey a 29 year old married man who lives and work in Accra. He completed secondary school and earns between 100.00 – 4,999.00 Ghana Cedis annually. Clottey had this to say about the incidence of theft that occurred in his household.

I live with my wife but I travel most of the time due to the nature of my job. On three different occasions she has called me to complain about thieves breaking into our room at midnight to steal her mobile phone, money and other valuables. Theft cases are on the rise because of some criminals who were evacuated from Agbogbloshie and Nima area as suggested earlier by participant number 8. I cautioned her to always make sure that all doors are locked before they go to bed but she told me they do lock the doors. On all these occasions, the theft cases have never been reported to the police.

Similarly, Saatso a 57 year old uneducated widow who engages in casual jobs to make a living described the theft she witnessed as follows:

I was living in a house with a co-tenant and one night I was sleeping when I heard a loud sound in his room but he was around so I did not bother to check what was happening. This had happened on two different occasions. On all these occasions, thieves succeeded in breaking into his room. Apparently, my co-tenant did not hear the noise and so the thieves succeeded in stealing his belongings. They came again the second time and it was the same scenario. He travels a lot but each time he is not around, thieves do not come to his room. Sometimes he will be away for a week without informing me, he will lock his door with a padlock anytime he travels. It is
only when he is around rather sleeping in the room with his friends that they come to steal from his room and it surprises me. The third time they came I was wide awake and that was when I got to know they are experienced thieves. They threw the light of a torch light into my room expecting me to respond if I am not sleeping but I did not respond. I was quiet waiting to see what that was meant for. Few minutes after the reflection of the torch light, I heard the sound of someone trying to break into the man’s room and I quickly reflected on the torch light that was thrown into my room to think that it is the thieves who did that. Because I was not sleeping, I shouted thieves and they bolted. When we all came out of our rooms, we realized they had blocked the trap door with a chair. On all these three occasions, the incidence was not reported to the police.

In the Eastern Region, 33 year old Mamle, a JHS graduate who is a single parent and a trader narrated the story of her stolen phone this way:

Someone stole my mobile phone from my room through the window. The thief cut the window net and took the phone away. In fact the phone is very expensive and so I should have reported but I did not. I even suspected some guys around my neighborhood who could have been arrested if I had reported but I still did not report to the police because I realized they fled.

The last thefts case that a participant spoke about in the Ashanti Region and presented in the analyses happened to Kwame. Kwame is a university graduate and a Pastor aged 44 years old man who is married. According to him, he experienced two different theft incidents and he describes it as follows:

I am stranger in this town. Three months after I came to stay here, three boys came to threaten me that they will kill me but I did not know what I have done. When they came the first question they asked was “are you the pastor”? I responded in the affirmative. Fortunately for me I had three hundred Ghana cedis (GHC 300.00) on me so I gave that money to them then they left. I did not go to report because I do not have time. Three months after this incident, On 31st December 2017 after the watch night service, just as I got home, I realized thieves had broken into my room and taken away my flat screen TV and some personal belongings. Since I have not stayed in the town for long and considering the nature of my work as a pastor, I did not want to report for the people in the town to start hating me.
5.1.2 Violent Crime Incidents Experienced by the FGD Participants

There were eleven (11) violent crime incidents discussed in the three (3) FGD’s, three (3) were reported in the Ashanti Region, two (2) from the Eastern Region and six (6) from the Greater Accra Region. Two (2) of these violent crimes involved the use of weapons and occurred in Accra. Incidentally, Kwashie a 26 year old store keeper was the victim in both cases. He narrates his experiences as follows:

I was stabbed in my head with a knife by a woman and her son of my age. The woman and her son came quarreling in front of our store and I asked them to move away from our store with their fight since we were thinking of our plans for the day. The woman turned and asked who was talking, knowing [fully well] that I was the one talking. She held my shirt close to my neck and was squeezing the shirt to my neck. The woman was huge but I asked her what I had done to her to warrant such behavior. While I was trying to struggle with the woman, her son removed a knife from his pocket and stabbed me in the head. I went to the police station with my torn shirt and the blood on me to report. I was given police hospital forms and I was asked to seek treatment and come back. I did not have money on me so I did not go to Korle-Bu teaching hospital as recommended by the police. I decided to visit a private clinic in the community for treatment but since that was not the recommended place to visit as the police directed, I did not go back to the police station after treatment. All the police forms and my torn shirt are in my room as I speak. I did not take them back to the police station.

We have a family house at a different part of the community where my auntie and uncle live. Thieves went to that house at midnight when my uncle was sleeping outside because he complained of heat in the rooms so preferred sleeping outside. My auntie saw the thieves and shouted “thieves.” My uncle upon hearing the shout woke up and was trying to run whether to face the thieves or to escape I am not sure. The thieves stabbed my uncle and he died. The thieves then started running away sensing danger. They entered a lagoon in the area and were not found. So thieves have come to my family house attempting to steal and stabbed my uncle to death in the process. The police did not do much about this story after reporting so no family member went back to the police station.

Another violent crime incident mentioned during the Ashanti Regional FGD was a situation experienced by Christian, a 54 year old married man who works as an ?? . He described the violent crime that he did not report to the police this way:

I had a little misunderstanding with a young man and he slapped me. I really wanted to get him arrested but I did not have the money to report at the police station.
Later, his family members came to me with an apology and I had no option than to accept the apology since I was not in the position to report because of my financial situation then. Besides, I was also thinking about the time wasting at the police station where you will always be asked to come back at a particular time since you have a case at the station.

Pehue is a 48 year old uneducated trader who lives with her husband and children. She shared her ordeal in the Eastern Region that has led to her son’s partial blindness. This is how she narrates the story:

Two years ago, my son went to a nearby community to meet up with his friends. A few minutes after he left, the lights went off and so he decided to return home. On his way back, some young men met him and beat him up mercilessly to the extent that one of his eyes got affected. When he was taken to the hospital, he was transferred to a bigger one and they decided to operate on his eye. Doctors did all that they could but that eye could not be fixed. We were advised to report the case to the police for a possible arrest because the person who caused the fight is still walking freely in this town.

5.1.3 Deception Incidents Experienced by the FGD Participants

There were 6 incidents of deception discussed in the three FGD’s conducted, 3 were reported in the Ashanti Region’s group and the other 3 from the Eastern Region group. Among the deception cases discussed, five (5) led to the loss of money and the other led to the loss of a child. The deception case that led to the loss of a child was experienced by Isaac who is currently not married and lives in the Ashanti Region. Isaac, a 43 year old farmer, narrates his painful ordeal as follows:

I cohabited with a lady and even had a child with her. Four months after the child was born, she claimed I was not the biological father of the child. To add insult to injury, her family told me to calculate the monies I had spent on the child so that they would refund it, but I did not agree to that.

One of the deception cases in the Ashanti Region was narrated by Kyeiwaa, a 48 year old divorcee who trades to take care of her four (4) children.
Four years ago, it was announced at church that any church member whose child had completed school and needed a job, could contact a gentleman for assistance in finding a job for them. My daughter had completed secondary school and I even wanted her to continue but efforts to gaining admission had proved futile. Since she was not getting the opportunity to further her education, I decided to find her a job in the military, which had been her interest. I trusted the man considering the fact that our Reverend Minister introduced him. In order to assist my daughter gets enrolled in the military, the man asked for three thousand Ghana cedis (GHC 3,000.00) which I paid but since then I have not heard from him. I decided to report the case to an FM Station but our Reverend Minister came to the FM station to say he will settle the case at home but he has done nothing about it, the money has still not been paid.

The other story of deception happened in the Eastern Region and was narrated by Kene who is a 52 year old trader who lives with his wife and children. Kene decided to engage in cassava farming and experienced deception that led to the loss of money:

I decided to go into cassava farming in my village two years ago. When I harvested the cassava, there was no market for it and a woman later expressed interest so I showed her the farm and she went to harvest the cassava but this woman has failed to pay me the money involved till date. I reported to the Chief of the village and she was summoned but she still has not paid the money. As at now, I don’t know where to find this woman.

5.1.4 Sexual Crime Incidents Experienced by the FGD Participants

In all the three FGDs, only three 3 sexual crimes were mentioned and these sexual crimes occurred in the Ashanti and the Eastern Regions. The sexual crimes were all reported by the parents of the victims because none of the victims were present for the FGDs. Ankama is a 57 year old married man whose main occupation is farming. Ankama described his daughter’s situation this way:

A guy impregnated my 16 year old daughter and decided to abort the pregnancy by given her some medicine to induce abortion and she nearly died. Fortunately, nothing happened to my daughter and the family of the young man came to me with an apology and promised to take care of her until she is well.
The other cases in the Ashanti Region involved a missing 16 year old girl believed to be hiding in a man”s room. The girl”s mother, Kyerewaa, a 35 year old trader who narrated her daughter”s situation as follows:

My 16 year old daughter who is in JHS 2 has left home for the past one month and she is believed to be hiding in a man”s room. Her friends hinted me about where she was hiding but I am not sure whether her friends also made her aware I have been told, because when we went to that house she was not found.

The other sexual crime mentioned in the FGD occurred in the Eastern Region and was described by Jack. Jack is a 54 year old farmer who lives with his wife and children. This is what he had to say:

I have a general comments and it is about the way young girls in this community get involved in sexual intercourse that ends up getting them pregnant at an age that is illegal in this country. This makes most first born children in the community bastards as a result of the fact that both the mother of the child and the father are not matured enough to be responsible especially the fathers. This is a very worrying situation in this community that really needs attention.

My own daughter who was 16 years was impregnated by a young man who was irresponsible. I decided to report to elders of the community who instructed him to do what is right by being responsible for the pregnancy but he denied being responsible and failed to take care of my daughter.

5.2 Socio-cultural reasons for not reporting crimes to the police

The secondary data considered for this study (GLSS – 6) Governance, Peace and Security (GPS) module gathered information regarding the main reasons why victims to criminality will decide not to alert the police about their victimization. These reasons were collected for only sexual and violent crimes. Tables 19 and 20 bring to the fore socio-cultural reasons that dominated respondents” answers regarding their decision not to report crime to the police from the secondary data source. The reason cited by most of the respondents for
not reporting sexual crime is that the offence was not serious enough. This was mentioned by 46.0 percent of the respondents. Other reasons cited such as (solved by myself) or (offender known by victim) constituted 30.0 percent and 10.0 percent respectively. Some other reasons cited by few of the respondents included (solved by the chiefs 2.0 percent); (time wasting 2.0 percent) and (fear of stigmatization given by 1.0 percent). Table 20 presents other reasons specified for both sexual and violent crimes.

**Table 19: Respondents’ Reasons for not Reporting Crime to the Police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Sexual Crimes</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not serious enough</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solved it myself/perpetrator known to me</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family solved it</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate for police</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solved by chiefs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police could do nothing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police won't do anything about it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear/dislike for the police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time wasting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported to other agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't dare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of stigmatization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014*
Table 20: Reasons for not Reporting Crime to the Police – Other Specified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for not Reporting Crime - Specified</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not have money to report</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culprits had escaped</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to police too far</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not my problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported to a pastor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Neighbors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advised by colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a Christian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending to a patient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because she was drunk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know injury will be serious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of dismissal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender was a policeman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrators lynched</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police came on patrols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run for your life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solved by my pastor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The victim reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was stopped by my husband</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSS; GLSS 6 Data Set 2014*

These factors can therefore be said to be the nature of the socio-cultural factors that affects the accuracy of official crime statistics in Ghana. The second objective of this study is to identify the specific nature and effects of the socio-cultural factors that affect crime statistics in Ghana. There were nine (9) socio-cultural factors that participants in the three (3) FGDs presented as their reasons for deciding not to report crimes they have experienced to the police. Five (5) of these factors Financial difficulties, Police Ineffectiveness/ Inefficiency, Third Party Involvement, Time wasting and Victim – Offender Relationship were cited in all
the four (4) crime types that were discussed by the FGD participants. The nature of these factors can be explored from the table below. The other four (4) factors (Lack of Evidence, Police Offender Relationship, Avoiding Conflict and Not Serious Enough) were all cited as reasons for not reporting theft while police offender relationship was also cited by one participant for not reporting a violent crime experienced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Types</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>Violence Crimes</th>
<th>Deceptions</th>
<th>Defilements</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Ineffectiveness/Inefficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time wasting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim – Offender Relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Evidence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Offender Relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Conflict with community members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Serious Enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study Data Set 2016

5.2.1 Socio-cultural reasons for not reporting incidents of theft to the police

All the nine socio-cultural factors that emerged from the discussions were mentioned as reasons for not reporting theft cases to the police. The most common socio-cultural factor cited for not reporting theft to the police from the three (3) FGD’s was lack of evidence which was mentioned by seven (7) participants. Five (5) participants noted the lack of time or time wasting as the major reason for not reporting cases of theft. Police inefficiency/ineffectiveness and police offender relationship were cited by four (4) and three (3) participants respectively. This is confirmed in a study conducted by Tankebe (2009) in Ghana which revealed that alienation of the police by many Ghanaians is characterized by
attributes such as abuse, violence, intimidation and wide spread corruption which characterized the service during the times of colonial and military rule and which the police service is not able to move away even during this democratic dispensation. Financial difficulties was mentioned by two (2) participants while the remaining socio-cultural factors thus third party involvement, victim-offender relationship avoiding conflict and crime not serious enough were all mentioned by one participant in each case. Kwame who is a 44 years old university graduate and a Pastor narrated the reasons why he could not report the two different theft incidents he experience:

At the time the incident happened, I had a programme that I needed to attend in Accra so I did not have the time to think of reporting to the police. Also, some elders advised that since I went to church and this happened, I should just forget about it. Besides, I live in this house with a guy, since I came to the town this guy has been at loggerheads with me. If I should report the case to the police he will be the first suspect and arresting him will bring about more tension and hatred. I want peace to prevail so I decided not to report. Reporting will also spread a bad name about me as a pastor. The first time I experienced theft in the town, I announced at the information center that if I don’t find my things something will happen and they was bad name about me all over town that why should a pastor say that. I have realized that these are temptation that could bring my reputation down if I report to the police. So I just decided to forget about it.

Sampson was in the Eastern Region’s group, he is a 49 years old farmer who generalized the crime situation in the town and spoke about the reasons why he will not report all the numerous theft experiences he has faced:

I also have a general problem about high crime rate in our community. There are a number of wee smoking gags and their hide out in our community, as the saying goes, the devil finds job for idle hands so my believe is that the situation is as a result of lack of employment opportunities for the youth in the community. This situation brings about several crime cases such as theft, violence and sexual crimes which are mostly not reported to the police. No member of the community takes the pain to report because even if you do they will be freed few days after arrest and if they get to know that you caused their arrest you will be in their bad books and they can harm you. I think when there is a police station of even a police post with well-resourced police personnel, the increased crime situation which makes our community a flash point can be reduced. I have had several experiences of theft but in almost all situations, the crime happens if my absence and so you don’t get to see the offender
to be able to report to the police. I have instances where my radio was stolen, on another occasion my wallet was stolen and on a different occasion my personal belongings. I can go on and on but in all these cases, I did not report to the police station”. The most recent one, thieves broke into my son”s room and took away all his personal belongings. My son is a polytechnic student and that is how come he is not around. But since I did not see those who did that, I have no basis to go and report to the police.

Quayetey from the Greater Accra Region is a 46 year old male who holds a diploma and works as a politician described the reasons why he will not go to the police station with any type of crime he will experience.

In most instances when you report a case to the police, they will demand money from you before there will from you to the crime scene or arrest the culprit. As some who protects the people who are paid, who do they demand money or request you the poor person to hire a taxi before they will follow you. I am even planning to take them on one day, they are not helping us at all, and why will police charge you an amount that if you don”t pay they never follow you. When you report an emergency situation to the police, they will not add any urgency to the case, they will delay to the extent even if they will go to the crime scene, and by the time they get there it will be no more worth it.

5.2.2 Socio-cultural reasons for not reporting violent crimes to the police

Six (6) socio-cultural factors emerged as the reasons for not reporting violence crimes to the police. The most commonly cited reason for not reporting violent crimes was financial difficulties cited by eight (8) participants across the three Regions where the discussions were held. Pehue, a participant in the FGD in the Eastern Region had this to say; “I said earlier that my husband said he does not have money to hire a lawyer and follow up the case so he insisted that we discontinue the case and so we did not go back to the police and my son”s one eye has been spoilt for free.” Grace who participated in the FGD in the Ashanti Region also noted:

I am someone who is really going through hardship, even when I went and the young man who beat up my son had been arrested, I could not have arrested him if not because he had been arrested already because I don”t have money. Since the young man was granted bail, he has been on the run and I needed to report to get him
rearrested but because I do not have money I have not made any attempt. I have vowed never to set my foot at any police station again in my life because I cannot have that money and time to go there. If I had money, the Assembly man who bailed the young man could have been reported. But I did not go back to the police station because of money.

Police inefficiency/ineffectiveness and police offender relationship were cited by four (4) and one (1) participants respectively. Third party involvement also featured strongly as cited by three (3) participants as their reason for not reporting violence crimes. Victim-offender relationship and time wasting were both mentioned by one participant in each case. The following three quotations have been selected from the three regions. Pehue was in the Eastern Region’s group; Grace participated in Ashanti region, and Adjetey from the Greater Accra Region.

The fact that I work for his father who I have reported his son to, I think it will mean I have disrespected the man if I should report to the police. The man also asked me to exercise patience but all efforts by the man to talk to his son proved futile but I still did not report because of the respect I have for his father. In the second case involving my wife, the man who works with the guy who pushed my wife came to apologize and that is why I did not report to the police”.

5.2.3 Socio-cultural reasons for not reporting deception to the police

Five (5) socio-cultural factors emerged as the reasons for not reporting deception which includes fraud and break of trust that are not reported to the police. Third party involvement was the reason cited most by six (6) participants as their reason for not reporting deception. Police inefficiency/ineffectiveness was mentioned by four (4) of the participants as confirmed by Skogan (1994) and MacDonald (2001) from the BCS that victims who have received positive reporting results from the police were more likely to go back to the police with subsequent victimization. Victim-offender relationship and financial difficulties were the reasons that two (2) participants used in resolving issues of deception.
and one participant cited time wasting as the reason for not reporting deception to the police.

Narrating the reasons why she will not report the case of deception she experienced, Kyeiwaa, a 48 year old divorcee who trades to take care of her four (4) children had this to say.

I did not go to report to the police because the case happened at church so I reporting would mean disgracing my own church as my pastor will also be involved for allowing the fraudster to use him. If we had reported our pastor could have been arrested or sacked and it is only the pastor who can really tell the whereabouts of this fraudster. If not for this gathering, I had decided to call the Rev. Minister today to tell him that if the man will not come and pay the money then I am resorting to spiritual means. As for police station I will not go to waste money and my time when I know they will not be fair in handling the case. I cannot suffer and raise GHS 3,000.00 as a lady for someone to just defraud me and escape while Antoa shrine exists. I even called the Pastor but he did not pick my call just before I came here, let me show it to you, have you seen that I also missed his call; I was cooking when he called. I will call again and tell him that I have decided to resort to spiritual means to get my money back.

Isaac, a 43 year old farmer who lost his child as a result of a woman deceiving her also narrates the reasons why he did not report his painful ordeal to the police:

The two families met and tried to resolve the issue. At that meeting, the lady’s family proposed that I should mention the amount I spent in taking care of the pregnancy and four months after delivery so that they will pay me but considering the pain of losing the child I decided to let go of the money. So I wanted to report to the police but my family advised that it is not necessary since it involves a human being. Even if I send any case to the police station the case will never be treated to your satisfaction. I do not trust the police and even their judgment so I will not go to the police station.

In the Eastern Region, Kene also spoke about why he will not report the deception case he experienced to the police.

I rather thought the Chief who is responsible for our wellbeing will be the best to handle such a case since I don’t trust the police and that is the main reason why I decided to report to the Chief rather but I still did not get my money. The Chief did his bit though, he invited the woman and she came to promise that she was going to pay the money at a specific date agreed after she admitted that she did harvest my
cassava, since then, the whereabouts of the woman is not known. So my main reason for not reporting to the police is the fact that I thought the case could be solved by the Chief. Whenever you go to the police station to make complain there will vehemently demand money from you and if you are not able to provide they will not treat your case with any seriousness. They will tell you they cannot go with you so find people to arrest the offender and bring him or her to the station. When we consider all these frustrations, we decide to solve crime cases at home rather than to report to the police mandated to do that. In case your family member gets into the hands of the police and you go to bail the person, they will openly tell you how much you need to pay before you will be allowed. So the question is they not being paid for the work they do?

5.2.4 Socio-cultural reasons for not reporting sexual offences to the police

The three sexual crimes discussed in the FGDs by participants mentioned Five (5) socio-cultural factors as the reasons for not reporting those defilement cases to the police. Third party involvement, financial difficulties and victim-offender relationship were cited by two (2) participants in each case as their reasons for not reporting sexual offenses to the police. Time wasting and Police inefficiency/ineffectiveness was mentioned by one (1) participant in each case as the reason for not reporting to the police. All the three sexual offense cases were reported by parents of the victims. Kyeiwaa, Anakma and Jack described their reasons for not reporting the sexual ordeals their daughters experienced to the police respectively. “If I should report the case to the police now, you will have to pay money, secondly, they will ask me to hire a vehicle for them to come and look for my daughter meanwhile I do not have that kind of money” Ankama, “The offender and the family came to apologize and promised that they will take care of my daughter until she recovers fully”.

The flash points of criminal acts in this community are very alarming. There are several wee smoking hideouts where they stay and engage in all kinds of criminal acts like stealing and violent crimes. These are joints that are known to all members of the community including the police but no one is doing anything about it and the situation is really that bad.
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5.3 Conclusion:

In confirming all these reasons that emanated from the secondary data, the primary information which was solicited from three (3) FGD’s at Ashanti region, Greater Accra and Eastern Region’s turns to confirm some of these socio-cultural factors. The reasons mentioned by participants of the FGD’s as their reasons for not reporting violent crime such as attack, assault or threat and sexual offenses included Financial difficulties, Police Ineffectiveness/ Inefficiency, Third Party Involvement, Time wasting and Victim – Offender Relationship. These same reasons also emerged as cited by respondents in the quantitative study as reasons for not reporting violent and sexual crimes. Examples are; Not serious enough Solved, it myself/perpetrator known to me, My family solved it, Inappropriate for police, Solved by chiefs Police could do nothing, Police won't do anything about it, Fear/dislike for the police, Time wasting and Reported to other agencies. All these factors feed into the broader socio-cultural themes that emerged from the FGD’s. Other non-pre-coded responses provided by the respondents for both violent and sexual crimes are similar to the responses in the Table above. These included reasons such as not having money to report, culprits had escaped, distance to police too far, reported to a pastor and others as shown in the table above.
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0 Summary:

For every society to be able to prevent the occurrence of crime and to promote peaceful coexistence, the statistics on the different types of crime committed must be properly gathered and documented to aid policy formulation towards crime prevention. “Crime statistics may be defined according to Mannheim as classified and tabulated facts relating to crime compiled either officially or by private investigators” (Mannheim 1965 cited in Abotchie 2008: 11). The status and availability of crime statistics is very crucial for the work of crime prevention and management agencies in every society. In Ghana, crime statistics gathered from official records and victimization surveys indicate a discrepancy between the two forms of statistics. This study attempted to explore the nature and effects of the socio-demographic and socio-cultural factors on the “dark figure” of crime statistics in Ghana.

Literature on the subject brings to the fore human socio-demographic characteristics and socio-cultural factors that relates to crime reporting. Donald Black (1976) propounded the Behavior of Law Theory that postulates five different dimensions of social life which include stratification, morphology, culture, organization and social control and how it contributes to crime statistics. Literature that discusses the theory excludes a test on the African continent but has been tested in other parts of the world such as US, Australia and Taiwan. The results obtained in those studies could not fully support or debase Black’s assertions of the different social dimensions and its contribution to the quantity of law. The theory requires intensive investigation in other parts of the world such as Africa. Using data
from the country-wide Ghana Living Standard Survey round six (GLSS 6) which includes a victimization survey component the theory has been tested in this context by this study. The socio-cultural factors that inhibit crime reporting have been teased out from three FGD’s considering the reasons provided by the quantitative secondary data for not reporting crimes to the police as the basis.

As per the articles reviewed, the theory has received divergent propositions from empirical testing from different context and space. None of the tests conducted based on the theory has so far rejected the theory in totality. The stratification, morphology and cultural components were partially supported by three of the articles Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979), Braithwaite and Biles (1980) and Avakame et al. (1999) and were fully supported by Kuo et al., (2012). “It was also found that the severity of infraction was positively related to crime reporting” and not just about the person’s status as per the social life dimensions discussed. This implies that other socio-cultural factors also have a role to play in crime reporting and crime statistics. All the evidence established to support or disprove Black’s Behavior of Law Theory requires further research in other parts of Africa.

This study has also established similar divergence, testing Black’s propositions on stratification, morphology and culture against three major crime types such as theft, sexual and violent crime in the context of Ghana. The study has established that the “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is significantly high such that the rate is more than 50 percent in all the three types of crimes selected for this study. The implication is that more than 50 percent of Ghanaians who are victimized criminally in theft, sexual and violent crime do not report their victimization to the police. The average percentage of Ghanaians according to the study who reported their victimization within the period of the study across all the three crime types is 14.6 percent, meaning that as much as 85.4 percent of Ghanaians
who are victimized fail to report their ordeals to the police.

The specific nature of the socio-cultural factors that affect crime statistics in Ghana emanates from the specified reasons why respondents will not report crime to the police. These factors include Financial difficulties, Police Ineffectiveness/Inefficiency, Third Party Involvement, Time wasting and Victim–Offender Relationship. These factors were cited as reasons for not reporting all the four (4) crime types that emanated from the FGDs. The quantitative data also confirms some of these established factors such as crime not serious enough, Solved it myself/perpetrator known to me, My family solved it, Inappropriate for police, Solved by chiefs, Police could do nothing, Police won't do anything about it, Fear/dislike for the police, Time wasting and Reported to other agencies. The other identified socio-cultural factors that were cited by some crime victims are Lack of Evidence, Police Offender Relationship, Avoiding Conflict and Not Serious Enough. With the quantitative studies, other reasons such as unsatisfactory police service (institutional lapses), lack of evidence for a committed crime, avoidance of ethnic conflict, financial constraints, religious reasons, avoidance of family disgrace, crime severity, lack of education, access to police service, chieftaincy involvement and community members were also mentioned.

All three stratification variables: age, sex and income could not be confirmed to play a role in sexual crime reporting. In the case of theft, age was unimportant and in the case of violent crime sex was insignificant. On the other hand, stratification variables such as sex and income confirmed Black’s propositions relative to theft and age and income also confirmed the propositions relative to violent crime. Black’s claim that the married are more likely to report crime than the unmarried have tested otherwise in the case Ghana for all three crime types theft, violent and sexual crime. Blacks claim that employed people report crime more than the unemployed has also tested false in all the three crime types’ theft, sexual and violent
crime. The morphological proposition by Black using marital and employment status as his bases has similarly proven false in this study. Further, Black’s claim that educated people are more likely to report crime than the less educated has tested positive in Ghana in the case of theft and violent crime but tested negative for sexual crimes. This means that educational status and crime reporting can therefore not be accepted or rejected wholly in the Ghanaian context.

6.1 Conclusions

This study set itself three main objectives relating to the factors that contribute to the inaccuracy of official Crime Statistics in Ghana. These objectives are to establish (a) the level of the “Dark Figure” in Ghana’s official crime statistics (b) to identify the specific nature of the socio-cultural factors that affect crime statistics in Ghana and (c) ascertain the extent to which Black’s Behavior of Law Theory can be confirmed in Ghana. The study used quantitative and qualitative methods of social research and concluded on all three objectives and further explored the specific nature of the socio-cultural factors that affect crime statistics using FGD’s. The relevant conclusions drawn to each of these objectives are the following:

1. With reference to the first objective, the study has concluded that the “Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is significantly high such that the rate is more than 50 percent in all the three types of crimes selected for this study. The implication is that more than 50 percent of Ghanaians who are victimized criminally in theft, sexual and violent crime do not report their victimization to the police. The average percentage of Ghanaians, according to the study, who reported their victimization within the study period across all the three crime types, is 14.6 percent, meaning, as high as 85.4 percent of Ghanaians who are victimized fail to report their ordeal to the police.
2. The study identified with reference to the second objective that the specific socio-cultural factors that influence people’s decision not to report crime in the Ghanaian society include financial difficulties, police ineffectiveness/inefficiency, third party involvement, time wasting and victim – offender relationship, lack of evidence, police offender relationship, avoiding conflict and not serious enough. These factors confirm the reason cited for not reporting crimes in the quantitative data which is a secondary data.

3. Finally, with reference to my first objective, Black’s proposition in the Behavior of Law Theory has been shown by this study to have mixed results which means that the theory cannot be wholly rejected or accepted based on the data in Ghana. Some of the propositions turned out to be true and others proved false. The implication of this conclusion is that the theory needs further testing in other parts of the world, or alternatively the theory has to be modified based on the cumulative results obtained from studies carried out so far.

6.2 Recommendations:

The findings from the study have significant implications for Ghana and the criminal justice system as a whole. The criminal justice system needs to incorporate all the planned and unplanned processes by which individuals and groups are taught, persuaded or coerced to conform to the laws of the land as recommended by Roucek (1947). The means by which this can be achieved should include public education on the critical importance of accurate crime statistics for crime control; the threat to penalize those who willfully conceal information about known crimes and the institutionalization of rewards for those who report serious or emotionally flavored crimes. The police should then act responsibly to ensure the accurate tabulation of all reported crimes into the uniform crime report. These records are to be used by the criminal justice system in the quest to attaining a peaceful, safe and secured
environment for residents in all communities. As concluded by this study, the „Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics is extremely high and renders the crime statistics significantly inaccurate. With reference to the specific socio-cultural factors that contribute to the high rate of the „Dark Figure” in Ghana’s crime statistics, the following recommendations are provided;

1. There should be routine crime victimization surveys by the Ghana Statistical Service to serve as a monitoring and evaluation tool in assessing the effort to reduce the „Dark Figure” rate in Ghana’s official crime statistics.

2. The teaching, persuasion and coercion functions of social control agencies needs proper planning and implementation by these security agencies to enable them achieve high rates of conformity among residents of communities in Ghana.

3. The identified socio-cultural factors and the discussions on Black’s Behavior of Law Theory must be considered in any attempt to strategically improve the criminal justice system in Ghana by the criminal justice system.

4. The criminal justice system should institutionalize policies that will inspire positive attitudes, trust and confidence among residents to improve their perception of the justice system positively increasing satisfaction, trust and confidence in the entire system.

5. The criminal justice system should be provided the necessary resources and logistics to carry out their responsibilities effectively and efficiently.
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APENDIX A: QUANTITATIVE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

Questionnaire on the Study of the Socio-cultural Determinants of Inaccurate Official Crime Statistics in Ghana

Introduction

This questionnaire is being used to seek information on the above subject. Although crimes are reported all over the country, the Ghana Living Standard Survey round six (GLSS 6) (2014) victimization survey brings to fore the existence of the “Dark Figure” in Ghana’s crime statistics. The study, socio-cultural determinants of inaccurate official crime statistics in Ghana objects to explore the nature and effects of socio-cultural factors on the “dark figure” in crime statistics and using these established bases to test the propositions of Donald Black’s Behavior of Law Theory in the context of Ghana. The study will provide information on the subject matter and add knowledge to the academic discourse regarding the applicability of Black’s Behavior of Law Theory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SURVEY INFORMATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGION: ........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.: ...........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD: ....................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD: ........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONDENT'S CONTACT(S): ...............................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME STARTED: .......................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSEHOLD ROSTER

Please, I would like to make a complete list of all the people who
usually live and eat together in this household including visitors who
spent the previous night.

1. First, I would like to have the names of the head of household, his
wife(s) or husband and children

2. Please give me the names of any other persons related to the head
of household or to his wife/her husband who usually live and eat
here.

3. Please give me the names of any other persons not related to the
head of household or to his/her spouse who usually live and eat
together here.

4. Please give me names of other persons not now present but who
normally live and eat here.

Now I would like to have some information about each of the
persons on the list.
### SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td><strong>What is the relationship of (NAME) to head of household?</strong></td>
<td><strong>How old is (NAME)?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What is (NAME’S) present marital status?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does (NAME’S) spouse live in this household?</strong></td>
<td><strong>To which ethnic group(s) does (NAME) belong?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ID</strong></td>
<td><strong>Head</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGE IN COMPLETED YEARS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Male</strong>.1</td>
<td><strong>Spouse (Wife/Husband)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Consensual Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Female</strong>.2</td>
<td><strong>Child (Son/daughter)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Separated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grandchild</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Divorced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parent/Parent-in-law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Widowed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Son/ Daughter-in-law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other relative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Adopted/Foster/step child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Househelp</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-relative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other (specify)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td><strong>What is (NAME’S) present marital status?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Consensual Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Separated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Divorced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Widowed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE IN COMPLETED YEARS (IF LESS THAN 12 YEARS OLD >>7)**

**12 years or older**

**13**

**14**

**15**

**16**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has (NAME) ever attended school?</td>
<td>Yes....1 (&gt;&gt;3) No......2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is/was the main reason why (NAME) has never attended school?</td>
<td>Too young ......................01 Disabled/ illness ......................02 No school / school too far ..03 Cannot afford schooling .......04 Family did not allow schooling ..................05 Not interested in school ......06 Education not considered valuable .................07 School not safe ..............08 To learn a job ...............09 To work for pay ..........10 To work as unpaid worker in family business/farm ....11 Help at home with household chores ....12 Other ......................13 (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What was the highest educational qualification (certificate) attained?</td>
<td>None ......................00 JSS/JHS/Middle ..............01 Secondary/SSS/SHS/Voc/ Tech/Comm ..............02 Certificate/Diploma ..........03 Tertiary(Degree/Post graduate) ..............04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Can (NAME) read a phrase/ sentence in English or French?</td>
<td>Yes English.....1 Yes French.....2 Yes both ......3 No ..........4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can (NAME) write a sentence in English/ French?</td>
<td>Yes English.....1 Yes French.....2 Yes both ......3 No ..........4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In what Ghanaian language can (NAME) do written calculations?</td>
<td>None ......................1 Twi/Fanti ..............2 Ewe ..............3 Ga-Dangme ..............4 Dagbani ..............5 Frafra/Grusi ..............6 Nzema ..............7 Wali/Dagari ..............8 Other (specify) ..............9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SECTION 2: EDUCATION AND LITERACY CHARACTERISTICS: ALL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 18 YEARS OR OLDER**

---

**University of Ghana  http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh**
## SECTION 3: EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME: ALL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 18 YEARS OR OLDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did (NAME) do any work for pay, profit, family gain or did (NAME) produce anything for barter or home use during the past 12 months (Including Apprentices)</td>
<td>During the past 12 months, how many jobs did (NAME) do/have altogether?</td>
<td>During the past 12 months, what were the main tasks and duties in the job (NAME) spent most of his/her time on? describe the main job/task (NAME) was performing e.g. carrying bricks; mixing baking flour; harvesting maize; etc</td>
<td>How long has (NAME) been doing this work altogether?</td>
<td>To what extent is (NAME) satisfied with his/her job? (Read out responses below)</td>
<td>Do you believe that in the next 12 months (NAME) would be able to keep his/her main job?</td>
<td>When (NAME) started this work was there a contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied........1</td>
<td>Very likely........1</td>
<td>Yes written.....1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No......2 (&gt;&gt; 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied........2</td>
<td>Likely, but not Certain ........2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Unsatisfied.....3</td>
<td>Not likely........3</td>
<td>Oral/verbal…2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not satisfied........4</td>
<td>Do not know........4</td>
<td>No...............3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NUMBER OF JOBS

<p>| 01 |   |   |
| 02 |   |   |
| 03 |   |   |
| 04 |   |   |
| 05 |   |   |
| 06 |   |   |
| 07 |   |   |
| 08 |   |   |
| 09 |   |   |
| 10 |   |   |
| 11 |   |   |
| 12 |   |   |
| 13 |   |   |
| 14 |   |   |
| 15 |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M E M B E R I D</th>
<th>CODES FOR QUESTION 9</th>
<th>CODES FOR QUESTION 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 In what sector was (NAME) mainly working?</td>
<td>A paid employee.............01</td>
<td>Government sector:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFER TO CODE</td>
<td>Non-Agric Self employed</td>
<td>Civil Service............01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With employees........02</td>
<td>Other Public Service........02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without employees.....03</td>
<td>Parastatals....................03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing family worker..04</td>
<td>NGOs (local &amp; International).04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agric Self employed</td>
<td>Cooperatives....................05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With employees..........05</td>
<td>Inter. Organ./Diplomatic Mission..05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without employees....06</td>
<td>Private Sector Formal (incl. paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing family worker.07</td>
<td>Apprentices.................07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agric Business...........................09</td>
<td>Private Sector Informal..........08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other(specify)..........................10</td>
<td>Agric. Business....................09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; 13</td>
<td>Other(specify)..................11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Has (NAME) received or will (NAME) receive money for this work?</td>
<td>Has (NAME) made any effort during the past 12 months to find work or start own business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, received……1 Yes, yet to receive...2 No...............3 (&gt;&gt; 13)</td>
<td>Yes....1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.............1 (&gt;&gt; 16)</td>
<td>No....2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 What is the amount (incl. any bonuses, commissions, allowances or tips) received for all work done?</td>
<td>Was (NAME) available for work during the past 12 months if there had been an opportunity to work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Include remittances)</td>
<td>Yes....1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No....2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; SECTION 4</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; SECTION 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 What is the value of the goods or services provided by employer and or consumption of own produce? (Include remittances)</td>
<td>Has (NAME) not available for work during the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In school...............01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 AMOUNT GHȼ</td>
<td>TIME UNIT</td>
<td>AMOUNT GHȼ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIME UNIT**

- Daily......................1
- Weekly......................2
- Fortnightly................3
- Monthly....................4
- Quarterly...................5
- Yearly.....................6
Table 1: Names of household members 18+ years (circle the rank of the selected respondent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name from Household list</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Kish grid for selecting eligible respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last digit of household number</th>
<th>Total number of eligible members in the household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART A: THEFT, ROBBERY AND BURGLARY

1. Over the past five years (since 2010) did anyone steal or try to steal anything from you or other members of your household?
   - Yes, myself: [ ]
   - Yes, a member of my household: [ ]
   - No: [ ]  (PART B)
   - Don’t know: [ ]  (PART B)

2. Sex of victim
   - Male: [ ]
   - Female: [ ]

3. How many times has this happened (since 2010)?
   - NUMBER

4. The last time (since 2010) that the incident occurred, where did it happen?
   - At home: [ ]
   - Neighborhood: [ ]
   - Someone else’s home: [ ]
   - Elsewhere in the town: [ ]
   - At the workplace: [ ]
   - Bush/Farm: [ ]
   - Market/Shopping center: [ ]
   - Filling station: [ ]
   - Public/private car park: [ ]
   - Lorry station/bus stop: [ ]
   - Bank: [ ]
   - On a highway: [ ]
   - In a vehicle: [ ]
   - Police station: [ ]
   - Religious center: [ ]
   - Elsewhere in the country: [ ]
   - Abroad: [ ]

5. The last time (since 2010) that this happened, was any member of your household intimidated, threatened, assaulted, etc. In other words, would you describe the situation as robbery?
   - Yes: [ ]
   - No: [ ]
   - Don’t know: [ ]  (PART B)

6. Was the weapon actually used?
   - Yes: [ ]
   - No: [ ]
   - Don’t know: [ ]

7. The last time (since 2010) that this happened did anyone actually get into your property without permission and stole or tried to steal something?
   - Yes: [ ]
   - No: [ ]

8. The last time (since 2010) that this happened was any item actually stolen?
   - Yes: [ ]
   - No: [ ]  (PART B)
   - Don’t know: [ ]  (PART B)

9. The last time (since 2010) that this happened were the stolen items retrieved?
   - Yes, all: [ ]
   - Yes, some: [ ]
   - No: [ ]
   - Don’t know: [ ]

10. Are such incidences (theft, robbery and burglary) common in your community?
    - Very common: [ ]
    - Common: [ ]
    - Not common: [ ]

11. The last time (since 2010) that this happened, did you or anyone else report the incident to the Police?
    - Yes: [ ]
    - No: [ ]
    - Don’t know: [ ]

12. What was the main reason why you or anyone else did not report the incident to the police?
    - Not serious enough: [ ]
    - Solved it myself/perpetrator known to me: [ ]
    - My family solved it: [ ]
    - Inappropriate for police: [ ]
    - Solved by chiefs/elders/tradition: [ ]
    - Reported to other public/private agencies: [ ]
    - Police could do nothing/lack of proof: [ ]
    - Police won't do anything about it: [ ]
    - Fear/dislike police/avoid police: [ ]
    - Time wasting: [ ]
    - Didn't dare (for fear of reprisal): [ ]
    - Fear of stigmatization: [ ]
    - Other (Specify): [ ]

13. What was the main reason for reporting the incident to the police?
    - It was a crime: [ ]
    - Wanted offender punished: [ ]
    - To get help: [ ]
    - To get compensation: [ ]
    - To stop such crime: [ ]
    - Other(specify): [ ]

14. On the whole, were you or the reporter of this incident satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
    - Yes: [ ]
    - No: [ ]

15. Why were you or the reporter not satisfied with the way the police handled the case?

16. Considering how the police handled the case, would you still go back to the police to report
Police didn’t do enough …………1
Police not interested in the case………2
Couldn’t find offender………………3
Didn’t keep me properly informed …..4
Didn’t treat me decently/were impolite .6
Were slow to arrive …………………7
Were corrupt ........................8
Don’t know why .........................9
Other (Specify ) ........................10

PART C: SEXUAL OFFENCES

1. People sometimes grab, touch or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way. This can happen at home, at the market, in the street, at school, on public transport or at the work place. During the past five years (since 2010) has anyone done this to you?

Yes…………………1 (> 3)
No………………..2

2. Apart from you, has any other member of your household been sexually offended / assaulted in the past five years (since 2010)?

Yes………………1
No………………..2
Don't know………..3

3. Sex of victim

Male……...1
Female…...2

4. How many times has this happened in the past 12 months?

NUMBER

5. The last time (since 2010), did you know at least one offender by name or by face?

Known by name,.................1
Known by face only..............2
Did not see offender(s).........3
No, did not know offender(s)...4

6. The last time (since 2010), this happened to you, where did this happen?

At home ....................01
In the neighborhood ..02
At the workplace ...........03
Elsewhere in town/city ....04
Elsewhere in the country...05
On a highway..................06
In a vehicle....................07
In the bush....................08
Abroad ..........................09

7. The person that did this to you how was he/she related to you?

Spouse/partner ..............01
Ex-spouse/partner ..........02
Boy/girlfriend ...............03
Ex-boy/girlfriend ..........04
Parent(s) .....................05
Other relative ...............06
Friend(s) ......................07
Schoolmate (s)...............08
Boss at workplace ..........09
Colleague at workplace ....10
Subordinate at workplace ..11
Did not know person .......12
Did not see person ..........13
Other (Specify) .............14
Refused to say ...............15
Other (specify) .............16

8. The last time (since 2010), did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?

Yes......................1(>10)
No......................2

9. What was the main reason why you or anyone else did not report the incident to the police?

Not serious enough............01
Solved it myself/perpetrator known to me…02
My family solved it...............03
Inappropriate for police/police not.........04
Solved by chiefs/elders/traditional ……05
Reported to other public/private agencies…06
Police could do nothing/lack of proof……...07
Police won't do anything about it………...08
Fear/dislike of the police/avoid police....09
Time wasting ..................10
Didn't dare (for fear of reprisal) .........11
Fear of stigmatization .............12
Other (Specify) ...............13
Don't know.......................14

10. What was the main reason for reporting the incident to the police?

It was a crime ...................1
Wanted offender punished ......2
To get help .....................3
To get compensation ..........4

11. Why would you or why would you not go back the police?

12. Why were you or the reporter not satisfied with the way the police handled the case?

Police didn’t do enough ............1
Police not interested in the case ....2
Couldn’t find offender ..........3
PART C: ATTACK, ASSAULT, THREAT

1. During the past five years (since 2010), have you or a member of your household/relative or someone you know been attacked, assaulted or threatened by someone in a way that really frightened you, him/her either at home or at your workplace or elsewhere such as at school, in a vehicle, etc?
   Yes …..1
   No …..2
   D.K. …..3

   11. On the whole, were you or the reporter of this incident satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       D.K. …..3

   12. Considering how the police handled the case, would you still go back to the police to report it if you become a victim of any crime?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       D.K. …..3

   2. Sex of victim
       Male……..1
       Female…..2

   3. How many times has this happened?
       NUMBER

   4. Where did this happen?
       At home ...............01
       In the neighborhood......02
       At the workplace ........03
       On a highway .............04
       In a vehicle ..............05
       In the bush/Farm ........06
       Abroad ..................07
       Other (specify) ...........08

   5. What type of aggression, attack, assault or threat was it? (main)
       Physical assault .................01
       Verbal assault ..................02
       Curse ........................................03
       Riots in the public place ..........04
       Vandalism .................................05
       Robbery ....................................06
       Theft .......................................07
       Rape ..........................................08
       Defilement .................................09
       Sexual harassment ........................10
       Arson ..........................................11
       Highway attack .......................12
       Kidnapping/Abduction ............13
       Text message/Phone call ......14
       Other (specify) ......................15

   6. The person(s) that did this to you or someone you know, how was he/she related to you or the person at the time of the incident?
       Spouse/partner ..................01
       Ex-spouse/partner ...........02
       Boy/Girlfriend ....................03
       Ex-boy/girlfriend ..............04
       Parent(s) .................................05
       Other relative ......................06
       Friend(s) .................................07
       Schoolmate (s) .....................08
       Boss at workplace .................09
       Colleague at workplace ......10
       Subordinate at workplace...11
       Other (Specify) ....................12

   7. Did you or the person suffer an injury or emotional effects as a result?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       DK .......3

   8. Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident to you?
       Very serious ..............1
       Slightly serious .............2

   14. Are such incidences (sexual offenses) common in your community?
       Very common ..........1
       Common ...............2
       Not common ..........3

   15. Why would you or why would you not go back the police?

   10. Why were you or the reporter not satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
       Police didn’t do enough .................1
       Police not interested in the case ...........2
       Couldn’t find offender ........................3
       Didn’t keep me properly informed ..........4
       Didn’t treat me decently/were impolite ....6
       Were slow to arrive ........................7
       Were corrupt ..................................8

   11. On the whole, were you or the reporter of this incident satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       D.K. .......3

   12. Considering how the police handled the case, would you still go back to the police to report it if you become a victim of any crime?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       D.K. .......3

   2. Sex of victim
       Male……..1
       Female…..2

   3. How many times has this happened?
       NUMBER

   4. Where did this happen?
       At home ...............01
       In the neighborhood......02
       At the workplace ........03
       On a highway .............04
       In a vehicle ..............05
       In the bush/Farm ........06
       Abroad ..................07
       Other (specify) ...........08

   5. What type of aggression, attack, assault or threat was it? (main)
       Physical assault .................01
       Verbal assault ..................02
       Curse ........................................03
       Riots in the public place ..........04
       Vandalism .................................05
       Robbery ....................................06
       Theft .......................................07
       Rape ..........................................08
       Defilement .................................09
       Sexual harassment ........................10
       Arson ..........................................11
       Highway attack .......................12
       Kidnapping/Abduction ............13
       Text message/Phone call ......14
       Other (specify) ......................15

   6. The person(s) that did this to you or someone you know, how was he/she related to you or the person at the time of the incident?
       Spouse/partner ..................01
       Ex-spouse/partner ...........02
       Boy/Girlfriend ....................03
       Ex-boy/girlfriend ..............04
       Parent(s) .................................05
       Other relative ......................06
       Friend(s) .................................07
       Schoolmate (s) .....................08
       Boss at workplace .................09
       Colleague at workplace ......10
       Subordinate at workplace...11
       Other (Specify) ....................12

   7. Did you or the person suffer an injury or emotional effects as a result?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       DK .......3

   8. Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident to you?
       Very serious ..............1
       Slightly serious .............2

   14. Why were you or the reporter not satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
       Police didn’t do enough .................1
       Police not interested in the case ...........2
       Couldn’t find offender ........................3
       Didn’t keep me properly informed ..........4
       Didn’t treat me decently/were impolite ....6
       Were slow to arrive ........................7
       Were corrupt ..................................8

   11. On the whole, were you or the reporter of this incident satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       D.K. .......3

   12. Considering how the police handled the case, would you still go back to the police to report it if you become a victim of any crime?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       D.K. .......3

   2. Sex of victim
       Male……..1
       Female…..2

   3. How many times has this happened?
       NUMBER

   4. Where did this happen?
       At home ...............01
       In the neighborhood......02
       At the workplace ........03
       On a highway .............04
       In a vehicle ..............05
       In the bush/Farm ........06
       Abroad ..................07
       Other (specify) ...........08

   5. What type of aggression, attack, assault or threat was it? (main)
       Physical assault .................01
       Verbal assault ..................02
       Curse ........................................03
       Riots in the public place ..........04
       Vandalism .................................05
       Robbery ....................................06
       Theft .......................................07
       Rape ..........................................08
       Defilement .................................09
       Sexual harassment ........................10
       Arson ..........................................11
       Highway attack .......................12
       Kidnapping/Abduction ............13
       Text message/Phone call ......14
       Other (specify) ......................15

   6. The person(s) that did this to you or someone you know, how was he/she related to you or the person at the time of the incident?
       Spouse/partner ..................01
       Ex-spouse/partner ...........02
       Boy/Girlfriend ....................03
       Ex-boy/girlfriend ..............04
       Parent(s) .................................05
       Other relative ......................06
       Friend(s) .................................07
       Schoolmate (s) .....................08
       Boss at workplace .................09
       Colleague at workplace ......10
       Subordinate at workplace...11
       Other (Specify) ....................12

   7. Did you or the person suffer an injury or emotional effects as a result?
       Yes …..1
       No …..2
       DK .......3

   8. Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident to you?
       Very serious ..............1
       Slightly serious .............2

   14. Why were you or the reporter not satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
       Police didn’t do enough .................1
       Police not interested in the case ...........2
       Couldn’t find offender ........................3
       Didn’t keep me properly informed ..........4
       Didn’t treat me decently/were impolite ....6
       Were slow to arrive ........................7
       Were corrupt ..................................8
9. Are such incidences (attack, assault or threat) common in your community?
   - Very common: 1
   - Common: 2
   - Not common: 3

10. Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?
    - Yes: 1
    - No: 2
    - D.K.: 3

11. What was the main reason why you or no one else reported this incident to the police?
    - Not serious enough/no loss: 01
    - Solved it myself/perpetrator known to me: 02
    - Inappropriate for police/police not necessary: 03
    - Solved by chiefs/elders/traditional authorities: 04
    - Reported to other public or private agencies: 05
    - My family solved it: 06
    - Police could do nothing/lack of proof: 07
    - Police won’t do anything about it: 08
    - Fear/dislike of the police/no involvement wanted with police: 09
    - Time wasting: 10
    - Didn’t dare (for fear of reprisal): 11
    - Other (Specify): 12
    - Don’t know why: 9

12. What was the main reason for reporting the incident to the police?
    - It was a crime: 1
    - Wanted offender punished: 2
    - To get help: 3
    - To get compensation: 4
    - To stop such crime: 5
    - Other (Specify): 6

13. On the whole, were you or the reporter of this incident satisfied with the way the police handled the case?
    - Yes: 1
    - No: 2
    - D.K.: 3

14. Considering how the police handled the case, would you still go back to the police to report if you become a victim of any crime?
    - Yes: 1
    - No: 2
    - D.K.: 3

PART D: SAFETY

15. In general, how much confidence do you have in the public security services to protect you, your household and your property from crime and violence?
    - Extremely confident: 1
    - Somewhat confident: 2
    - Not very confident: 3
    - Not at all confident: 4
    - Don’t know: 5

16. Do you feel safe walking down your street alone in your neighbourhood at night?
    - Very safe: 1
    - Fairly safe: 2
    - Safe: 3
    - A bit unsafe: 4
    - Not safe at all: 5

17. How safe do you feel when you are at home alone after dark?
    - Very safe: 1
    - Fairly safe: 2
    - Safe: 3
    - A bit unsafe: 4
    - Not safe at all: 5

18. How safe do you feel in your daily life?
    - Very safe: 1
    - Fairly safe: 2
    - Safe: 3
    - A bit unsafe: 4
    - Not safe at all: 5

19. In your daily life do you feel very safe or not safe at all?
    - Very safe: 1
    - Fairly safe: 2
    - Safe: 3
    - A bit unsafe: 4
    - Not safe at all: 5

20. Would you say your household is safe from crime and violence at home?
    - Very safe: 1
    - Fairly safe: 2
    - Safe: 3
    - A bit unsafe: 4
    - Not safe at all: 5
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE SOCIO-CULTURAL DETERMINANTS OF INACCURATE OFFICIAL CRIME STATISTICS IN GHANA

INTRODUCTION:

This guide is being used to seek information on the above subject. Although crimes are reported all over the country, the Ghana Living Standard Survey round six (GLSS 6) (2014) victimization survey brings to fore the existence of the “Dark Figure” in Ghana’s crime statistics. The study, socio-cultural determinants of inaccurate official crime statistics in Ghana objects to explore the nature and effects of socio-cultural factors on the “dark figure” in crime statistics and using these established bases to test the propositions of Donald Black’s Behavior of Law Theory in the context of Ghana. The study will provide information on the subject matter and add knowledge to the academic discourse regarding factors that derive the existence of the „Dark Figure“ and the applicability of Black’s Behavior of Law Theory. This is a thesis to be submitted to the department of sociology at the University of Ghana and the information to be provided would be treated confidential.
SECTION 1: SOCIETAL REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING THEFT, VIOLENT OR SEXUAL OFFENCES TO THE POLICE (THREE DIFFERENT GROUPS)

1. How would you describe the incident that happened to each one of you?

......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

2. What was your relationship with the offender in your case?....................................................... ......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

3. Each one of you had an experience that you could have but did not report to the police. Why in your particular case did you not report the case? Please explain all the possible factors that influenced each one of you not to report such an act to the police? (one after the other, please tell me why you did report the incident)........................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

4. If this act or a similar one is to happen now, will you report it to the police?

......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

5. For those of you who said yes, why would you have reported the act if it were now?

......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

6. For those of you who said no, why would you not report the act if it were now?

......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

THANK YOU