

The Perception of Causes and Types of Crime in the Informal Settlements in Nairobi, Kenya

Dr John Ndikaru Wa Teresia, PhD.

*Senior Lecturer of Criminology, Technical University of Kenya, School of Information and Social Studies
Department of Criminology and Legal Studies, P O Box 57173 - 00200 Nairobi – Kenya*

Abstract: The prevention and containment of crime is a key priority for governing authorities given that security is a significant contributor to social and economic development in any society. However, the quest to control and prevent crime in informal settlements has remained elusive for government authorities and the upsurge of more people settling into these slums threatens to make the situation untenable going forward. This study embarked on making comparisons between the types and causes of crime in four informal settlements in Nairobi, Kenya, which include Kibera, Mathare, Mukuru, and Korogocho slums. The findings of the study were based on a sample size of 659 who were surveyed and their responses were analyzed descriptively. The study found that poverty was the major cause of crime in the informal settlement, and its antecedents include low education levels, high unemployment rates, and underemployment of most residents. The study recommended the provision of poverty alleviation programs targeting entrepreneurship and skills development for the youth; upgrading of the housing in the informal settlements and adoption of community policing to enhance the collaboration between the residents and police in controlling and preventing crime.

Key words: crime control, crime prevention, informal settlements, poverty alleviation

I. INTRODUCTION

The surge in crime trends in the recent past has continued to defy efforts that have been put in place by government and non-government agencies in terms of preventing and managing criminal activities. This has put the peace and stability of the country in a precarious position and even jeopardized social and economic developments (Musoi, et al., 2014). Within urban spaces, crime continues to be a headache for both the informal urban residents and local authorities charged with the responsibility for preventing and controlling crime.

Informal settlements are often considered the hub of criminality in urban spaces (Fattah & Walters, 2020). Informal settlements are also referred to as inner-city neighborhoods or slums. They are typically areas that are characterized by deprivation or the lack of basic urban services, and amenities including shelter and sanitation facilities such as toilets. Informal settlements are also identified by economic deprivation of their residents, lack of security of tenure of the residential land, and squalor. Notably, these characteristics are consistent across various informal settlements across the globe and due to this the trends are

levels of crime are also generally similar across the informal settlements (Musoi, et al., 2014). Notably, these particular characteristics make informal settlements ideal for criminal activities and criminal agents to thrive.

The informal settlements account for the majority of the urban population in most cities in developing countries (Fattah & Walters, 2020) such as Kenya and are essential for the economic and social development of those cities (Mutahi, 2011) because most semi-skilled and unskilled labor force that makes up the informal sector come from these slums. Notably, informal sectors are considered the bedrock of these developing economies as they provide employment opportunities for many and also generate the bulk of goods and services that are consumed locally. However, despite their important role in the economic and social development of these urban spaces, informal settlement residents are subjected to stigmatization which affects their relationship with the wider urban areas, and also limits their life chances (Fattah & Walters, 2020). This study compared the types and causes of crime in four urban informal settlements in Nairobi Kenya.

Objectives of the Study

- i. To examine the types of crime in four urban informal settlements in Nairobi, Kenya.
- ii. To investigate the causes of crimes in four urban informal settlements in Nairobi, Kenya.
- iii. To recommend measures for controlling and preventing crime in four urban informal settlements in Nairobi, Kenya.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Types of Crime in Informal Urban Settlements

Extant literature on crime in informal settlements in Kenya has revealed a catalog that ranges from serious crimes to misdemeanors. Notably, the informal settlements in urban areas provide a convenient environment for the perpetration of various forms of crimes. For instance, the most prevalent crime in Korogocho slum in Nairobi County includes stealing and mugging. The other very common crimes include fraud and rape (Murefu, Wamũyũ, & Ochieng, (2019). The gangs in informal settlements such Kibera and Mathare engage in various forms of crime and also provide slum residents with illegal electricity and water connections even as they extort

money from the dwellers. They are a type of a 'local government' and they extort the dwellers for a protection fee which is their form of taxation (Mutahi, 2011).

Kubende (2018) found that the most prevalent type of crime in Kibera was robbery and pickpocketing at 29% and 23% respectively. The other forms of crime included mugging (15%); robbery with violence (8.3%); sexual abuse (7.4%); carjacking and theft at 6.5% each and murder at 4.6%. Osundwa, (2021) notes that most crimes reported in the informal settlements are perpetrated by the youth and include rape, armed robbery, prostitution, corruption, bribery, fraud, homicides, gambling, food and drugs alterations, drug trafficking, smuggling, human trafficking, money laundering, and kidnapping.

Causes of Crime in Informal Urban Settlements

Extant literature has indicated various predictors for crime involvement and criminal activities in the informal urban settlement. Poor housing infrastructure in the informal settlement is a key enabler of criminal activities. According to Fattah & Walters, (2020), the segregation of cities into formal and informal settlements has resulted in territorial stigma which in itself has become an instrument for maintaining hegemonic control by actively producing and reproducing social and spatial divisions. Kubende (2018) observes that in most cases the informal settlement shelter includes single-room units that are constructed using inferior material, which leaves the occupants exposed to not just the elements of the weather but criminal intruders as well.

Meth, (2017) contends that in most cases violence and crime are influenced by social and economic inequalities even though the spatial design of urban housing and urban areas also contributes to criminogenic behavior. For instance, building materials used in informal housing in South Africa greatly increase vulnerability to crime by making the settlement hyper permeable spaces and therefore targets by criminals. The housing also lacks security features such as fences and burglar guards which contribute to their hyperpermeability. Musoi, et al., (2014) concur that there is a strong causal relationship between the occurrence of crime and the environment in which crime is perpetrated.

Generally, there are more current spots in urban informal settlements as compared to the planned affluent residential neighborhoods, which can be explained by the fact that residents in these posh neighborhoods have the financial wherewithal to invest in better security. Shikuku, Makworo, & Njuguna (2018) also found that most of the houses in these informal settlements that are prone to robberies and burglaries are those that face the streets, and Ndikaru (2010) noted that the lack of proper lighting makes slums the most convenient spaces for criminal hideouts.

Economic factors have been considered as the key cause of crime in informal urban settlements. These economic factors are characterized as youth unemployment (Kubende, 2018;

Musoi, et al.,2014; Mutahi, 2011, Ndikaru, 2010) with the idleness and lack of basic needs pushing the youth towards criminal activities to earn a living (Filippi, Cocina, & Martinuzzi, 2020; Murefu, Wamũyũ, & Ochieng, 2019). The other economic factors include high poverty levels amongst the households in the settlement (Filippi, Cocina, & Martinuzzi, 2020; Musoi, et al., 2014; Mutahi, 2011), which has made some slum residents empathize with gang activities as they blame the government for doing nothing to create economic empowerment opportunities for them (Mutahi, 2011). These high poverty levels are caused by increased rural-urban migration and lack of economic growth (Ndikaru, 2010), which necessitate the crowding of the economically disenfranchised people into informal settlements. In other studies that have looked at the economic predictors of crime in informal settlements Ndikaru (2010) found that rape crimes in the Kaptembwa slum in Eldoret town were positively and significantly correlated to economic factors including unemployment and economic inequality.

Economic theories regarding criminal activities have supported the findings presented in these previous studies. Economic theorists such as Jeremy Bentham and Cesare Beccaria argue that people commit a crime when it becomes evident that the benefits they acquire from it are higher as compared to the costs. This implies that individuals have the free will of deciding whether they should participate in criminal activities (Britt & Gottfredson, 2003). Winters, Globokar, & Roberson, (2014) note that in most contexts the rational reaction of society to criminal activity involves reaching a point where the cost of crime is increased and its benefits significantly reduced or alternatively reaching a point where crime no longer pays.

There is also a broad scope of social factors that have been linked to criminality in the urban informal sectors. These include the abuse of drugs and substances (Musoi, et al., 2014); for instance, formal settlements in Kenya have for a long time been regarded as illegal by the authorities and they have as a result been subjected to neglect evidenced by the lack of provision of social amenities. This has resulted in numerous social conflicts that have in turn manifested in the form of criminal activities which include selling and consuming illegal substances, and mostly among youth who have become aggressive and resort to crime so that they can keep affording the drugs (Shikuku, Makworo, & Njuguna, 2018).

The other social factors include peer pressure (Musoi, et al., 2014); the easy access to small arms (Musoi, et al., 2014, Ndikaru, 2010), which are used to perpetrate criminal activities. The other social predictors include low education levels (Kubende, 2018), which significantly contributes to high unemployment rates (Filippi, Cocina, & Martinuzzi, 2020; Kubende, 2018; Ndikaru, 2010); dysfunctional family structures (Kubende, 2018), characterized by broken families, single parenting, and abusive parenting that have contributed to the poor upbringing of children who later resort to criminal

activities around them (Kubende, 2018). Ndikaru (2010) also found that negative ethnicity and political competition was significant cause of rape crimes at Kaptembwa slum in Eldoret town and more particularly during electioneering seasons.

Studies have also indicated that the difficulties involved in reporting crime are also a key contributor to the prevalence of crime in informal settlements. Ndikaru (2010) established that most crime hotspots in the informal settlements are out of bounds for the police who are supposed to ensure the maintenance of law and order there, which makes it increasingly difficult for residents to collaborate with the police or report criminal activities. Musoi, et al., (2014) found that most informal settlement residents were discouraged from reporting criminal activities because the police would demand bribes before they can work on the cases. Besides being unfriendly to a larger extent, the police did not take any action against property-related criminal incidents. The police also lacked confidentiality that the informers need to be protected from criminal gangs and it is also too inordinately long for one to make their statement.

The failure in the criminal justice system has incentivized criminal activities in informal settlements. According to Ndikaru (2010) poor court judgments, in which case criminals have been released on bail or given lighter sentences have significantly contributed to the increase in crime in the informal settlements. Besides, the social policies enacted by local authorities have also contributed to an increase in crime. Meth, (2017) notes that poor policing services have contributed to the provision of communal pit latrines which cannot be easily accessed at night, especially by women and children who are prone to muggings and rapes when they do. There are also no regulations on how people should build their structures, which leads to limited passageways lighting and streets where criminal activities thrive.

The communities in the informal settlements seem to benefit from gang activities. Due to the neglect by the authorities based on the illegality of their settlement, slum residents are often disconnected from crucial services that make urban life convenient including water and electricity. The gangs step in and provide illegal connections to these critical services at a fee, effectively alleviating the suffering of the residents. They also charge them protection fees to guarantee their safety from attacks by rival gangs (Mutahi, 2011). In this way, the slum communities are enablers of gang criminality, which in essence seems to fill in gaps from failed government interventions.

There are also instances of collaboration between the police and the criminals or gangs that operate in the slums. The continuum of legality and illegality in the informal settlement is characterized by the ambiguous relationship between gangs and the police. There are cases where the police have killed gang members to assert their authority in the informal settlements; the police have also used gang members as informers, and have eventually established mutual tolerance,

cooperation, and coexistence in solving crimes in this neighborhood. The police have also been accused of protecting gangs when they commit crimes since they benefit from the proceeds of crime and extortion. Due to these, dwellers in informal settlements such as Mathare and Kibera report crimes to the police or gangs best on the seriousness of the crime. For instance, crimes such as rape and murder are reported to the police due to their gravity; while petty crimes such as house break-ins, domestic violence, muggings, fights, and theft are reported to the gangs. In most cases, the residents prefer gangs rather than the police since they are sure that the culprit will be dealt with, unlike the police who may not investigate the case unless they are bribed (Mutahi, 2011).

These reviewed studies underscore the fact that the social causes of criminogenic behavior in the informal settlement far outweigh the economic and other physical environmental predictors. These social antecedents are reflective of the social learning theory which aims at explaining the socialization of individuals and their subsequent development and more particularly how their social influences that particular development. According to Akers & Jensen, (2007) the social learning theory argues that people get involved in criminal activity as a result of their association with other criminals. The association, therefore, reinforces the criminal behavior out of which they develop beliefs that are favorable to criminal activity (Osundwa, 2021). Therefore, this implies that the society around them provides them with a model of criminality with which they associate. Consequently, they end up being crime as a desirable activity or they may justify it based on some particular situations (Beaver, Barnes, & Boutwell, 2014). Teasdale & Bradley, (2017) further noted that the learning of deviant behavior is similar to learning to conform to acceptable behavior since it is done through exposure to others or by association with others. The association with criminals or delinquent friends is therefore considered as a key predictor of delinquent behavior apart from one being a past delinquent.

As the reviewed literature has demonstrated the social and physical environment in the informal settlements, provides justification for youth who are embroiled in poverty, who have limited education and limited opportunities for economic growth to resort to crime as their way of earning a living (Kubende, 2018; Musoi, et al., 2014; Mutahi, 2011, Ndikaru, 2010). The community in which they reside is supportive of their criminal activities, especially when conducted in gangs, and same to provide essential services to the slum dwellers at an affordable cost (Musoi, et al., 2014; Mutahi, 2011); the community is also sympathetic to the youth whom they consider to have no other alternatives for economic development rather than engage in criminal activities (Mutahi, 2011). Arguably, such a social and physical environment may serve as an incentive for the young unemployed to engage in criminal activities.

Beaver, Barnes, & Boutwell, (2014) notes that the social learning theory proposed that there are three silent

mechanisms through which individuals are oriented into criminal activities. They include differential reinforcement, modeling, and beliefs. Differential reinforcement implies that individuals teach one another to engage in criminal activity through reinforcement and punishment of particular behavior (Akers & Jensen, 2007; Beaver, Barnes, & Boutwell, 2014). Beaver, Barnes, & Boutwell, (2014) further notes that due to this, the frequent occurrence of a crime if there is frequent reinforcement and infrequent punishment; besides, crime occurs when the reinforcement results in gains such as money, pleasure, or social approval and there is little punishment, if any, for the crime committed. Furthermore, crime is highly likely to occur when it is more likely to be reinforced as compared to other alternative behaviors. Therefore, individuals who have been reinforced for crime are highly likely to subsequently commit crimes particularly when they are put in situations that are similar to those that they were reinforced with.

The other social learning mechanisms for criminogenic behavior involve the development of beliefs that justify criminal behavior or activities (Beaver, Barnes, & Boutwell, 2014).

Apart from reinforcing criminal behavior, people learn beliefs that are favorable to criminal activity from others. These beliefs may involve approval of some particular minor forms of crimes such as gambling, and drug and substance abuse. This may include the justification or approval of some particular types of crimes, some of which can be serious crimes (Beaver, Barnes, & Boutwell, 2014; Teasdale & Bradley, 2017). At this level, individuals acknowledge that the crime is generally wrong but they find justification for it based on some particular situations. An individual may therefore justify prostitution or theft based on their lack of opportunity to acquire means for gainful employment. Thirdly, people may hold beliefs that encourage criminal activity making it an attractive alternative to other behaviors (Akers & Jensen, 2007). Such individuals may have a strong desire for a good life, or to succeed easily and quickly, or those who desire to be considered as tough by others and therefore consider a crime as their mainstay.

The other social mechanism involved imitating criminal models (Beaver, Barnes, & Boutwell, 2014). This is based on the fact that behavior is not just a product of reinforcement or punishments and beliefs that an individual may be exposed to (Akers & Jensen, 2007). Instead, behavior also results from the behavior of the people around an individual. They, therefore, provide one with models upon which they can form their own behavior and particularly when those individuals are influential (Teasdale & Bradley, 2017). Therefore, children who grow up in neighborhoods where the people they admire commit crimes are highly likely to get reinforced for that crime, and therefore highly likely to commit the crimes themselves. Social learning, therefore, is relevant in this case when it comes to understanding the predictors of criminal behavior in the social context of informal settlement residents.

Various sociological theories have supported the findings highlighted in these studies. Sociological theories posit that crime is a product of sociological phenomena as influenced by social and environmental factors (Winters, Globokar, & Roberson, 2014). These factors can be at the micro-level in terms of socialization including the family, peer group, workplace, or school. They could also be at the meso-level involving the process of urbanization and industrialization, in which case they include the community, city, or village. Besides, they could be at the macro-level and in this case involve the local or global society (Britt & Gottfredson, 2003). The sociological theories, therefore, consider crime as the manifestation of pathology or social deviance and therefore, involves the violation of the values and norms, which is considered destructive to the community. Based on the culture and context, criminal behavior may therefore be considered normal or be condemned as a social ill (Winters, Globokar, & Roberson, 2014).

Notably, extant empirical literature did not associate the occurrence of crime to any biological factors that have been theorized to predict criminogenic behavior. Notably, biological theories focus on biological factors such as neurological, biochemical, and physiological factors; they also consider genetic factors as critical determinants of human development (Dubber & Hörnle, 2014). Therefore, biological theories train their attention to personality disorders and divide them into acquired disorders also referred to as characteropathy and congenital disorders or rather psychopathy (Britt & Gottfredson, 2003). The theories, therefore, premise the involvement of crime as a form of individual deviation resulting from mental faults or an average state of mental balance, characterized by low mental development levels. Due to this, persons with mental illnesses such as schizophrenia or oligofrenia are highly predisposed to adopting criminogenic behavior (Winters, Globokar, & Roberson, 2014). An empirical study on the biological causes of crime in the informal settlement is warranted to establish the manifestation amongst residents in these contexts.

Preventing and Controlling Crime in Informal Urban Settlements

Much of the empirical studies in preventing and controlling crime in informal urban settlements have looked at the need for addressing the physical environment predictors of criminogenic behavior. Meth, (2017) notes that crime prevention through environmental design has evolved especially after it has been criticized for emphasizing the environmental and physical factors that predict crime. Currently, this crime prevention approach incorporates social awareness in its analysis of housing or neighborhood designs. The idea is also supported by Brown-Luthango, Reyes, & Gubevu, (2016) who established that the further development of the physical infrastructure in the informal settlements is considered an effective strategy for improving the social, health, and economic outcomes of the residents and therefore,

minimizing or eliminating the criminogenic triggers that are occasioned by the physical environment.

Based on the problem analysis triangle, the physical environment is a critical consideration when looking for interventions to control and prevent crime in particular localities. The problem analysis triangle was developed from the routine activity model, which is used in explaining why and how crime occurs (Clarke & Eck, 2014). The triangle proposes a framework for thinking about recurrent crime and devising appropriate interventions. The triangle presumes that three key things must fall in place for a crime to occur, which include the offender, the victim or target, and the convenient place and time (Peak, 2013). Therefore, when a likely offender encounters their target victim at a convenient place and time they will invariably victimize them. The crime, may, however, abort if the victim is in the presence of people who may protect them from the offender.

The place and time where crime normally occurs may also be controlled by people such as guards, police, or CCTV cameras, therefore, deterring criminals from finding it convenient for committing their crimes. Therefore, based on this framework, effective control and prevention of crime requires an understanding of how the offender(s) and their targeted victims encounter each other in particular places and at a particular time; and also how to control these three key variables (Clarke & Eck, 2014). The problem analysis triangle, therefore, reveals the security lapses in particular locations and at particular times; thereby revealing the appropriate intervention that could be adopted in those respective cases. The problem analysis triangle is, therefore, instructive in understanding the crime hotspots in the informal settlements with respect to how and what interventions can be adapted to contain and prevent crime in those particular areas.

The establishment of vigilante groups has proved an effective local solution to criminal activities in informal settlements. Musoi, et al., (2014) found that informal settlement residents have formed vigilante groups because they are quick when it comes to responding to crime and resolving criminal cases; the vigilante group members are also aware of the criminals and are effective when it comes to recovering stolen property. In some informal settlements such as Kibra in Nairobi and Bondeni in Nakuru, the vigilante members are more respected than the police. Vigilante groups are considered as a form of informal policing and according to Mutahi, (2011), they have been associated with gangsterism, radicalization, warlordism, and the general abuse of human rights. Involved a complex web of linkages that contains various groups largely composed of youth. There is therefore a need for ensuring the formation of vigilante groups involves betting to eliminate criminal elements that may compromise the process of preventing and controlling crime in informal settlements.

Therefore, informal policing should take note of the role that gangs play in informal settlements and therefore incorporate the good elements even as they leverage the already existing networks to strengthen the formal security structures. This is

because the disbandment or criminalization of gangs without providing adequate measures to address the security gaps has already proved ineffective when it comes to solving crime in informal settlements (Mutahi, 2011).

Closely associated with the formation of vigilante groups is community policing. According to Kubende, (2018) community policing involves the members of the public in the policing activities with the major goal of reducing and preventing crime. Murefu, Wamüyü, & Ochieng, (2019) notes that community policy has proved to be a more effective complementary policing approach as compared to the traditional policing form, even though the government interventions were not adequate to support the effective implementation of community policing. Shikuku, Makworo, & Njuguna, (2018) found that the adoption of community policing has not only prevented crime in the crime hot spots; it has also helped to restore the confidence of members of the public to the police service and increased police responsiveness to crime occurrences.

Both community policing and the formation of vigilante groups are crime prevention strategies that could provide effective in curbing minor forms of crimes, which may, in turn, contribute to the overall enhancement of security. The broken window theory argues that any visible manifestations of civil disorder and crime such as public use and abuse of substances, vandalism, and broken windows result in an urban environment in which more crime and disorder thrive (Kelling & Coles, 1997). This makes the policing of these particular misdemeanors helpful when it comes to the realization of a lawful and ordered society in which the crime rates are low and all the citizens feel safe (Walker, 2015). Therefore, the broken window policies seek to regulate low-level criminal activities as a way of preventing large-scale unlawfulness and disorder from occurring. The successful containment of the low-level crimes creates the impression of enhanced security in the whole neighborhood (Kelling & Coles, 1997). With the increased reduction in the visible display of disorder and neglect, there is a high possibility for a violent or serious crime to go down as well, which will, in turn, translate into the overall reduction of crime in the neighborhood and therefore, enhanced public safety (Walker, 2015).

Other interventions to reduce or prevent crime in informal settlements could include the adoption of slum upgrading programs which involves the construction of high-rise blocks flats to replace the dilapidated housing of the residents (Kubende, 2018). Besides, the establishment of poverty reduction programs can be used to address social predictors of criminal activity in informal settlements. Kubende, (2018) specifies that these programs should involve training and development for the youth to provide them with skills they can use to get employment or start their own enterprises.

Technology has also come in handy when it comes to preventing crime in urban spaces. Filippi, Cocina, & Martinuzzi, (2020) notes that with the approach of crime prevention changing from repressive to preventive crime

mapping has been greatly adopted whereby statistical and geographical tools are used to study criminal events. These tools are based on digital geographic analysis applications such as the Geographical Information system GIS). The use of these tools enables policymakers and other stakeholders to combine architectural and territorial information with other diverse sources such as crime reports, public and private lighting, and video surveillance systems. This makes it possible for crime to be analyzed comprehensively and for the crime-prone areas within a particular territory to be identified including the causes of criminal activities in that area. This accurate analysis of crime trends paves the way for the development of more specific and effective crime prevention strategies.

III. METHODS

The correlational study aimed at investigating the causes and types of crime in the informal settlement in Nairobi. Therefore, the research population in the study was randomly sampled from residents in Kibera, Mathare, Mukuru, and Korogocho. A total of 659 respondents participated in the study, consisting of 223 Kibera residents, 152 Mathare residents, 169 Mukuru residents, and 115 Korogocho residents. The participants were aged 18 years and above. The data was collected using surveys and was later analyzed using descriptive statistics, which included percentages and frequencies that were thereafter presented using tables.

IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Participants Demographic Profile

A. Gender

The findings showed that both female and male slum residents participated in the study (Table 1.1). However, more men than women participated in the study at 53% and 47% respectively. Therefore, the findings of the study reflected nearly equal proportion of views from both gender of informal sector residents.

Table 1.1: Gender

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Male	53%	52%	57%	54%	46%
Female	47%	48%	43%	46%	54%

B. Age of Respondents

The findings showed that the respondents were drawn from various age categories. Most of the respondents from the four informal settlements were aged between 24-34 years (43%); the second largest category of participants were aged between 18 – 24 years (33%). Besides, those aged between 35 – 44 years were 15%; those aged between 45 – 54 years were 5%; those aged between 55 – 64 were 3% and those aged from 65

and above were only 1%. Furthermore, only 1% of the respondents refused to indicate their age (Table 1.2). The findings therefore, showed that most of the residents in the informal settlements were youth as they were cumulatively aged between 18 and 43 years.

Table 1.2: Age

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
18-24 years	33%	38%	24%	30%	42%
25-34 years	43%	42%	44%	47%	37%
35-44 years	15%	11%	20%	17%	12%
45-54 years	5%	4%	6%	2%	8%
55-64 years	3%	2%	5%	2%	0%
65 years+	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%
Refused	1%	2%	0%	1%	0%

C. The Highest Level of Education

The finding of the study revealed that the informal settlement residents have varied levels of education attainment. The majority of the respondents had completed their secondary education (30%); another significant majority had completed primary education (23%). However, only 15% had tertiary education, and 1% had university level education; while 19% had some secondary education; 9% had some primary school education and 3% had never gone to school. Besides, about 1% of the respondents refused to indicate their education level (Table 1.3). A combination of those residents who had some secondary education (19%) and those who had completed secondary education (30%) reveal that cumulatively, most of the residents in these informal settlements have acquired education up to the secondary school level.

Table 1.3: Highest level of Education

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Never gone to School	3%	2%	6%	2%	4%
Some primary school	9%	5%	13%	4%	17%
Primary completed	23%	22%	32%	15%	23%
Some secondary	19%	24%	19%	14%	19%
Secondary completed	30%	31%	16%	46%	20%
Tertiary College	15%	13%	13%	18%	15%
University and above	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Refused	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

D. Marital Status of the Respondents

The findings of the study showed that most of the respondents were married (49%). However, 43% of the respondents were single while 8% were either widowed, divorced or separated (Table 1.5).

Tab 1.4: Marital Status

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Single	43%	44%	34%	51%	41%
Married	49%	50%	53%	43%	50%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	8%	5%	13%	7%	10%

F. House Hold Status of the Respondents

The findings showed that the respondents held varied status in their households. The majority of the respondents were the head of their households (51%); 24% were housewives; 12% were relatives; 7% were children to the heads of the households; 3% were others while 2% refused to divulge their household status (Table 1.5).

Table 1.5: House Hold Status

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Head of Household	51%	46%	64%	51%	46%
Housewife	24%	28%	18%	22%	25%
Relative	12%	11%	7%	20%	6%
Child	7%	10%	3%	2%	16%
Other	3%	4%	4%	2%	5%
Refused	2%	1%	3%	4%	2%

Housing Conditions of the Respondents

A. Household Type

The findings showed that the houses that the respondents lived in were of various types, based on the material used to make them. Most of the houses of the respondent were made of iron sheets (33%); mud houses accounted for 31%; brick stone houses were 20%; timber houses were 5%; while those made by other material were 11% (Table 1.6). Notably, iron sheet houses were most predominant in Mathare (52%) and Mukuru (63%) as compared to other types of housing. In Kibera most houses were made of mud (63%) and the same case applied to Korogocho (39%). The findings therefore, demonstrated the most common household types in the informal settlement are mud and iron sheets housing.

Table 1.6: Household type

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Mud	31%	63%	13%	1%	39%
Timber	5%	2%	3%	12%	3%
Brick/Stone	20%	2%	30%	24%	35%
Iron Sheets	33%	4%	52%	63%	21%
Other	11%	30%	2%	1%	2%

B. Number of People Sharing the House

The findings showed that the number of people sharing houses in the informal settlements ranged from between 2 – 4 people. About 22% of the respondents consisted of 2 people sharing a household; another 22% accounted for 3 people sharing a household while 20% represented 4 people sharing a household. However, a significant proportion of the residents (37%) had alternative living arrangements (Table 1.7).

Table 1.7: Number of people sharing the house

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
2 people	22%	23%	22%	23%	18%
3 people	22%	16%	26%	31%	15%
4 people	20%	24%	22%	12%	18%
Other	37%	37%	30%	34%	49%

C. Type of Toilet

The findings indicated that the residents of the informal settlements predominantly had pit latrines and water closets at their disposal. Most of the residents however, had pit latrines (85%); while 14% had water closets with cess tank, while the rest 1% did not mention their type of toilet (Table 1.8). Therefore, pit latrine is the mostly used type of toilet in the informal settlements.

Table 1.8: Type of toilet

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Pit Latrine	85%	98%	77%	78%	81%
Water Closet with Cess tank	14%	1%	22%	21%	19%
Others	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Not mentioned	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%

D. Toilet Facility Shared by More than One Household

The findings showed that the majority of the respondents shared their toilet facility with more than one household (97%); while only 3% did not share their toilets.

Table 1.9: Toilet facility shared by more than one household

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Yes	97%	99%	92%	98%	98%
No	3%	1%	8%	2%	2%

Economic Occupation of the Respondents

A. Work Status of the Respondents

The findings showed that the majority of the respondents (31%) were employed as casual laborers; 25% were unemployed; 23% were self-employed; 10% were employed fulltime; 8% were employed part time and only 1% were retired. The other 2% refused to reveal their work status.

Table 1.10 Work Status

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Unemployed	25%	32%	20%	22%	20%
Employed casual labourer	31%	26%	38%	30%	32%
Employed part-time	8%	10%	9%	9%	4%
Employed full-time	10%	9%	9%	11%	9%
Self employed	23%	19%	22%	26%	30%
Retired	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Refused	2%	2%	3%	2%	4%

B. Income Levels of the Respondents

The findings indicated that 22% of the respondents earned between 3001 to 5000 each month; 16% earned between 1000 to 3000 monthly; 14% earned between 5000 to 7000; 7% earned less than 1000; and 5% earned between 7000 and 9000. Besides, while those earning more than 9000 were 5%, about 32% refused to reveal their income bracket.

Table 1.11: Income

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Less than 1000.00	7%	4%	10%	2%	20%
1000.00 to 3000.00	16%	7%	36%	8%	18%

3001.00 to 5000.00	22%	18%	27%	23%	18%
5001.00 to 7000.00	14%	14%	12%	21%	5%
7001.00 to 9000.00	5%	7%	1%	7%	2%
Over 9000.00	5%	4%	2%	8%	3%
Don't know/Refused	32%	46%	13%	31%	33%

C. Perception of Respondents Regarding the Economy

The findings showed that the majority of the respondents (81%) considered the economy as a big problem; 14% claimed that it was a moderate problem; 3% indicated that it was a small problem while only 1% claimed that it was no problem at all.

Table 1.12: Economy

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
A big problem	81%	88%	73%	86%	71%
A moderate problem	14%	8%	22%	12%	18%
A small problem	3%	3%	3%	1%	6%
No problem at all	1%	1%	0%	1%	3%
Refused/Missing	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%

D. Perception of Respondents Regarding Unemployment

The findings indicated that 89% of the respondents considered unemployment as a big problem; 7% considered it a moderate problem; 2% claimed it was a small problem; while another 2% said that it was not a problem at all.

Table 1.13: Unemployment

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
A big problem	89%	84%	94%	93%	89%
A moderate problem	7%	9%	4%	6%	9%
A small problem	2%	4%	2%	1%	1%
No problem at all	2%	4%	0%	0%	1%
Refused/Missing	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%

E. Perception of the Respondents Regarding Poverty

The findings showed that the majority of the respondents (89%) said that poverty was a big problem; 13% claimed that poverty was a moderate problem while 3% indicated that it was a small problem.

Table 1.14: Poverty

Total		Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
A big problem	83%	81%	86%	82%	86%
A moderate problem	13%	13%	12%	14%	11%
A small problem	3%	5%	1%	4%	3%
No problem at all	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Refused/Missing	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%

A moderate problem	35%	28%	38%	38%	43%
A small problem	15%	16%	24%	10%	10%
No problem at all	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Refused/Missing	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%

Crime in the Informal Settlement

A. Perception of the Respondents Regarding Crime and Safety

The majority of the respondents (47%) said that crime and safety was a big problem in the informal settlements; 35% said it was a moderate problem; 15% claimed it was a small problem and 2% indicated that it was not a problem at all.

Table 1.15: Crime and safety

Total		Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
A big problem	47%	54%	37%	50%	44%

B. Spontaneous Crime Faced by the Residents

The findings showed that the respondents were exposed to a variety of crimes. The most common crimes included general robbery (59%); muggings (50%); burglary (50%); illicit brew (47%) and assault (43%). The other crimes included drugs (31%) robbery with violence (30%); murder (23%); pick-pocketing and sexual abuse (13%).

The most common spontaneous crime affecting men in Kibera were burglaries (54%) and muggings (50%); while women were mostly affected by general robbery (51%), burglary (48%) and muggings (48%). In Mathare the crime that mostly affected men was illicit brew (74%) and assault (66%); while women were mostly affected by illicit brew (77%) and assault (72%). In Mukuru men often faced general robbery (74%) and burglary (60%) whereas women faced general robbery (78%) and illicit brew (64%). In Korogoch men mostly faced muggings (53%) and robbery with violence (51%) whereas women faced general robbery (55%) and muggings (47%).

Table 1.16: Crime faced in the slum areas - Spontaneous

	Total	Slum settlement							
		Kibera		Mathare	Mukuru		Korogoch		
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	N=659	N=116	N=107	N=87	N=65	N=92	N=77	N=53	N=62
Assault	43%	49%	43%	66%	72%	18%	25%	38%	29%
Pick-pocketing	22%	20%	13%	36%	28%	27%	22%	17%	13%
Mugging	50%	50%	48%	52%	51%	49%	49%	53%	47%
Sexual abuse	13%	5%	11%	13%	12%	7%	8%	23%	42%
Burglary	50%	54%	48%	51%	55%	60%	44%	43%	42%
Robbery with violence	30%	22%	15%	22%	23%	49%	39%	51%	31%
General robbery	59%	46%	51%	66%	60%	74%	78%	42%	55%
Arson	10%	2%	3%	24%	26%	14%	6%	4%	2%
Murder	23%	22%	19%	37%	38%	13%	16%	17%	27%
Car-jacking	2%	0%	1%	5%	6%	2%	0%	2%	6%
Kidnapping	3%	0%	0%	7%	6%	1%	0%	2%	8%
Illicit brew	47%	26%	28%	74%	77%	52%	64%	38%	32%
Drugs	31%	16%	12%	60%	48%	36%	34%	28%	24%
Other	6%	13%	7%	6%	5%	3%	0%	6%	6%
Refused/Missing	2%	0%	3%	0%	0%	2%	5%	0%	2%

C. Prompted Crime Faced by the Residents

The findings indicated that the respondents faced various forms of prompted crimes. The most common form of prompted crime included drugs (51%); illicit brew (50%); murder (42%); assault (37%); muggings (34%); burglary (34%)’ pickpocketing (32%); robbery with violence (32%) and general robbery (31%). The other forms of crime included arson (16%); kidnapping (9%); and car-jacking (7%).

The most common prompted crimes in Kibera included illicit brew (69%) and drugs (68%). In Mathare the most common prompted crimes included pickpocketing (33%); murder (32%) and mugging (32%). In Mukuru drugs (41%), assault (40%) and murder (40%) were common prompted crimes, while drugs (59%) and assault (56%) were common in Korogocho.

Table 1.17: Crime faced in the slum areas - Prompted

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Assault	37%	31%	26%	40%	56%
Pick-pocketing	32%	21%	33%	31%	55%
Mugging	34%	33%	32%	34%	39%
Sexual abuse	24%	22%	16%	25%	37%
Burglary	34%	35%	28%	31%	49%
Robbery with violence	32%	31%	31%	25%	46%
General robbery	31%	35%	31%	18%	43%
Arson	16%	4%	22%	21%	24%
Murder	42%	48%	32%	40%	47%
Car-jacking	7%	3%	6%	7%	16%
Kidnapping	9%	4%	11%	5%	19%
Illicit brew	50%	69%	25%	39%	63%
Drugs	51%	68%	30%	41%	59%
Other	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Refused/Missing	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%

D. Most Prevalent Crime

The findings showed that the most prevalent crime in the informal settlements was illicit brew (26%) and general robbery (19%). The most prevalent crime in Kibera was mugging (25%); illicit brew in Mathare (24%) and Mukuru (43%) and, general robbery (23%) and illicit brew (23%) in Korogocho.

Table 1.18: Most prevalent crime

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Assault	6%	9%	10%	1%	4%
Pick-pocketing	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%
Mugging	18%	25%	20%	11%	13%
Sexual abuse	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%
Burglary	12%	16%	11%	12%	7%
Robbery with violence	6%	5%	9%	2%	12%
General robbery	19%	19%	13%	21%	23%
Arson	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Murder	1%	1%	2%	0%	1%
Illicit brew	26%	16%	24%	43%	23%
Drugs	4%	4%	5%	5%	3%
Other	1%	2%	0%	1%	0%
Refused/Missing	3%	3%	2%	1%	10%

E. Time of Crime

The findings showed that most of the crimes were committed early mid night (29%). The other hours of the day where crime likely happened included evening (19%); early in the morning (13%); and late at night (13%). Crime also happened other times during the day such as mid-morning (7%); mid-day (7%) and late afternoon (7%) and early afternoon (3%). In Kibera, crime mostly happened early mid-night (34%); evening in Mathare (28%); late at night in Mukuru (30%); and evening or early midnight at Korogocho at 27% respectively.

Table 1.19: Time of crime

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=292	N=76	N=68	N=81	N=67
Early in the morning	13%	9%	9%	16%	16%
Mid-Morning	7%	3%	7%	15%	1%
Mid-Day	7%	11%	3%	9%	3%
Early Afternoon	3%	1%	4%	0%	7%
Late Afternoon	7%	1%	9%	11%	6%
Evening	19%	18%	28%	6%	27%
Early night Mid	29%	34%	25%	30%	27%
Night Late at night	13%	22%	9%	11%	10%
No idea when crime was committed	2%	0%	6%	2%	1%

F. Place of Crime

The findings showed that crime happened in various places in the informal settlement. However, crime commonly happened along the way (39%); in the house (31%); outside the house nearby (19%). Besides, 8% of crime happened at the public place while 3% happened in other places. Most crime happened on the way in Kibera (51%); Korogocho (42%) and Mathare (29%) while in Mukuru most crimes happened in the house (42%).

Table 1.20: Place of crime

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=292	N=76	N=68	N=81	N=67
In the house	31%	28%	26%	42%	25%
Outside the house but nearby	19%	16%	28%	14%	21%
At a public place	8%	4%	12%	7%	9%
On the way	39%	51%	29%	33%	42%
Other	3%	1%	4%	4%	3%

G. How the Police Found out

The findings indicated that there were various ways through which the police found out about the crime. The majority of the crime in the informal settlements were personally reported to the police (59%). However, 15% were reported to the police through another household member or neighbor; 10% were reported by an unknown person; and 8% involved the police knowing by coming to the crime scene. About 5% of the respondents claimed they did not know how the police found out.

Table 1.21: How the police found out

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=79	N=12	N=20	N=27	N=20
I reported to the police personally	59%	83%	65%	59%	40%
Through another household member/nei	15%	17%	10%	19%	15%
Police came to the scene themselves	8%	0%	5%	7%	15%
An unknown person called the police	10%	0%	10%	11%	15%
Some other way	6%	8%	10%	0%	10%
I don't know how the police found out	5%	0%	0%	11%	5%

H. Why the Crime was not reported

The findings showed that 34% of the respondents did not report because they feared the police would not act; 31% failed to report because they did not have any proof; 17%

feared that the police may demand a bribe; 11% considered the crime a trivial offense; 4% reported the offenders to the authorities instead; and 2% because they recovered their stolen property. However, 16% claimed that they did not report for some other reasons while 8% did not respond to this question.

Table 1.22: Why crime was not reported

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=213	N=64	N=48	N=54	N=47
It was a trivial offense	11%	17%	4%	15%	6%
I feared the police would not act	34%	41%	29%	35%	30%
I feared the police may demand a bribe	17%	5%	13%	41%	13%
I did not have any proof	31%	8%	48%	56%	17%
I reported the offender to other authorities	4%	5%	6%	2%	4%
I recovered my stolen property	2%	2%	0%	0%	6%
Other reason	16%	33%	2%	4%	21%
Did not mention	8%	13%	10%	4%	6%

I. Satisfaction with the Police

The majority of the respondents (48%) were dissatisfied with the police; while 20% were satisfied with the police, another 20% were very dissatisfied. Besides, only 5% were very satisfied while 6% had no idea. The levels of dissatisfaction were higher in Kibera (58%); Mukuru (59%) and Mathare (55%).

Table 1.23: Satisfaction with the police

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=79	N=12	N=20	N=27	N=20
Very satisfied	5%	0%	0%	0%	20%
Satisfied	20%	8%	20%	30%	15%
Dissatisfied	48%	58%	55%	59%	20%
Very dissatisfied	20%	25%	20%	4%	40%
No idea	6%	8%	5%	7%	5%

J. How Police Tackle Crime

The findings showed that the police use various means to tackle crime. The mostly commonly used methods included

going to the informal settlement once in a while (44%); going to the informal settlements daily (33%) or when there is an incident (30%). However, 5% of the respondents claimed that the police did not go to the informal settlement at all while 2% indicated that they did not know.

Table1.24: Description of how police tackle crime

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
The police patrol the area daily	33%	13%	54%	41%	33%
The police come here once in a while	44%	49%	53%	33%	38%
The police only come when there is an in	30%	37%	16%	37%	27%
The police do not come here at all	5%	11%	3%	1%	4%
Don't Know/Refused	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%

K. Government Efforts to Solve Crime Problem in the Settlement

The majority of respondents claimed that the government involvement in solving crime problems in the informal settlements was to a lesser extent (34%). Another 34% claimed that it was to a small extent; 28% said that it was to a large extent while 4% claimed that they had no idea.

Table1.25: Extent of government commitment to solve the problem of crime in slums

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
To a large extent	28%	14%	42%	24%	42%
To a lesser extent	34%	39%	30%	41%	17%
To a small extent	34%	43%	26%	33%	32%
No idea	4%	4%	2%	3%	9%

L. Poverty as the Cause of Crime

The findings showed that the majority of respondents (68%) strongly agreed that poverty was the cause of crime. Besides, while 20% of the respondents agreed; 8% neither agreed nor disagreed; 2% disagreed while 1% strongly disagreed.

Table1.26:Poverty is the key cause of crime here

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Strongly agree	68%	85%	78%	44%	59%
Agree	20%	7%	15%	41%	20%
Neither nor	8%	5%	5%	11%	16%

Disagree	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%
Strongly disagree	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%

M. Community Participation Can Help Prevent Crime

The findings showed that most of the respondents (84%) strongly agreed that community participation can help prevent crime; 32% of the respondents agreed; 2% neither agreed nor disagreed while another 2% disagreed.

Table1.27:Community participation can help prevent crime

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Strongly agree	64%	74%	50%	56%	76%
Agree	32%	23%	45%	40%	22%
Neither nor	2%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Disagree	2%	0%	1%	3%	3%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%

N. Police and the community can work together to prevent crime

The findings showed that the majority of the respondents (83%) strongly agreed that the police and the community can collaborate in crime prevention; however, while 13% of the respondents agreed; 25 neither agreed not disagreed; 1% disagreed and another 1% also strongly disagreed.

Table 1.28:The police and the community can work together to prevent crime

	Total	Slum settlement			
		Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=659	N=223	N=152	N=169	N=115
Strongly agree	83%	89%	78%	73%	89%
Agree	13%	6%	18%	21%	6%
Neither nor	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%
Disagree	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Strongly disagree	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%

O. Spontaneous Mechanisms for crime Prevention

The findings showed that the major spontaneous crime prevention mechanisms included police patrols (68%); vigilante groups (42%); gates and fences (28%); village security committee (23%); and employed night guards (13%).

Table 1.29: Mechanisms of crime prevention -Spontaneous Total Slum settlement

	Kibera	Mathare	Mukuru	Korogoch
Total	N=516	N=123	N=141	N=159
	N=123	N=141	N=159	N=93

Police patrols	69%	50%	82%	84%	48%
Vigilante groups	42%	31%	40%	42%	61%
Employed night guards	13%	1%	4%	35%	5%
Village security committees	23%	15%	32%	23%	23%
Gates and fences	28%	46%	13%	38%	10%
Others	3%	10%	0%	1%	3%

P. Prompted Mechanisms for Crime Prevention

The findings showed that the majority of the residents considered gates and fences as the significant promoted mechanism for crime prevention in the informal settlements (29%). The other major prompted crime prevention mechanisms included the village security committee (27%); police patrols (21%); vigilante groups (20%); and employed night guards (14%). However, a significant majority (35%) discounted that none of the above measures accounted for prompted crime prevention mechanisms.

Table 1.30: Mechanisms of crime Prevention-Prompted Total Slum settlement

	Kibera		Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=516	N=123	N=141	N=159	N=93
Police patrols	21%	30%	14%	7%	43%
Vigilante groups	20%	20%	3%	25%	35%
Employed night guards	14%	6%	5%	22%	26%
Village security committee	27%	20%	23%	23%	49%
Gates and fences	29%	40%	2%	34%	49%
Others	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%
None	35%	20%	62%	37%	11%

Q. Most Effective Mechanism for Crime Prevention

The findings showed that the majority of the residents recognized police patrol as the most effective crime prevention mechanism (42%); the other effective mechanisms included vigilante groups (23%); erecting gates and fences (20%); village security committees (7%) and employing night guards (5%).

Table 1.31: Mechanisms of crime prevention-most effective Total Slum settlement

	Kibera		Mathare	Mukuru	Korogocho
Total	N=516	N=123	N=141	N=159	N=93
Police patrols	42%	15%	54%	52%	42%
Vigilante groups	23%	11%	30%	21%	34%
Employed night guards	5%	0%	1%	16%	0%
Village security committee	7%	11%	8%	1%	14%
Gates and fences	20%	60%	6%	11%	2%
Others	3%	4%	1%	1%	8%

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concluded that while there may be other predictors of crime in the four informal settlements, the most common and predominant factor was poverty. This was evident by the livelihoods of the residents which is characterized by high rates of unemployment and underemployment, living in semi-permanent houses made of mud and sharing amenities such as latrines amongst families within a locale. While most of the resident were casual laborers their income levels ranged between Ksh. 3000 – 5000 per month and most of the residents considered the economy as a big problem, alongside poverty and unemployment.

The study also concluded that there were various criminal activities went on in the informal settlements with the residents in all four slums acknowledging that crime was a big problem to them. The most common spontaneous crimes included robbery and muggings while most common prompted crime in the informal settlements included drugs and illicit brews. Most crimes were committed late at night and early mid-night and often occurred along the way or inside the house. Most residents reported the crime to the police though others did not because they feared the police would not act or that they would demand a bribe. The residents were dissatisfied by the efforts by the police to control crime in the settlements, which mostly involved patrolling the areas once in a while. The efforts by the government to control crime in the settlement was also perceived to be effective only to a lesser extent, informing the dissatisfaction by the residents. The community has a significant role to play in preventing crime in the settlement. More so, the collaboration between the community and the police is required to effectively control and prevent crime. The effective spontaneous and prompted mechanisms for crime prevention include police patrols and the use of vigilante groups.

The study therefore, recommends the investment in poverty alleviation programs amongst the residents to boost their economic prospects: the program should focus on supporting small enterprises and developing skills for the youths. The study also recommends the upgrading of the informal settlements to address the environmental factors that make the slums convenient for criminals: this could include provision of proper housing, adequate street lighting and sanitation. Besides, the study recommends the exploration of community policing approaches to increase the collaboration between the police and the residents of the informal settlements.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akers, R. L., & Jensen, G. F. (2007). Social Learning Theory and the Explanation of Crime. New Jersey : Buy From Transaction Publishers.
- [2] Beaver, K. M., Barnes, J. C., & Boutwell, B. B. (2014). The nurture versus biosocial debate in criminology : on the origins of criminal behavior and criminality. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- [3] Britt, C. L., & Gottfredson, M. R. (2003). Control Theories of Crime and Delinquency. New Jersey : Transaction Publishers.

- [4] Brown-Luthango, M., Reyes, E., & Gubevu, M. (2016). Informal settlement upgrading and safety: experiences. *Journal of Housing and Built Environment*, 1-26.
- [5] Clarke, R., & Eck, J. E. (2014). *Become a Problem-Solving Crime Analyst*. Routledge .
- [6] Dubber, M. D., & Hörnle, T. (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminal Law*. New York, NY : Oxford University Press.
- [7] Fattah, K. N., & Walters, P. (2020). "A Good Place for the Poor!" Counternarratives to Territorial Stigmatisation from Two Informal Settlements in Dhaka. *Social Inclusion* , 8(1), 55–65.
- [8] Filippi, F. D., Cocina, G. G., & Martinuzzi, C. (2020). Integrating Dierent Data Sources to Address Urban Security in Informal Areas. The Case Study of Kibera, Nairobi. *Sustainability*, 12(2437), 1-26.
- [9] Kelling, G. L., & Coles, C. M. (1997). *Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order And Reducing Crime In Our Communities*. Simon and Schuster.
- [10] Kubende, H. S. (2018). *Factors Infleuncing Crime in the Urban Informal Settlements: A Case of Kibra*. University of Nairobi.
- [11] Meth, P. (2017). Informal Housing, Gender, Crime and Violence: The Role of Design in Urban South Africa. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 57(2), 402–421.
- [12] Murefu, M. N., Wamüyü, T. W., & Ochieng, D. O. (2019). Community Policing And Crime Reduction In Informal Settlements: A Case Of Korogocho Slum, Nairobi City County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 6(3), 575 - 584.
- [13] Musoi, K., Muthama, T., Kibor, J., & Kitiku, J. (2014). *A Study Of Crime In Urban Slums In Kenya: The Case of Kibra, Bondeni, Manyatta and Mishomoroni Slums*. Security Research and Information Centre. Retrieved from http://www.srickenya.org/publications/slum_Crime_Survey_Report_Thur_2.pdf
- [14] Mutahi, P. (2011). Between Legality and Illegality : (In)security, crime and gangs in Nairobi informal settlements. *SA Crime Quarterly*, 37, 11-18.
- [15] Ndikaru, J. N. (2010). *Crime Differentials In Metropolitan Slum Areas: An Analysis Of The City Of Nairobi Slums, Kenya*. Kenyatta University. Retrieved from <http://erepo.usiu.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11732/5827/AGATHER%20W.%20GICHAGA%20MAIR%202020.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- [16] Osundwa, M. S. (2021). *Socio-Economic Determinants Of Youth Driven Criminal Activities In Kenya: A Study Of Lamu West-Sub County*. Africa Nazarene University. Retrieved from <http://repository.anu.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/123456789/661/Socio-Economic%20determinants%20of%20youth%20driven%20criminal%20activities%20in%20kenya%20Acase%20of%20Lamu%20West%20-Sub%20County.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- [17] Peak, K. J. (2013). *Encyclopedia of community policing and problem solving*. Thousand Oaks, California : SAGE Publications, Inc...
- [18] Shikuku, J. K., Makworo, M., & Njuguna, M. B. (2018). Influence of Physical Environment on Crime in Informal Settlements of Kibra in Nairobi County, Kenya. *African Research Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 5(1).
- [19] Teasdale, B., & Bradley, M. S. (2017). *Preventing Crime and Violence*. Cham : Springer International Publishing.
- [20] Walker, S. (2015). *Sense and Nonsense About Crime, Drugs, and Communities*. Cengage Learning .
- [21] Winters, R. C., Globokar, J. L., & Roberson, C. (2014). *An Introduction to Crime and Crime Causation*. CRC Press.