Crime Victimization Among University Students At Egerton University, Njoro Campus, Nakuru County, Kenya

Hillary Korir Larema Chebii[1], Kibet A. Ng'etich[2] & Eric Bor[3]
[2, 3] Lecturers, Department of Peace, Security and Social Studies, Egerton University
*Corresponding Author: *Hillary Korir Larema Chebii*

Abstract: *Crime and violence are increasingly becoming recognized as a problem in Kenyan Universities and something needs to be done about it. Personal and Property crimes committed against University students are widespread, serious and hampering their ability to learn as well as individual wellbeing. Egerton University Njoro Campus with 14,284 students is experiencing high crime rates. There has been significant rise in crime incidents reported from 367 cases in 2013 to 710 cases in 2015. The purpose of this study was to investigate crime victimization among University students at Egerton University, Njoro Campus, Nakuru County. The study objectives included determination of the prevalence of crime victimization, fear of crime victimization, perception of security services and factors influencing reporting of crime incidents amongst students in Njoro Campus. The study incorporated Felson and Cohen's (1979) Routine Activity Theory. The target population was 14,284 students studying in Njoro campus. Data was collected using questionnaires for students. The most prevalent crime among university students was theft as 43.9% of the crime victims indicated that they had been victims of theft. On the other hand, out of the reported crimes at Njoro campus, the students had been victims of physical assault, sexual harassment, and room burglary at 10.0%, 6.6%, and 35.9% respectively. The least common crime among university students was mugging due to the fact that most places where crimes occur are closed spaces and where few numbers of witnesses are, and most open spaces at universities are highly populated. The study therefore recommended the mounting of closed circuit television and increase of security guard presence within the university halls of residence so as to eliminate the favourable environment for these crimes to occur. The study also recommends the establishment of appropriate security services for the university to address challenges relating to security aspects.*
Keywords: *Crime, Crime Victimization,*

I. INTRODUCTION

The presence of criminal activities and crime victimizations amongst students within universities has increasingly become a concern amongst education officials, security agents, parents, student communities and other education stakeholders across the world (Addington, 2008). According to Gyong (2010) crime victimization refers to a situation in which persons or groups suffer physical, mental or psychological harm and/or injuries, material loss or damage or other social disadvantages resulting from either natural, socio-economic, political, or physical or mechanical disaster or misfortune. The concerns of crime victimization within campus has been attribute to incidents of crime and crime victimization amongst the student population in diverse universities across the world leading to an increase in fear of crime victimization and safety concerns by the students and other education stakeholders (Bartula & Bowen, 2015). This has been contrary to society's expectation of the university as an institution of learning and isolated from the crimes that are prevalent in general population (Henderson, 2010).

The case of crime victimization is prevalent across diverse countries across the world. In the United States of Amercia, Alan, O'Neill, Depue, & Englander (2008) study on campus violence and prevention noted high prevalence of crime victimization amongst university students in the country. The study cited the case of 32 students shot dead at Virginia Tech University in 2007 and a further five students shot dead by fellow students at Northern Illinois University. The study further noted that a total of 76 homicides were committed between 2001 and 2005 within universities in the United States of which 57.3% constituted student victims. Still in the United States, Gonzales, Schofield, & Schmitt (2005) put the overall prevalence rate of sexual assault against women at 3% across the universities. On the other hand, Gover, Tomsich, Jennings, & Higgins, (2011) study on perceptions of safety and fear in universities examined crime prevalence levels at the University of Colorado Denver administration. The study using a sample size of 228 found the prevalence levels of direct victimization at 30.6%. On the other hand, Howard (2012) estimated that 20% of women and 6% of men are likely to be victims of sexual assaults within their period learning in universities across the United States. Using

secondary analysis of secondary data dating from 1995 to 2002, Mckinney (2007) found extremely high levels of crime victimizations amongst university students in the United States. Out of every 1,000 students, the study found the prevalence levels of 40.6 for violent crime, 3.3 for sexual assault, 9.1 for aggrieved assault, and 15.3 for serious violent crime. Muscat (2011) in an examination of the crime prevalence levels at Rowan university in the United States noted that 11 cases of burglary, one incident of robbery, and two cases of aggravated assault were reported to have occurred on campus grounds in the year 2009. This was out of a population of 11, 392 students.

Crime victimization is also prevalent in African universities. In Nigeria, Arijesuyo & Olusanya (2011) study on theoretical perspectives of on campus cultism and violence noted prevalence of kidnapping, violence acts and physical assaults within universities . This was attributed to the prevalence of cultism in the universities. In Ghana, Owusu, Akoto, & Abnory (2016) study on safety at the University of Cape Cost campus noted high prevalence of petty crimes such as theft and snatching of students' valuables in the university. The study noted that though rare, occasionally serious crime occurs such as the killing of a Nigerian student at the university in 2014. In Uganda, Mehra, Agardh, Stafstrom, & Ostergren (2014) examined the sexual coercion amongst university students in the country. Using a sample size of 1,954 students from Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST) the study found that the 28% of the sample had an experience of sexual coercion.

In Kenya, cases of crime victimization amongst university students have been observed. Ndung'u, (2015) study on status of private accommodation amongst Kenyatta university students noted a high crime prevalence levels. Amongst the cases of crime victimization that the study found students in private hostels at Kenyatta University faced included mugging, theft, property losses, and incidents of gender based violence. Muasya (2014) examined the effects of sexual harassment on women students' access to opportunities at the University of Nairobi. The study using a descriptive research design noted that there was a notable prevalence of sexual harassment for the female students. On the other hand, the University of Nairobi security annual report for 2012 noted indicated that a total of 42 crimes committed by students were reported to university management (University of Nairobi., 2013).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

The theoretical framework of the study was guided by Cohen's (1979) Routine Activities Theory.

Routine Activity Theory

The routine activity theory was developed by Cohen and Felson (1979). According to Cohen and Felson (1979), structural changes in routine activity patterns influence crime rates by affecting the convergence in time and space of three elements of direct-contact predatory crimes: motivated offenders, suitable targets, and the absence of capable guardians against a violation. Cohen and Felson (1979) noted that increase in crime rates could occur without any increase in the structural conditions that motivate offenders to engage in crime as long as there has been an increase in the supply of attractive and unguarded targets for victimization. Their argument about how crime rates can increase even if offender motivation remains constant is important because it allows them to account for the apparent contradiction underlying most theories of criminality that crime rates continued to rise throughout in the society even though conditions that foster criminality (e.g., unemployment, racial segregation, economic inequality, and gender inequality) were decreasing.

From this perspective, routine activities are defined as "any recurrent and prevalent activities that provide for basic population and individual needs" (Cohen and Felson 1979, p. 593). These routine activities include formalized work, leisure, and the ways by which humans acquire food, shelter, and other basic needs or desires (e.g., companionship, sexual expression). Cohen and Felson (1979) argue that humans are located in ecological niches with a particular tempo, pace, and rhythm in which predatory crime is a way of securing this basic needs or desires at the expense of others. Potential victims in this environment are likely to alter their daily habits and take evasive actions that may persuade offenders to seek alternative targets. It's under such predatory conditions that the routine activities of potential victims are said both to enhance and to restrict the opportunities for crime.

The basic premise underlying the routine activity theory is that various social changes in conventional society increase criminal opportunities. For example, given the assorted costs for stealing items with great weight (e.g., their theft requires more physical energy, they are harder to conceal), it's not surprising that burglars are most attracted to items that are easily portable and have high resale value (e.g., cash, jewelry, electronic equipment). Similarly, increases over time in the level of safety precautions taken by the public would apparently decrease crime rates by reducing the accessibility of potential crime targets to would-be offenders. Such changes might also result in alternative outcomes such as no net reduction in crime rates because crime is being displaced to other objects, victims or times depending on the structural conditions.

Any decrease in the concentration of activities within family-based house-holds will increase crime rates (Cohen and Felson (1979). There are several ways by which such social changes are assumed to increase criminal opportunities. First, a rise in single-person households or households consisting of unrelated persons requires a greater supply of durable consumer goods and other merchandise that are considered attractive property to steal. Such duplication of consumer goods is unnecessary in family-like living arrangements. Second, increase in nonfamily activities and households decrease the level of personal guardianship over others. The mere presence of a spouse, child, or other relative in a household provides greater protection for individuals and their property than it is true of persons who live alone, and living with other relatives also increase the likelihood that public activities will be undertaken in groups. Third, increase in nonfamily households alter the location of routine activities from a private domain to a public domain, thereby also increasing one's exposure to risky and vulnerable situations. Thus, changes in domestic activities and living arrangements may increase the supply of attractive crime targets, decrease the level of guardianship, and consequently increase criminal opportunities.

This theoretical approach clearly highlights the symbiotic relationship between conventional and illegal activity patterns. Illegal activities are presumed to "feed on" the routine activities of everyday life (Cohen and Felson 1980). This theory also identifies a fundamental irony between constructive social change and crime rates. Routine activity theory and lifestyle-exposure theory attempt to explain crime, not in the actions or numbers of motivated offenders, but in the activities and lifestyle of potential victims. These approaches have relevance in the topic of study because they ignore the source of criminal motivation and direct attention to how the habits, lifestyles, and behavioral patterns of ordinary citizens in their daily lives create an environment for predatory crime.

Types and Prevalence of Campus Crime

Crime victimization is a major concern on college campuses. Several recent, high-profile events have thrust campus security issues into the forefront of media attention. For example, the shootings at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in 2007 and Northern Illinois University in 2008 resulted in the death and injury of over 70 students and faculty. Although college campuses are generally assumed to be safe and relatively free from crime, research indicates college students report being fearful of crime (Fisher *et al.,* 1998). Although prior literature has concentrated on a number of factors associated with fear such as collective efficacy and neighbourhood disorder, some of the extant literature focuses on the gendered relationship between crime victimization and fear. Overwhelmingly, research has found interesting gender differences among the general public as well as among college students: men are more likely to be victimized by crime than are women, whereas women are more fearful of crime than men (Warr, 2000: Jennings *et al.*, 2007).

Researchers define campus crime in multiple ways: some include serious criminal offenses such as murder and rape, whereas others include perception of safety or feelings of fear on campus (Robinson & Mullen, 2001: Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2007). Institutional-level studies tend to use severe and distinctive forms of crime (e.g., murder/non-negligent manslaughter, sex offenses forcible, and illegal weapons possession) when measuring campus crime. Wilcox *et al.* (2007) measured campus crime along with multiple dimensions of reactions, including cognitive, emotional, and behavioural. Specifically, whether people feel safe on campus, worry about their security on campus, or have had actual experience as victims including being stalked or experiencing physical and/or sexual victimization in terms of abuse or attack were examined.

One of the most consistent factors in increasing campus crime rates has been the proportion of students living on-campus in residence halls. Wilcox *et al.* (2007) who conducted one of the noteworthy studies of campus crime found that the number of students living in residence halls influenced campus crime rates. Other studies have found that demographic characteristics of the student body can lead to an increase in crime rates. For instance, Honkatukia & Nyqvist (2006) cited a positive correlation between the percentage of male students and crime: while other studies such as Sloan *et al.* (2000) and Waynick (2010) cited a positive correlation between the percentage of minority students and the violent crime rate. Another area of research about routine activities focuses on whether people live in or near an area with large populations of potential offenders (Robinson 1998). Since students primarily prey upon other students, all students are at risk of being victimized by the people they associate with (McConnell 1997).

The impact of alcohol and drugs on campus crime rates has been cited as a considerable factor. Krebs et.al (2007) noted that drug and alcohol arrest rates on campuses had been consistently increasing since 1991. Studies have consistently shown that alcohol and drugs are implicated in the majority of violent campus offences. Sloan *et al.* (2000) notes that over 95% of such offences committed on campuses involve alcohol or drugs. Taken together, distinguished definitions of campus crime (e.g., a range from serious criminal offenses to perception of campus crime) have been used by researchers, and the victims were not limited to students, but included faculty and staff. Although different measures of campus crime could have their own strengths, the current study focuses on actual occurrence and perceptions of crime incidents that affect students only.

Fear of Crime on Campus and Associated Factors

The fear of crime is extremely prevalent on campus across the world (Gover et al., 2011; Hilinski & Andrews, 2011; Petherick, 2000; Steinmetz, 2012; Truman, 2007). The fear of crime within the universities is also context bound across the geographical spread. In the United States, the fear of crime was acknowledged with the general population from the 1960s leading to compilation of data on the same through General Social Survey and the National Crime Survey (Taiwo, Omole, & Omole, 2014). When people think of fear of crime, it seems obvious that they must perceive that they are in danger of being victimized . As an example, when a serial killer is stalking victims, people's fear of being victimized is heightened because they may perceive themselves to be more at risk than when crimes seem more random in the community (Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2007). Gover et al., (2011) undertook a study on the fear of crime at an urban university in the United States. The study measured the fear of crime based on fear of crime by day and fear of crime by night. The fear of crime was measured using a range of six questions; I feel safe at this university, I feel the university has sufficient measures to protect its community, I feel safe during the day on campus, I feel safe at night on campus, There is adequate lighting on campus and the campus police do a good job at crime prevention. A five likert scale of strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree was used. The study found that the average scale for fear or crime during the day was 2.23 and at night was 3.58. The high fear of crime at night was attributed to a high prevalence of crime during the night hence driving the fear of crime.

Petherick (2000) in a study on the environmental design and fear noted that there are diverse factors that lead to fear of crime in the universities. The study noted that the university setting is attractive to criminal activities due to a huge student population (hence potential targets), an increase in freedom levels amongst the students, lack of guardians within the university, and the homogenous nature of the campus setting creating an element of uncertainty. These factors often make the crime victimization possible through availing suitable targets and opportunities for crime to occur. Hilinski & Andrews (2011) examined the fear of crime amongst women in universities. The study noted that women are generally more afraid of crime victimization than men due to the fear that any crime is likely to escalate to sexual crime. In this context, Hilinski & Andrews (2011) argues that any type of victimization (i.e., larceny, robbery, robbery, assault) could potentially result in rape or sexual assault, women are more fearful of all crimes, despite their lower victimization rates. This concept is explained by the shadow of sex assault hypothesis. The study further explained the high fear of crime amongst the women to be driven by the vulnerability of the women and the inability to defend themselves when faced with threats of crime.

Truman (2007) undertook a study on fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization among college students. The study noted diverse factors that drive the fear of crime amongst the university students including knowledge of perceived risk of the crime, and the vulnerability of women due to limited ability for self-defence. Peterson, Sackrison, & Polland (2015) further noted that prior victimization plays a critical role in fear of crime. The possibility of the reoccurrence of the crime acts to drive the fear of crime. On the other hand, Iriberri, Leroy, & Garrett (2006) notes that the crime type impacts on the fear of crime with the violent victimization leading to significant increase in fear of crime compared to non-violent victimization. Nolan, Randazzo, & Deisinger (2011) further indicate that media coverage plays a significant role in fear of crime as it sometimes presents a distorted view of the crime. The media effect on people's fear of crime is due to aspects such as sensationalism or randomness of the crime and the characteristics of the audience.

Student Perception of Safety and Security Services on Campus

The perceptions of safety and security services within the universities vary across different university. Gover et al., (2011) in a study on the perception of safety amongst the university fraternity in the University of Colorado. Using a sample size of 507 students and a five point likert scale to measure the safety perception, the results found a perception safety scale of 3.6 which indicated that the students felt moderately safe in the university environment. In the context of gender differences, the study found that male students compared to female students had higher perception of safety at a mean of 3.94 compared to the females at a mean of 3.51. Kleberg (2004) argues that perception of safety is reflective of campus environment in general. In this context, Kleberg (2004) indicated that students often interact amongst themselves leading to shaping of opinions in relations to the security aspects. The perception on the environment is critical. High profile incidents of criminal behaviour in the campus area, front-page headlines, and rumours create an image of a dangerous and insecure college or university environment.

Muscat (2011) in examination of Rowan University students' perceptions of campus safety noted that security aspects involve diverse aspects. The study noted that safety needs consists of security, freedom from fear, anxiety, and chaos as well as need for structure, order, law and limits. Waynick (2010) examined Spatial Analysis of Surveyed Perceptions of Safety, Crime, and Lighting. Using a sample size of a sample size of 758 students Appalachian State University, the study found that a total 54% of the respondents market at least an area to be unsafe. On the other hand, (Krauss, 2013) examined the perception of safety amongst students at

University of Central florida. The study examined perceptions of fear using metrics such as being afraid to being sexually assaulted, fear of being attached by someone, and fear of walking alone in the darkness in campus. In a likert scale of 1 to 5, the study found that fear of being afraid to being sexually assaulted stood at 1.20 for males and 2.47 for females, fear of being attached by someone (mean of 1.95 males and 2.63 females), and fear of walking alone in the darkness in campus (mean of 3.92 females and 2.81 females).

Student perceptions of safety vary widely between men and women on campus. In their study, Fletcher and Bryden (2007) found that women perceive themselves as belonging to a group that they feel is more victimized than others. The same study also found that high numbers of women consciously avoid specific areas of campus during the night, avoid walking alone, and are vigilant for suspicious activity. This shows that women are aware of potential safety risks on campus, either through common knowledge or first-hand experience, and act accordingly to protect themselves. According to Waynick (2010) women have an increased level of worry towards crime on campus, forcing them to adopt precautionary measures and restrict their activities and behaviours. This leads to limitations in educational, social, and leisure opportunities, which could affect the overall quality of life for women on college campuses.

Brown and Morley (2007) explain that the majority of people believe "that their personal susceptibility to negative events is less than that of the average person." This is an important implication for campus safety, where students may perceive their risk to be lower than it is in reality. Crawford (2008) surveyed female students about their perceptions of risks associated with sexual assault during and after social gatherings. The findings of this study show that most participants did not perceive the potential negative consequences of risky behaviour, such as accepting a drink from an acquaintance or leaving a drink unattended. Crawford *et al.* (2008) conclude that programs aimed at both awareness and risk reduction could help to bridge the gap between perceived risk and actual risk related to campus safety.

Reviewed literature on student perceptions of campus safety reveals that gender is an important dimension of this topic, and that there are marked differences in safety concerns between men and women. Several studies on college campuses, such as Fletcher and Bryden (2007), which present both quantitative and qualitative data, provide insight to perceptions of safety relating to physical structures such as lighting, buildings, and landscaping, perceptions of safety relating to specific types of incidents including sexual assaults, harassment, physical violence, abuse, and theft, precautions taken by students relating to safety, and issues with campus security services and administrations.

Campus security services vary markedly among college campuses, but most studies report campus security providing some form of security patrol, safety escort service, emergency phone system and emergency phone numbers. Fletcher and Bryden (2007) found that the majority of people in their study were aware of campus security and foot patrols, but fewer people had actually used either of these services. Students were much more likely to use avoidance strategies, walk with another person, or use some sort of weapon than they were to contact campus security or use the foot patrol. According to Bryden & Fletcher (2007), women rarely use campus security services, and, in some cases, campus safety personnel may even unintentionally discourage women from using such services by diminishing women's concerns when they report feeling threatened.

Factors Influencing Reporting of Crime Incidents by Students

Research supports this trend on college campus as well. Kelly & Torres (2006), Nicklin (2002) and Starkweather (2007) all highlighted the fact that students specifically women, are exposed to higher risks of sexual victimization on campuses. These studies also indicate that women are less likely to report the crime when the perpetrator is an acquaintance of the victim, which is the situation for the majority of sexual assaults on campuses. In sum, sexual assaults remain underreported on campus as well as the nation as a whole. The issue of viewing women's safety concerns as irrational is closely related to the problem of victim-blaming on college campuses. Kelly and Torres (2006) report: "Women students in this study reported that male students chided them when they shared stories of being victimized or assisted in women feeling the only way to be safe was to be with a man." This is obviously problematic because it fosters a culture of victim-blaming, which creates an uncomfortable, and often unhealthy, environment for victims of crime. Other studies, including Bode & Snow (2007) and Fletcher and Bryden (2007), found that women will often avoid reporting incidents either because they blame themselves or fear that others will blame them for the incident. Again, this is problematic if campus administrators base campus safety initiatives solely on crime statistics, which may not tell the complete story of campus security.

Bedenbaugh (2003) delves deeper into the issue of why victims of sexual assault on college campuses rarely report incidents to the authorities. These victims often believe that they are at fault, either because alcohol was involved or because they voluntarily went out with the perpetrator. These victims also worry that if they were to report the incident, the authorities would blame them for the assault for the same reasons. Other victims do not report sexual assaults because they believe that the school does not take these incidents seriously, or are

ill equipped to handle such incidents. They believe that it is not worth the trouble to go through there porting process when it is unlikely that anything will happen to the perpetrator. In any case, the fact that many incidents, especially those as serious as sexual assaults, go unreported on college campuses is disturbing. This is a fact which also must be taken into consideration when administrators are considering campus security.

On another side of this issue, Fox et al. (2009) explores the argument that women have an irrational response to a low threat of crime. This could be attributed to the stereotypes that women are more vulnerable to attack than men, less able to defend themselves, and less able to cope with victimization. Other possible causes for women's heightened fear of crime are that women suffer more daily, low level victimization (such as sexual harassment) than men, women fear sexual assault, which is generally not perceived as a threat for men, and that women fear unusual, serious crimes, which often involve female victims and are exaggerated in the media.

Bedenbaugh (2003) also suggests that women are socialized to fear public space: strangers, and men, and thus have a higher fear of crime in general. It is important to note that many of these claims concerning women's high fear of crime have been challenged by other research, including research that shows many crimes against women go unreported (Fletcher and Bryden, 2007). In summary, literature reviewed highlights the gaps in types and prevalence of campus crimes, fear of crime on campus, perceptions of safety and security services and reporting levels and factors influencing reporting providing a basis for the current study. The proposed study will attempt to fill these gaps and contribute to the body of knowledge while assisting University Management and Administrators in addressing crime and victimization in Njoro Campus.

III.   Objective Of The Study
1. To determine prevalence of crime victimization among students in Njoro Campus
2. To determine extent of fear of crime victimization among students' in Njoro Campus
3. To assess students perception on security services in Njoro Campus
4. To establish the factors influencing reporting of crime incidents among students in Njoro campus.

IV.   RESEARCH QUESTIONS
5. How prevalent is crime victimization among University students' in Njoro Campus?
6. How afraid are students of being victimized while on campus and what factors contribute to that fear of crime or lack thereof?
7. What are students' perceptions of security services in Njoro campus?
8. What factors influence reporting of crime incidents among students in Njoro campus?

V.   METHODOLOGY
Egerton University has a student population of 18,385 out of which 14, 284 study in Njoro Campus. This formed the target population of the study. The accessible population was 14,284 students studying in Njoro Campus. The population includes Deans of Faculties, Dean of students, Director University welfare services, Director Institute of Women, Gender and Development Studies, Student Counselors and Administrators. The sample of the study was selected using the following sampling techniques. The table for determining the sample size in social science research as outlined by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) in Sakaran (2010) was used to compute the sample size for students to be involved in the study. There are 14,284 students in Njoro campus and therefore a sample of 373 respondents will participate in the study. Therefore, 373 questionnaires were distributed to the students for the purposes of obtaining data for this study. The returned questionnaires were 330 out of the 373 distributed questionnaires making a response rate of 88%.

VI.   FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS
Overall Crime Prevalence Levels
Using the respondents who indicated that they had been a victim of various crimes within the university as indicated in table 4.6 above, these prevalence levels were analysed as multiple level responses, as shown in Table 4.7 below. This was with a view of understanding the overall prevalence levels of various crimes at Njoro Campus, Egerton University. The study sought to know which among the crimes that occurred among university students was most prevalent, that is, among theft, physical assault, sexual harassment, room burglary, and mugging. The most prevalent crime among university students was theft as 43.9% of the crime victims indicated that they had been victims of theft. On the other hand, out of the reported crimes at Njoro campus had been victims of physical assault, sexual harassment, and room burglary at 10.0%, 6.6%, and 35.9% respectively. The least common crime among university students was mugging due to the fact that most places where crimes occur are closed spaces and where few numbers of witnesses are, as most open spaces at universities are highly populated.

Table 4.1: Overall Crime Prevalence Levels

Crimes	Freq.	Percentage.
Theft	180	43.9%
Physical Assault	41	10.0%
Sexual Harassment	27	6.6%
Room Burglary	147	35.9%
Mugging	15	3.6%
	410	100%

Source: Field Data (2016)

Fear of Selected Crimes in Campus

The fear of crimes was examined using fear of diverse crimes such as theft, physical assault, burglary, sexual harassment, and mugging. In the context of theft, a majority of the respondents at 37.3% of the respondents indicated that they were fearful all the time compared to 22.7%, 34.2%, 3.0%, and 2.8% of the respondents who were fearful very often, sometimes, seldom, and never respectively. The high level of students who were fearful of theft all the time, very often and sometimes (cumulatively 94.2%) could be attributed to the high prevalence of theft cases within the university. These cases act to instill fear amongst the students on the probability of the same crime occurring to them. In the context of physical assault, a majority of the respondents indicated that they seldom and never experienced fear for physical assault with a cumulative percentage of 72.6%, as examined using Table 4.14 below. This could be attributed to the low prevalence of the physical assault within campus and the fact that going by the context in which the physical assault occurred, there was only a portion of the student population that were exposed to the crime. In the context of the burglary, a majority of the respondents that 45.8% that feared the crime all the time followed by the 25.6% of the respondents who indicated that they feared very often. The high prevalence of students who indicated they feared burglary to a high degree can be attributed to the fear of the loss of valuable items in the hostels as well as the high prevalence levels of the crime within the university.

Table 4.2: Fear of selected crimes in campus

	All the time Freq. (%)	Very often Freq. (%)	Sometimes Freq. (%)	Seldom Freq. (%)	Never Freq. (%)	Total Freq. (%)
Theft	123 37.3%	75 22.7%	113 34.2%	10 3.0%	9 2.8%	330 100.0%
Physical assault	27 8.1%	15 4.5%	49 14.8%	69 20.9%	170 51.7%	330 100.0%
Burglary	151 45.8%	85 25.6%	75 22.7%	18 5.5%	1 0.4%	330 11
Sexual harassment	29 8.8%	13 3.9%	35 10.6%	85 25.6%	168 51.1%	330 100.0%
Mugging	10 3.0%	15 4.5%	17 5.1%	132 40%	156 47.4%	330 100.0%

Source: Field Data (2016)

The sexual harassment had a majority of the respondents who indicated that they were never fearful of the sexual harassment at 51.1% of the respondents while 25.6% and 10.6% of the respondents indicates that they were seldom and sometimes fearful of the crime, as mentioned in Table 4.14. Finally, in respect to mugging a majority of the respondents at 47.4% of the respondents indicated that they were never fearful of mugging while a percentage of 40% of the respondents indicated that they were seldom fearful of mugging. These results could be attributable to the low prevalence levels of mugging within Njoro Campus of Egerton University together with the difficulty of executing mugging.

Perception on Security Services

The perception on security services was examined using the satisfaction levels of five scales levels from extremely satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied and extremely dissatisfied, as shown in Table 4.16. Amongst the aspects that were examined included security lighting on campus, presence of security guard, emergency response services, emergency phone service, investigation services, intelligence services, intelligence gathering and traffic management within campus. In the context of the security lighting on campus, a cumulative percentage of 32.5% of the respondents were satisfied and extremely satisfied on the security lighting within the campus. Therefore a cumulative total of 67.5% of the respondents were not satisfied or were neutral in regards to the security lighting on campus. The inadequacy of the satisfaction with the security lighting was consistent with the available literature. Fox et al., (2009) study on Gender, Crime and fear of

victimization indicated that adequate security lighting are hampered by logistical challenges of providing security lighting such as financial resources required as well as challenges of vandalism amongst the students.

In the context of satisfaction levels with the presence of guards, 7.6% and 48.2% of the respondents were extremely satisfied and satisfied respectively with the presence of security guards in the university respectively. This relatively high satisfaction levels with the presence of the guard could be attributable to the fact that most places have guard services within the university such as the hostels especially ladies hostels and key installations within the university. The emergency response services had over 38.4% of the respondents dissatisfied and extremely dissatisfied with the emergency response services. On the other hand, 35.2% of the respondents were neural in respect to the satisfaction with the emergency response services, as illustrated in Table 4.16. The low levels of satisfaction with the emergency response services could be attributable to the inadequacy of the emergency response services across the vast campus. Similarly, it was only a small percentage of 29.1% of the respondents who were satisfied with the emergency phone services at the university. This could be attributable to inadequate capacity to man emergency phone services within the university.

Table 4.3: Satisfaction Levels of Specific Security Services

	ES Freq. (%)	S Freq. (%)	N Freq. (%)	D Freq. (%)	ED Freq. (%)	Total Freq. (%)
Security lighting on campus	23 7.0%	84 25.5%	96 29.1%	67 20.3%	60 18.1%	330 100.0%
Presence of security guards	25 7.6%	159 48.2%	57 17.3%	50 15.2%	39 11.7%	330 100.0%
Emergency response service	0 0.0%	87 26.4%	116 35.2%	64 19.4%	63 19.0%	330 100.0%
Emergency phone service	0 0.0%	77 23.3%	96 29.1%	69 20.9%	88 26.7%	330 100.0%
Investigation services	9 2.7%	61 18.5%	48 14.5%	97 29.4%	115 34.9%	330 100.0%
Intelligence gathering	26 7.9%	34 10.3%	39 11.8%	151 45.8%	80 24.2%	330 100.0%
Traffic Management within campus	61 18.5%	89 27.0%	44 13.3%	37 11.2%	99 30.0%	330 100.0%

Source: Field data (2016)

When crime has occurred, there is often need for the investigation services to investigate the nature and perpetrators of the crime. In this context, 2.7% and 18.5% of the respondents were extremely satisfied and satisfied in relations to the investigation services. On the other hand, a cumulative of 64.3% of the respondents were dissatisfied and extremely dissatisfied with the intelligences services offered within the university. This could be attributable to the inefficiency and inadequacy of the services to address the nature of crime within the university. In respect to traffic management within the university, Table 4.16 above shows 18.5%, 27.0%, 13.3%, 11.2%, and 30.0% of the respondents were extremely satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied and extremely dissatisfied respectively. The traffic management within the university therefore received a fairly high satisfactory rating amongst the respondents with a cumulative 45.5% of the respondents being extremely satisfied and satisfied.

Reporting of Crime Incidents

The reporting of crime incidents refers to notification to other persons other than the victim that a crime has been committed (Hart & Colavito, 2011). The reporting of the crime activities was examined amongst the respondents who had been victims of the crime using Table 4.18. In this context, 72.2% of the theft crime reported the crime compared to 58.5% of physical assault, 55.6% of room burglary, 61.2% of the room burglary, and 53.3% of the mugging incidents. There was a high incident of reporting amongst the theft victims. This could be attributed to the need to recover the items stolen and the fact that the crime doesn't bear any stigma for being a victim. Similarly, 61.2% of the respondents indicated that they were victims of room burglary. This high level of reporting could be attributed to the need to recover the lost items given that cases of burglary often lead to loss of highly valuable items.

Table 4.4: Crime Reporting Levels through Specific Crime Activities

If you have been a victim of any of the following crimes on campus, did you report the incident?	Yes Freq. (%)	No Freq. (%)	Total Number of Victims
Theft	130 72.2%	50 27.8%	180 100.0%
Physical Assault	24 58.5%	17 41.5%	41 100.0%
Sexual Harassment	15 55.6%	12 44.4%	27 100.0%
Room Burglary	90 61.2%	57 38.8%	147 100.0%
Mugging	8 53.3%	7 46.7%	15 100.0%

Source: Field Data (2016)

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study found that the most prevalent crimes among university students were theft and room burglary at 43.9% and 35.9% respectively. According to the routine activity theory, these crimes occur when the students are mostly not in their halls of residence which provides a conducive environment for the crimes. The study therefore recommends the mounting of closed circuit television and increase of security guard presence within the university halls of residence so as to eliminate the favourable environment for these crimes to occur. The study also recommends the establishment of appropriate security services for the university to address challenges relating to security aspects.

REFERENCES

[1]. Addington, L. (2008). Current Issues in Victimization Research and the NCVS ' s Ability to Study Them. Journal of Justice Statistics, 2(4), 1–11.
[2]. Alan, J., O'Neill, D., Depue, R., & Englander, E. (2008). Campus Violence Prevention and Response. Journal of Drug Education & Awareness, 7(3), 9–16.
[3]. Arijesuyo, A. E., & Olusanya, O. O. (2011). Theoretical Perspectives on Campus Cultism and Violence in Nigeria Universities: A Review and Conceptual Approach. International Journal of Psychological Studies, 3(1), 106–112.
[4]. Bartula, A., & Bowen, K. (2015). University and College Officials' Perceptions of Open Carry on College Campus. Justice Policy Journal, 12(2), 1–17.
[5]. Bedenbaugh, C. (2003). Measuring Fear of Crime on Campus: A Study of an Urban University. Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis. Retrieved from etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-0704103-080530/.../Bedenbaugh_thesis.pdf
[6]. Bergh, D. D., & Ketchen, D. J. (2009). Research Methodology in Strategy and Management. Emerald Group Publishing.
[7]. Bode, T., & Snow, L. (2007). Stalking Acknowledgement and Reporting among College Women Experiencing Intrusive Behaviors: Implications for the Emergence of a "Classic Stalking Case." Journal of Criminal Justice, 35(5), 556–569.
[8]. Bryden, P., & Fletcher, P. . (2007). Personal Safety Practices, Beliefs and Attitudes of Academic Faculty on a Small University Campus: Comparison of Males and Females (Part 1). College Student Journal, 41(3), 13–622.
[9]. Chekwa, C., Thomas, E., & Jones, V. J. (2013). What Are College Students ' Perceptions About Campus Safety? Contemporary Issues In Education Research, 6(3), 325–332.
[10]. Cooper, R. D., Schindler, P. S., Cooper, P., Schindler, Z., Cooper, R. D., & Schindler, P. S. (2003). Business Research Methods (11th ed.). New Delhi: Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company.
[11]. Dobbs, R. R., Waid, C. A., & Shelley, T. O. (2009). Explaining fear of crime as fear of rape among college females: An examination of multiple campuses in the United States. International Journal of Social Inquiry, 2(2), 105–122.
[12]. Fazari, G. M. (2004). A Case Study Analysis of Undergraduate Perceptions of Theft Victimization. Journal of College Student Development, 5(June), 28–30.
[13]. Fisher, B. (1998). Crime of fear on campus. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 539: 85 – 101.
[14]. Fox, K. a, Nobles, M. R., & Piquero, A. R. (2009a). Gender, Crime Victimization and Fear of Crime. Security Journal, 22(1), 24–39.

[15]. Fox, K. a, Nobles, M. R., & Piquero, A. R. (2009b). Gender, crime victimization and fear of crime. Security Journal, 22(1), 24–39. https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2008.13

[16]. Gonzales, A. R., Schofield, R. B., & Schmitt, G. R. (2005). Sexual Assault on Campus: What Colleges and Universities Are Doing About It. Safety And Health, 8(3), 1–17.
[17]. Gover, A. R., Tomsich, E. A., Jennings, W. G., & Higgins, G. E. (2011). An Exploratory Study on Perceptions of Safety, Fear of Crime, and Victimization Experiences Among Faculty and Staff at An Urban University: A Focus on Gender. Criminal Justice Studies, 24(1), 37–55.
[18]. Gyong, J. E. (2010). Criminal Victimization and the Reporting of Crime in Kaduna State : Towards Integrating the Victim of Crime into Criminological Discourse, 2(5), 288–295.
[19]. Hart, T. C., & Colavito, V. (2011). College Student Victims and Reporting Crime to the Police: The Influence of Collective Efficacy. Western Criminology Review, 12(3), 1–19.
[20]. Henderson, C. E. (2010). Keeping Our Campuses Safe: Analyzing the Influence of Institutional Characteristics on Campus Crime Rates. University of North Carolina, Unpublished Master of Public Administration Thesis.
[21]. Hilinski, C. M., & Andrews, H. (2011). Explaining the Fear of Crime Among College Women, In Their Own Words. The Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice, 8(1), 115–123.
[22]. Hindelang, M. S., Gottfredson, M., & Garofalo, J. (1978) Victims of Personal Crime. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.
[23]. Honkatukia, P., Nyqvist, L., & Poso, T. (2006). Violence from within the reform school. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice 4(4), 328-344.
[24]. Howard, J. (2012). Promoting Effective Criminal Investigations of Campus Sex Crimes. Journal of Addiction and Social Issues, 15(3), 112–116.
[25]. Iriberri, A., Leroy, G., & Garrett, N. (2006). Reporting On-Campus Crime Online: User Intention To Use. Journal of Behavioural Addictions, 4(31), 6–8.
[26]. Kelly, B.T., & Torres, A. (2006), Campus safety: perceptions and experiences of women students. Journal of College Students Department, 47: 20 – 36.
[27]. Kleberg, J. R. (2004). Campus Safety : Reality and Perception. College Student Journal, 18(7), 19–38.
[28]. Krauss, A. L. (2013). Left in the Dark; University of Central Florida Students' Perceptions of Safety on Campus. University of Central Florida, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis.
[29]. Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The campus sexual assault study. Retrieved fromhttps://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf
[30]. McConnell, & Elizabeth, H. (1997). "Fear of Crime on Campus: A Study of a Southern University," Journal of Security Administration, Volume 20, Issue 2: pp. 22-46.
[31]. Mckinney, C. (2007). Violent Personal Crimes on Campus : The Influence of Size , Setting , and Police Presence. Journal of College & Character, 6(2), 16–23.
[32]. Mehra, D., Agardh, A., Stafstrom, M., & Ostergren, P. O. (2014). Is drinking alcohol associated with sexual coercion among Ugandan university students?: a cross-sectional study. Reproductive Health, 11(7), 7–9.
[33]. Muasya, J. N. (2014). Effects of Sexual Hrassment on Women Students' Access to Opportunities and Facilities; A Case Study of the University of Nairobi, Kenya. Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 3(4), 83–90.
[34]. Muscat, K. (2011). Rowan University students ' perceptions of campus safety. Rowan University, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis.
[35]. Ndung'u, W. (2015). Status of Private Accommodation for Undergraduate Students in Kenya : a Case of Kenyatta University.
[36]. Nicklin, J.L. (2002). Drug and alcohol arrest increased on campuses in 2000. The chronicle of higher education.
[37]. Nolan, J. J., Randazzo, M. R., & Deisinger, G. (2011). Campus Threat Assessment and Management Teams: What Risk Managers Need to Know Now. URMIA Journal, 4(2), 101–122.
[38]. Owusu G, Akoto J, & Abnory M. (2016). Is Our Safety and Security Guaranteed on University of Cape Coast Campus? Undergraduates Students' Perceptions. International Journal of Higher Education, 5(4), 75–85.
[39]. Peterson, J., Sackrison, E., & Polland, A. (2015). Training Students to Respond to Shootings On Campus: Is It Worth It? Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 2(2), 127–138.
[40]. Petherick, N. (2000). Environmental Design and Fear: The Prospect-Refuge Model and the University College of the Cariboo Campus. Western Geography, 11(1), 89–112.
[41]. Robinson, M. B., & Mullen, K. L. (2001).Crime on campus: A survey of space users. Crime Prevention and Community Safety, 3(4), 33–46.
[42]. Robinson, Matthew, B. (1998). "High Aesthetics/Low Incivilities: Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Risk in a Downtown Environment," Journal of Security Administration.Volume 21, Issue 2: pp. 19-32.

[43]. Sloan III, John J., Mark, M. L., & Deborah L. B. (2000). "Policing the contemporary university campus: Challenging traditional organizational models," Journal of Security Administration, Volume 23, Issue 1.

[44]. Starkweather, Sarah. (2007). Gender Perceptions of Safety and Strategic Responses among Ohio University Students. Gender, Place and Culture 14 (3): 355-370.

[45]. Steinmetz, N. M. (2012). Fear of Criminal Victimization in Relation to Specific Locations on a College Campus. University of Louisville, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis.

[46]. Taiwo, M. O., Omole, O. C., & Omole, O. E. (2014). Sexual Harassment and Psychological Consequence among Students in Higher Education Institution in Osun. International Journal of Applied Psychology, 4(1), 13–18.

[47]. Truman, J. L. (2007). Fear of Crime and Perceived Risk of Victimization Among College Students. Journal of Addiction and Social Issues, 36(11), 112–240.

[48]. University of Nairobi. (2013). University of Nairobi Security Department Annual Report 2012, (March), 1–5.

[49]. Warr, & Mark, S. (1983). "Fear of Victimization: A Look at the Proximate Causes,"Social Forces, Volume 61, Issue 4: pp. 1033-43.

[50]. Waynick, J. S. (2010). Spatial Analysis of Surveyed Perceptions of Safety , Crime , and Lighting : a College Campus Case Study. Appalachian State University, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis.

[51]. Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). A Multidimensional Examination of Campus Safety: Victimization, Perceptions of Danger, Worry About Crime, and Precautionary Behavior Among College Women in the Post-Clery Era. Crime & Delinquency, 53(2), 219–254.